

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th June, 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. F. E. MILLER; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism*); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. S. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Social Services*).

Prayers were read.

MESSRS. MOTTLEY and BOXILL entered the House and took their seats.

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.

DOCUMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 28th February, 1962.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to lay the following:-

Report of the Eastern Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962.

Statement showing the Net Customs and Excise Receipts for two months ended 31st May, 1962.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 30th September, 1961 in respect of schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$650,271 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 6 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to place the sum of \$75,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 7 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I should like to inform the House that it is my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply later in the day in order to deal in all their stages with the Resolutions of which I have just given notice.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$1,186 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. 8 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Resolution of which notice has just been given by the Hon. Minister of Social Services.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Replies to the following Questions are now ready:-

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 10/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph on the 23rd January, 1962.

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 11/1962 asked by the same hon. member on the 23rd January, 1962.

Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 34/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael on the 10th April, 1962.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:-

WHEREAS by virtue of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act, 1962, of the United Kingdom, entry in the U.K. will become increasingly difficult for Barbadian emigrants as from 1st July, 1962;

AND WHEREAS there are almost 400 would-be emigrants with issued passports who are willing to beat the ban but are without means of transportation to cause them to arrive in the United Kingdom before the said 1st July, 1962;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call upon the Government to provide such means of transportation as may be necessary, by charter or otherwise, for the said would-be emigrants without delay.

I beg to give notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal with this Resolution later on in the day, as it is very important.
2.45 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Question stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question is as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is it within the knowledge of the Minister that the general public who require Certificates from the Registration Department of this Island is put to much inconvenience in obtaining such Certificates?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative will the Minister issue directions that something be done to relieve such conditions?

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be taken forthwith.

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

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Question is No. 10/1962, which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government in view of the fact that the reaping season is near at hand put the following roads in such a condition that the land owners in the area will have their crops reaped with ease:-

"Cadogan's Tenantry Road and Coward's Tenantry Roads, off Chimborazo?"

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"The customary repairs to these roads to facilitate the reaping of crops by the land owners and others have been completed."

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be glad if the hon. member would speak a little louder. I have not heard what he was saying.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: The Reply is as follows:-

"The customary repairs to these roads to facilitate the reaping of crops by the land owners and others have been completed."

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to thank the hon. member for his reply, and also for the repairs which he carried out on these roads.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Oral Reply is to Question No. 11/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government consider the immediate repairing of the Highway known as Frizers-Vaughn Road?"

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"Repairs to the Frizers-Vaughn Road were commenced on the 19th of January, 1962 (i.e. some 4 days before the Honourable Member gave notice of the question) and were completed on the 31st March, 1962."

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the Hon. Minister for his Reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Oral Reply is to Question No. 34/1962, asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that the roads running through the district known as Free Hill, Black Rock, in the Parish of Saint Michael, are in a pitiable state of disrepair?

2. Will Government take the necessary action to see the said roads be repaired as soon as possible?"

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"1. Yes, Sir.

2. Consideration will be given to the repair of these roads when the Tenantry Road Programme for the financial year 1962-63 is being drawn up."

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the Hon. Minister very much for his reply, and hope he will see his way in the near future to have these roads fixed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That concludes the answers to Questions.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be taken next.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the two money Resolutions of which notice was given earlier in today's sitting.

I should also like to inform hon. members through you that one of the Resolutions, the one for \$75,000 has already been circulated, and the other one for \$650,271 will shortly be in the hands of hon. members.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.
The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.
2.55 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63, No. 5

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution reads as follows:-

RESOLVED that the sum of \$2,332 be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1962-63, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1962-63, No. 5, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

The sum of \$2,332 is required to meet a claim for compensation as a result of an accident involving the Schooner "Emeline" owned by Captain Sealy and the "Lord Willoughby" owned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

The accident caused the fracture of the bow-sprit of the "Emeline" and the schooner was forced to remain in the Careenage until a suitable replacement arrived from British Guiana and the necessary repairs were carried out. The claim includes the cost of replacing the bow-sprit, wages of members of the crew during the period pending repairs and compensation for loss of profit.

Mr. Chairman, on the 20th March, 1958, the tug *Lord Willoughby* towed the *Emeline* into the Careenage. After it was in the inner basin of the Careenage, the controls of the engines of the *Lord Willoughby* broke and it was not under control. The *Lord Willoughby* drifted across the schooner *Emeline's* bow-sprit and broke it. No bow-sprit was available in the Island of Barbados and the schooner *Emeline* had to remain in Barbados until a suitable replacement came from British Guiana.

After a considerable time arriving at the cost for damages, the Government and the owners of the *Emeline* arrived at a satisfactory conclusion to which the Harbour Master agreed. We are now asking in this Resolution for the money to pay the owner of the motor vessel *Emeline*.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, will the Hon. Minister give us a breakdown of this item? This seems a bit high.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Sir, a breakdown of the expenses is as follows:-

Bills submitted for Labour and Material, \$515.56; Other expenses during Repairs; Crew's wages from 8/4/58 to 5/5/58, \$180.08; Crew's food, 113 man days at 84¢ per man, per day, \$94.92; Harbour dues for period in question, \$33.04; Master's own wages, \$260.00; Loss of profit claimed by Capt. Sealy during the time ship was laid up, \$1,248.20; thus making a total of \$2,331.80.

Mr. Chairman, the time actually lost by this vessel in not operating is part of the compensation included in this Resolution. Fortunately for the Government, I can say that it has been calculated at a very low figure and I think the Government is extremely lucky to get off with the paying of so low a compensation.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Sir, I did not want to take part in the debate on this matter for personal reasons, but the Government was actually sued in Court over this matter

for a figure which was considerably higher than the one submitted, and it was ruled in that case that in proceedings which involved one of Her Majesty's ships, or a ship belonging to the Crown in right of government of this Island, no action would lie, but that the remedy was by way of Petition of Right.

Both in England in 1948 and in Barbados in 1955, I think - I am not quite sure of the dates - Acts were passed enabling subjects of the Crown to bring actions for damages against the Crown in matters involving any misfeasance or malfeasance committed or any liability incurred by the Crown or any one of its agents which resulted in damage to that person. This, however, does not apply to matters in which any one of Her Majesty's ships are involved. We have this anomalous position that if a motor car or a jeep owned by the Government runs into somebody else's property, then that person can sue without fear of anybody; but if a ship runs into the Wharf or a warehouse, then because it is one of Her Majesty's ships, it has no claim to the law at all.

Before the Crown Proceedings Act was instituted, what the Crown used to do was to make *ex-gratia* payments without admitting any liability at all. What the Hon. Minister of Communications said was right. The ship was laid up for 28 days. I am sure that the Hon. Minister would not mind my quoting this, but I remember one particular case in which a ship was laid up for nine days as a result of negligence on the part of some third party, and compensation was made out at the rate of \$1,000 a day. Of course, it was a ship which was a little larger than the one involved in this instance. In this particular case, this ship was laid up for 28 days and because of the length of time taken by this sailing vessel at that time between Georgetown and Bridgetown, it has been calculated at a lower rate of demurrage. In the other instance, it was a matter of a turn around in 36 hours. In a subsequent case of a ship in Trinidad in which the Hon. Minister and I was involved, the compensation was made at \$1,500 a day; therefore, in one day the Minister got demurrage at a rate which was the equivalent of the total demurrage rate of this ship for 28 days. I think that will answer the question of the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I can remember hearing that the accident occurred, but I would like to know if it occurred during the day or the night. The Hon. Minister also read out a breakdown of the expenses and said that it was so much per day for each of the crew. While I am in agreement with all of that expenditure so far as loss of profits and the expenses incurred by the captain, I am not a legal man; but I do not know whether you are right in paying the crew for their meals during that time. Bear in mind that you are paying the crew so much per day and it would be the same thing in my opinion as if the ship was out to sea and they were working. You will have to feed them just the same.
3.05 p.m.

Now the Captain will be compensated for every thing and still we have to pass money so as to feed the crew all the time. That may be a foolish question to ask, but I would still like to know from the legal brains if that is legal. You are paid for loss of profits, for the time during which the boat was there; you are paid the wages of the crew; why should we have to pay for the feeding of the crew also? I am wondering if this has been put in there so as to give a breakdown. If I cause a man not to be working and I pay his wages at \$2.00 a day, why should I have to feed him as well? That does not sound right to me and therefore I would like to hear about this matter from the Minister.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am glad that the hon. member has come around to my point of view. I was the first person to object to paying members of the House and feeding them as well, and I think it was the hon. member who contended that that was unfair. However, it is a question as to how the damages are computed. If you put in a claim for damages - loss of earnings - that is gross income which is coming in, and therefore you have to deduct your expenses from the amount in arriving at the net figure of damages you have suffered. If you put down loss of profits, that is the gross wages, the cost of feeding the crew and legitimate expenses

which the Master entails if he wants to keep that crew. The service begins and ends at the port at which he has signed up. If he keeps that crew until he reaches the port at which he began, those are expenses which, in law, the Master of the ship can claim. I should like to inform the hon. member that this claim was filed against the Government since 1958. It has already been vetted by the Crown Law Officers and the Crown Solicitors. Therefore it is not a matter at which we have arrived arbitrarily; it has been soundly based on the existing state of the law.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I said in my opening remarks that this thing does not sound right to me. However, the Premier must be very careful as to how he replies to hon. members of this Chamber. I am allowed - and I have the right - to question this, because he is expecting a vote from me on this; therefore I should know something about it. Now when the Premier talks about my coming around to him, about his complaining of paying hon. members and feeding them as well, he must try to rise a little higher than that as Premier of this colony. I would like him to reply to me and tell me if all the members of his own Party were in favour of the cessation of the feeding of hon. members. I am quite sure that they were not in favour of it. The Hon. Premier should not allow the public to feel that I am the only member who is not satisfied about his actions in so far as cutting out that grant is concerned. I will still appeal to him to rise a little higher when he is replying to hon. members.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has asked me a question as to whether hon. members were satisfied with my cutting out the food bill. That is personal to the hon. member, but I really do not know the answer to the hon. member's question. He must have discussed the matter with members of my Party, which I have not done. I did not ask members of my Party if that is the right thing. I took out that vote and told them about it when I came to the House. If I had to consult each and every member of my Party about anything, that would be disclosing secrets to them. I make no apology for that at all. What I have done, I have done, and I do not care. As Minister of Finance, what I have done I have done.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I was not referring to backbenchers; I meant members of the Cabinet: and when the hon. member says that he does not consult them, then he is a little dictator.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will give the answer to that question; it is this. It would be unconstitutional for a Minister of Finance to consult his Cabinet on matters of that kind. That is nothing at all to do with dictatorship. The hon. member would like me to tell my Party members what duties I must impose on what is coming to the country? They will know one minute before I come in here and not a minute before.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I could not allow that statement to pass in this House; it would be unconstitutional in a matter about which nobody knows anything. The Hon. Premier cannot say that it is unconstitutional because there is no constitution which gives any Minister the right to act independently. What you have at present is collective action, and therefore you cannot say that it is constitutional for a Minister to act in a financial matter independent of his Cabinet. I would not like that tripe to go down anybody's throat. The Prime Minister of Great Britain can say that, but not the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer cannot say that he can decide to do something, and whatever he puts in his budget he puts in, no matter what the Prime Minister says. We are just like Grenada; we are back in the position of Grenada. When the Prime Minister brings down something, the Secretary of State for the Colonies can decide that certain things they cannot do. (Hon. E. W. BARROW: Let him try.) It is not a question of letting him try; we cannot stop him. This Order-in-Council gives him the power to do it. We are not like Bermuda or Bahamas; we are like St. Lucia, Antigua and the others. I do not want it to be said that this is unconstitutional because I do not believe it is worthwhile. That would be parading the Barbados constitution just as how the former Premier used to do it.

3.15 p.m.

I do not think this is a Chamber in which one should get up and make those statements which are not legal statements, because you are not making them before a Court; you are making them in the House of Assembly; and when you make a statement in the House of Assembly, you make it to 23 equals.

Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to the idea that you can act independently in financial matters and say that it is unconstitutional to tell members of the Cabinet what you are putting in the Budget. I say it is not true. We have not reached that stage yet. It might be unconstitutional to tell the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, but not for the Ministers to know what Budgets you are going to present to the House. How long since have we reached this stage of craziness?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, quite honestly I did not want to enter into any academic debate on a matter of this kind, but again I would reiterate that I have already informed the Cabinet that shortly, let us say, fifteen minutes or maybe extending to half an hour - depending on the length of the proposals - before introducing the Budget, I will tell members of the Cabinet what is in it. The hon. member asked if I asked anybody, and I said "no, I do not have to ask anybody."

I still emphasise that as Minister of Finance I do not have to ask anybody's permission; but obviously if I did not have the confidence of members of my Cabinet that I would have their support, I would not be so crazy as to introduce something to which they would be diametrically opposed. In the same way I would inform members of the Cabinet before I come here what the proposals are, I will do it just before presentation to this House, so that nobody will be able to say that the members of the Cabinet knew in advance and that kind of nonsense, in the same way the previous Appropriation Bill was discussed, I think, the day before with members of the Cabinet. Naturally it had their approval. They knew about it before it came, but I did not ask them. Perhaps there is a very subtle distinction between asking somebody's permission and showing them what you have decided on; and I do not hesitate to make any decisions like the last Government on matters, and hold up things seven and eight years waiting for decisions. There were several matters waiting to be done and not a Minister's signature appearing anywhere. I make decisions and take the consequences; and if hon. members do not like it, they had better go and read a little constitutional law. That is the end of the matter and I am making no apology. If hon. members had listened to me very carefully, they would have seen the distinction between what I was saying and the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I too was very worried, Mr. Chairman, when the Hon. Premier said something about 'unconstitutional'. I was looking at it in a different light myself. I would be prepared to say that it would be indiscreet for the Minister of Finance to release his proposals, but I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that we have not got the same rights in sovereignty, speaking as a layman, as the Prime Minister of England. I would say that while it would not be unconstitutional, it would be rather indiscreet for the Minister of Finance to say to the six members of his Cabinet two weeks before he lays his proposals, the method by which he is going to raise taxation on rum, cigarettes or something like that. It has never been done, but I do not subscribe to the idea that it is unconstitutional.

As far as the Chancellor of the Exchequer is concerned, I believe none of us knows what is the true position. I am sure that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would never take into confidence the entire Cabinet of Great Britain and say that he is going to raise so-and-so in any Budget. Up to the last moment, Sir Stafford Cripps denied to the end certain proposals to the public and to the members of his Cabinet. I know that the Cabinet is a collective body, but I am only saying that it has always been said that more than one person can never keep a secret, and in England or Barbados it would be a rather indiscreet thing. I am taking it in a different light, because I do not see that taking something out of the Estimates has anything to do with the constitution at

all. What I do not think the Minister of Finance can say is what we are waiting for in June, which had been promised to us: that is, to say by what methods we are going to raise the deficit for which we are looking. To get up and say that to the five or six Ministers is as good as telling the Barbados public.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer myself, as the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has said, but I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that it would not be a constitutional issue at all. It would be indiscreet to make such a statement as to how you are going to raise money; but if you are going to take money out of the Estimates which is provided for something, I see nothing wrong in telling that to anybody.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Before you put the question, I do not want to lose my temper.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to permit any more discussion other than on the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is not a question of your permission. We are dealing with a Resolution of the House. We are not here on your permission; we have been elected; so you have to sit there and listen to us if a point arises in the debate with which we want to deal. We are dealing with a Resolution for money, which is very important. I am not here based on your permission to allow me to speak; I am in here because I have a mandate from the people to speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But we must follow the correct procedure.

Mr. WALCOTT: This intemperance on the part of people who preside over meetings is not good enough.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will listen to the hon. member on the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise, Mr. Chairman, because a point has been made in this debate. The Premier made a statement which must be cleared up in the interest of the Colony as a whole. The hon. senior member for the City said he is not a lawyer. I make no apology for not being a lawyer, but I am a member of this Assembly, and it is my business to be acquainted with every aspect of a political matter, whether it is constitutional, legal, social or economic. I make no apology for saying that in any Cabinet system, and this is so in the United Kingdom, the whole Cabinet and the Government falls on the economic policy which the Minister poses to the country; so no Chancellor of the Exchequer or Prime Minister can go down to Parliament with an issue for which the whole Government would fall and about which they knew nothing. I do not have to be a lawyer to know that that is an ordinary, elementary, commonsense, constitutional matter which is known.

Mr. Chairman, nobody has to read constitutional law or be a constitutional lawyer to understand that any matter involving the economic or financial policy of a Government rests with the Cabinet. Sir Stafford Cripps told the world — and when you tell the world, you do not talk about the Cabinet — that he did not talk about devaluing the pound, but do not tell me that this Cabinet did not know that the pound was going to be devalued. Hugh Dalton had to resign because when he was going into the House he said something to somebody other than to a member of his Cabinet, and therefore he had to resign. The whole Cabinet did not resign. If he came to the House with any financial matter such as the Premier has brought here, are you going to say to me that the whole Government must fall if there is a vote of "no confidence" in the Premier, and tell me it is only something for the Premier to know? There is no matter that can bring down the whole Government unless it brings down the Premier himself, and the Minister of Finance in this context is also the Premier.

3.25 p.m.

The Minister of Finance is the Premier, one and the same person; so it is no point to say that you have con-

fidence in the Minister of Finance but not in the Government. As Minister of Finance, the Hon. Premier is holding the corresponding position in this Island of First Lord of the Treasury in Great Britain. Here, you follow all the trappings of the United Kingdom Government.

I am not concerned when anybody asks you something, or that a little ordinary conversation went on between the Hon. Premier and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph because I regard that as just an ordinary conversation to which you should pay no great attention. I pay attention to what the Hon. Premier says and I say that because Barbados can be an extremely ignorant community at times. As a lawyer, if the Premier gets up and says something, the hon. senior member for the City has a habit of saying that "he is a lawyer and I take what he says and dare you as a layman to criticise it".

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member knows me better than that. I am the last person to say that because a lawyer says such a thing, I dare not criticise it. What I said is that in actual theory it might mean one thing and in actual practice it might be another. I do not consider the Hon. Premier as the only lawyer and therefore I should sit down and take what he says for granted. I take my opinion from those who are trained. As a matter of fact, if I want to know something on the Trade Union, I will go to the hon. senior member for St. Peter and ask him something about it. If I want to know something which has to do with constitutional law, I will go to somebody who is trained in constitutional law and ask that person something about it.

What I have said is that in actual theory it is one thing and in actual practice it is another. The Chancellor of the Exchequer makes certain decisions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is bound to discuss it with the Prime Minister, even if it was at the last minute. If he did not do that he would be the damnedst fool. Barbados is a small community. I never said because a lawyer said so, it is so. I did say that I have the greatest respect for people who are trained along a certain line.

Mr. WALCOTT: It would be ignorant if any person did not have any respect for training. I have respect even for trained criminals, because you have to deal with them differently from the ordinary amateur criminal. In this House of Assembly we expect that the politicians must be trained men also. They must be so trained that if anything happens, they have the answers.

I am not going to have any constitutional lawyer to advise me on simple matters. There is no law involved in this matter. The hon. member said that he did not mean what he said at the beginning. He did not mean that he makes a decision on financial matters and members of the Cabinet need not know anything about it. I said that that cannot be so because the whole Cabinet has to fall by anything which he brings in here. Read all the Letters Patent on all the things and you will see that it is a collective decision. They have not yet reached the stage that even a Minister can make decisions which would involve the Cabinet, because it is a question that they do not have the power which a Minister of the United Kingdom Government possesses.

Sir, I believe that we will have to discuss our constitutional position later. There is a Resolution here for the purpose. I do not feel in answering questions that we should enter into these large issues and make these statements.

I think the Hon. Premier has to be more careful. He has been making too many of these statements recently which he had to re-explain. Let us be quite frank. The Premier answered in a different way from the phrase; therefore, I will not accept that because it would be a peculiar position if you get the Premier of Barbados undertaking to act independently on matters in which the whole Cabinet is involved. It is not that he cannot do it; but you will have to come to the conclusion, if he does it, that the Cabinet is a bunch of nit-wits. It is known that some time you can go so far that your own Cabinet can pull you down.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I really am not too happy about the reply by the Hon. Premier when he said that he

has the confidence of his Cabinet. That is true; but if he is going to do things in this way — let us say, he may be studying what he is going to do for the last three months and then half an hour before he comes to the House, he releases it to his Cabinet — then, according to my way of thinking, it is as good as if he did not draw it to their attention. The Cabinet should have the chance of going into these things thoroughly and deciding on the matter with him. When it is not done in this way, it is taking advantage of their confidence. Because you have the confidence of your Cabinet, it does not mean that within fifteen minutes before you declare anything you should call on them. I repeat, they should have the chance of studying it.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I can sit down and allow this Resolution to pass without saying something on it. This Resolution before us is for the sum of \$2,332 to meet a claim for compensation as a result of an accident involving the schooner *Emeline* owned by Captain Sealy and the *Lord Willoughby* owned by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

I am telling you now, Mr. Chairman, that this Resolution before the House today did not need all this argument. I am warning you that on any Resolution which comes into this House of Assembly after today, you should cause members to stick to the latitude which is before them, whether it is the Hon. Premier or any other hon. member: because by so doing, you will have proper control. What caused the Government's launch to strike the *Emeline*? It was because it was not in the right latitude. That is what caused the accident. That is what is causing us to pay the owner of the *Emeline* compensation. But what is causing all this worry today in this House of Assembly? It is because hon. members would not keep in the right latitude. I hope in the future, Mr. Chairman, that you will stick to your guns and do your duty and cause all hon. members to be in the right latitude.
3.35 p.m.

You should know how far you can allow any hon. member to go out of his latitude, because too far East is West. That is causing you not to have the power and jurisdiction which you should have. You should see that we stick to the Resolution because what I have mentioned can happen with you, with me or with anybody else. Let us get ahead with the people's work; let us get ahead with the job which the people have sent us here to do. I am therefore agreeing to this Resolution, and hope that you will have things under your proper control when you sit in that Chair.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63, No. 7

PROPERTY ACQUISITION

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution to place the sum of \$75,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 7 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. This Resolution is for the acquisition of a property known as "Sherbourne". The property which it is sought to acquire by means of this Resolution is a property standing on some seven acres of land which land adjoins the land of the Governor-in-Executive Committee at the Pine Plantation. When it was discovered that this property was in the market for sale, it was decided to purchase it as a matter of general principle because it was felt that the price which we were prepared to give for it and which was eventually accepted would be reasonable, and if we had to acquire seven acres of open land we would have to pay probably twice as much for that land. The advantage is that it is not only an extensive property, but there is the fact that it would give an entrance, if necessary, to the Pine Plantation and the development there of the Pine-Parkinson School and the new Extra-Mural Department running directly through this property.

The purpose of acquiring this property was not to give a right of way or anything like that; that is only one of the

original advantages which would inure to the public of this island. Originally it was bought for general purposes, bearing in mind that we have a programme for expansion in education and in many other directions. The Acting Registrar and other Officials from the U.C.W.I. along with Heads of Departments have drawn up tentative plans for using it as a Liberal Arts College to house or to make teaching accommodation available for 150 students in the first instance. We had a survey undertaken with the Principal of the University College of the West Indies and he decided that there would be an output of 150 students in the first instance and 120 in every succeeding year at the present level of our educational standard. After these tentative plans were formulated for the utilisation of "Sherbourne" for the Liberal Arts College, the new Federation of the Eight came up, and after the London Conference, as the result of a decision made there, it was decided to site the pre-Federal Organization in Barbados. We felt that the Liberal Arts College could make use of the existing school buildings — buildings like the Science Library of Harrison College — and therefore we could release this property temporarily for the organization over which the Governor of Barbados presides as Chairman. There is going to be a meeting of the Council of Ministers during this month, whose work is already on the way, and it is necessary to establish a small secretariat to preserve the identity of the Windward Islands, the Leeward Islands and Barbados as a common unit with similar aspirations and ambitions. If we do not have the pre-Federal Organization to preserve this identity, then there would be a grave danger that the whole thing would fade into oblivion. The sum of \$67,200 is required for the actual purchase of the property, and the rest of the money, or some of it at least, will be required for the purpose of carrying out repairs and so on. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution, I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members how rapidly events outside of this island are making their impact on us and on our plans. As the Hon. Premier has just said, we do hope, if and when this property is acquired by the Government, to set up a Liberal Arts and Science College there. Hon. members will remember that the University College of the West Indies had agreed to a request of this Government that a Liberal Arts and Science College, an integral part of the University, should be set up in Barbados as the College prepares students with the necessary qualifications for general Arts and Science Degrees of the University. I rise at this juncture to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution, because I think it should be made clear that it is the right of the Ministry of Education to permit the Government to use this building, when it is bought, for pre-Federal work, and that this proposal will not in any way inhibit the Liberal Arts and Science College from going on. We did not need initially the building to start our work because the College will not in itself be a residential College except, of course, for its administrative staff.
3.45 p.m.

So far as the Arts lectures are concerned, they can be conducted almost anywhere that is convenient for the majority of students who enrol. For the first year courses in Science, the laboratories at Harrison College can be used, and for the second year, those at Combermere will do; so that nobody need feel afraid that by our decision to waive our immediate claim in favour of the Pre-Federal Organisation, we have in any way receded on our proposals for Higher Education in this Island.

I would like to say that I was very much interested to hear the exchange which went on a few moments ago on another Resolution, because I believe that if the Hon. Premier had continued, he would have said that some of his colleagues are as adamant in their own spheres of activity as he is in his, and he would probably not like me to disclose how both His Excellency and himself put it to me very gently that they would like to take away the proposed Liberal Arts College venue, and wondered whether I would mind. I said I would not. We do not tread on each other's preserves, and we treat each other with great courtesy, because we realise that in our respective spheres we have full responsibility. I think hon. members should know that in the

Ministry of Education we regard not as a setback but as a happy omen that the incipient endeavour to form a nation again ought to take place on territory earmarked for higher learning. It is a happy augury, and I think it means that the new Federation is bound to succeed.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member on that point, but what I would like to know is whether it is necessary in the first place to buy this property. Now I happen to know this property very well. The building is owned by Mr. Scott, and to purchase this property at a cost of \$67,000 is a colossal sum to pay for seven acres of land and then spending \$5,000 in developing the curtilage. I could not agree more that you need a Secretariat, but certainly I do not know that you need purchase this property for \$67,000. There are a number of other places which you can rent.

You will remember, Sir, what happened at the Secondary Modern School at Horse Hill, St. Joseph. It is lamentable that you are attempting to convert the existing building where only two of the rooms could be used as classrooms, if you think of a polytechnic or Evening Institute. The Government has its ideas and proposals, and has a right to ask Parliament for these things; but if you are going to incur an expenditure of \$67,000 and spend a further amount on repairs to the tune of \$7,000 or \$8,000, I certainly believe that you could find some place to rent for the Organisation until you have decided on the Cabinet. It is inevitable and you will have to find funds. I do not know whether or not the remainder of the eight poor territories will be expected to bear the cost of this matter, but I suppose the various Governments will be willing to help in this. I do not know if it is necessary to spend this \$67,000. I really think the price is too high.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this is on the open market and if in bargaining we were willing to acquire it, it would be a different matter. It is probable that you would pay more for it, but \$67,000 is a large sum of money for that building when there are two rooms suitable for classrooms, if you think in terms of 20 children. All the discussion we have had about the use by the College of Liberal Arts, whether it is going to be full-time or operate as an Evening Institute, would not lend itself to the conversion which the Ministry of Education is thinking about, and for the Pre-Federal Organisation you could find some place which you could rent or lease for five, six or ten years. I have some knowledge of properties in this country, and I feel that \$67,000 is too much for seven acres of grass and stone in Two Mile Hill, because there is only about six or seven inches of soil and no more.

Mr. Chairman, there is probably some anxiety on the part of the Ministry and the Minister of Finance to house this particular Federal Organisation - I could not agree with him more - but surely I believe we could find some place where we could lease or rent, and what is more, for your Liberal Arts College the property which you are planning to convert certainly would not lend itself to the type of conversion to make it suitable.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, just in reply to the hon. member who has just sat down.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Is the Minister replying already?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I am replying to the points raised by the hon. member who has just sat down. Apparently he is impugning the commonsense of this Government in implying that we are proposing to throw away money on this purchase which we have in mind by saying that \$67,000 is too much for this kind of property. Well, the hon. member should remember that it was about nine months ago that this House was asked to vote \$74,000 or nearly that to purchase a property in England for a Liaison Officer. Now a house in England that could have seven acres of land with it would make the owner as wealthy as the Duke of Westminster. You cannot get as much as a quarter of an acre that part of London, and if you did, the price would not be \$74,000, but probably five or six times as much,

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, if you are making comparisons, this is to be said. The Federal Government purchased a property improperly known as "Spanish Acres" as a residence for the Prime Minister, and to the best of my knowledge, not only was it not Spanish acres, but it was not even a Spanish acre, because the surrounding land was less than an acre, and the Federal Government paid the Trinidad Government, I believe, \$150,000 for it. Now in this case, not only have we got a little more than seven acres of land, but there is a building there which is in good condition, which is easily adaptable either to the immediate purpose to which we want to put it, and when that purpose has been met, to the more durable purpose which is to come after. It is land which is capable of infinite development and which will be worth more to us after development than it could possibly be worth now. I do not think therefore that the hon. member's point about finding a cheaper place or an alternative property costing less can be well taken. Of course, there is proof enough that this Government proposes to spend money wisely in this instance, as we try to do in all others.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would say that I was listening for the hon. senior member for the City who is the property man in here and knows about valuation to know whether it is a wise purchase. I am not looking at it on a cash basis, but I am looking at it in a general way, and it is very refreshing to hear the hon. junior member for St. George saying that this money is too much, because I remember that when the hon. member was a member of the last Government, they came down hot and sweaty for us to buy some old, broken-down house in the Garrison to put the Chief Justice in, and we threw it back outside the same evening as fast as it came down.
3.55 p.m.

Then they had to postpone that and go up in the Pine Hill and spend a lot of money. Whenever they had finished buying this old house and repairing it, it would cost a fantastic lot of money. If I give you another instance - I was not in the House at the time - but when I came back, the Government went down Fontabelle and bought "Herbert House" for £10,000 to house the Labour Department and they regarded that as a good buy. I understand that three-quarters of an acre of land is around that house with a little garden. I remember as a boy coming up Fontabelle that the Badleys were building that house. Look at that house! It has about 89 roofs, and a lot of gutters. To convert it into a public building with all those cubby-holes would be a lot of trouble.

I put it to the hon. junior member for St. George in this way: if you had to buy "Herbert House" and this house with seven acres of land - that is to say, if you have the two things offered to you - which would you buy? Would you buy this property with seven acres of land, even though it is an old house which was being sold for \$75,000 or would you think that "Herbert House" for \$48,000 was a better buy? I think that the majority of people would catch at this property with seven acres of land because the potential for development is there.

However, Sir, I do not have that as a criticism to make on this Resolution. What I would like to know from the Hon. Premier is this. Of course, this is tied up with the next Resolution which is coming before us and I propose to reserve what I have to say on the Resolution for \$650,000 specifically. But what I want to say on this is that I am very pleased to hear the Hon. Minister of Education making a statement which can be found in this Addendum that it could be adapted for use as a Liberal Arts College. I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. George said that his Government had turned this down. I say so because I know the question of a Liberal Arts College to be affiliated to the University College of the West Indies was something mooted during the time of the last Government and it is very refreshing to me that something has taken place now.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. It is not correct to say that the last Government had turned this down.

like him at all. The Hon. Premier would tell you that my record went up to England before I got there. I found myself when I got up there within the areas where the West Indian people were living. I am not therefore interested in what anybody told me, but I am convinced by what Mr. Brewster and Mr. Garnet Gordon told me. I say that you should carry the things to the people: do not ask people to come to you.

The hon. member said that he wanted to hear me on this matter. I am not going to criticise his Government for anything which he has done. I am entirely in agreement with the buying of this property. I say that despite what my detractors may say, whether they say that I am selling it to the Government, I am not selling it but I know the property. This is a property which has seven acres of land to it. I am going to make this statement; the amount of 43,560 square feet of land makes an acre. This property has seven acres of land attached to it which means 304,920 square feet which at the minimum price of 30 cents per square foot would mean that it would cost \$91,476. It cost ten cents per foot to put in road and water with a four-inch main and I am allowing for their knocking down the house. I will go as far as to advise the Government of this country to buy all these Victorian houses. If you do not buy them, I have people with capital who can buy them.

I am only going to point this to you for your consideration. Go up to Wilkey and you will see that I have been selling out land where canes were at 36 cents and 40 cents per square foot. Go to Rendezvous Hill and you will see that land there is sold at 50 cents and 55 cents per square foot. Now, you are going to Two Mile Hill to buy a property with seven acres of land which can well bring the owner \$91,000 and if you run road and water with a four-inch main which cost 10 cents per square foot, you will see what it is. Those are facts.

Now I come to another picture. I had the honour to be among the delegation at the pre-Federal Conference in London and I really still belong to the go-slow movement on it. I am worried and very much about it. Nevertheless, let us take what this Addendum states. The Addendum states:

"It is proposed that the property at Two Mile Hill called 'Sherbourne' be purchased. The property has come on the market, is suitable for Government purposes and an option to purchase at a price of \$67,200 has been obtained. The property comprises a large dwelling house, outbuildings and approximately seven acres of land."

The hon. senior member for St. Peter and I were in the forefront of trying to get a proper house for the Chief Justice to live in. When it was said that they would put him behind the horses' stables at the Garrison, I came in here and cursed everybody and said that it was nonsense. What we are now doing is right, and if it were wrong I would say that it is wrong. The Government is paying £14,000 for this property and it has seven acres of land.

The hon. junior member for St. George would have you to believe that it is a marl hole, but this is a place where Mr. Laurie Yearwood used to live. It is my business to know, when you are selling a property, if the people who lived in it had any complaint. This is a place where Mr. Norman Leacock lived and he was a man who would not live in any two-cents house. He was Mr. Dudley Leacock's brother. It is not true to say that this is an old house. If you take the land at a price of 30 cents per square foot, the face value of it would be more than what you are paying for it. How can the hon. junior member for St. George suggest that this property costs too much money when he sat down and signed a certificate saying that Jones Land at Black Rock should be sold at \$1.50 per square foot?
4.35 p.m.

It is next door to the Premier; it was never worth that. I have been selling land for thirty years and if this property up there is not worth this money, then it is not worth anything. If you were to put in roads, and so on, you would

sell it at 40 cents a foot. The idea is that this is a broken down house, but do you think that Mr. Norman Leacock would live in a broken down house? I hope that the Government will listen to me very carefully. This is what the Addendum states:-

"It is proposed that the property at Two Mile Hill called 'Sherbourne' be purchased. The property which has come on the market is suitable for Government purposes and an option to purchase at a price of \$67,200 has been obtained."

I believe that you should buy Dalkeith. No longer can people like Mr. Bowring get these places. The Government does not own any land as in some of the other islands, and at any time when these places come into the market for sale, the Government should buy them. I would get money out of it too. You can buy some of these places, cut them up and let people get land for probably one half of the price at which they could get it. The Addendum goes on to state this:-

"The property comprises a large dwelling house, outbuildings and approximately seven acres of land. It could be adapted for use of a Liberal Arts College to be affiliated to the University of the West Indies."

I want to say that Mr. Norman Leacock would have a better fowl-house than the houses in which some people live. I like to live in a big house too; don't you think I would like Dalkeith? Listen to what I have to say now, and my remarks are addressed to the Hon. Minister of Education. When I first bought my University Year Book of the Commonwealth it was brought to my knowledge that Codrington College was affiliated to Durham University. I knew when the West Indies University came into being; I know you had your Science and the Minister knows well enough how Codrington College was started. We had the seat of Education at Codrington which produced men of first-class ability. I think of men like H. A. M. Beckles; there was the affiliation of Durham University to Codrington College whereby you could get a classical degree. I refer to the Premier who, at one time, went to Codrington College and part of the blue riband in education was won there. He went to Codrington College but he forsook all of that for his King and country and went to the War. If you had a limited pigmentation, you would be relegated to the limbo of forgotten things. I think it was Bishop Bentley who reminded me of Codrington College as being a City set on a hill, the home of culture. When you go to Codrington College, the very atmosphere is something which strikes you as something desirable. I wonder if the Minister would see if another arrangement could not be made. In 1947 when the Higher Commission on Education came into these parts and decided to set up the University College, I sat in one of the plenary sessions with other members of the territories which are not now federated. There is a very strong feeling and because there are going to be essential services, there are those leaders of the West Indies who feel that they were treated badly. How is it that it is set out in the Addendum to this Resolution that this property could be adapted for use of a Liberal Arts College to be affiliated to the University of the West Indies? Although Codrington College today is now considered as an ecclesiastical institute, I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister will go into this matter and see if he cannot save some money.

The purchase of this property is a good purchase: but I am suggesting, in view of the fact that Codrington College is a seat of learning, that it could be arranged that the University College — when you go into that atmosphere it is certainly conducive to learning, and I suggest to the Hon. Minister that they should discuss this matter very carefully.

Barbadians are abroad in the Southern States of America. We have produced men from Codrington College, men who built up and carried on all the colleges and seats of higher learning in the West Indies — in Trinidad, British Guiana and other parts. If you were to go to New Orleans tomorrow and you went into a certain area you would really think that you are in Barbados. You have men like Sir Frank Holder and Magistrate Talma and others who went to the

College in the South and gave people the benefit of their knowledge. I feel that Codrington College has done so much that the Hon. Minister of Education should take steps to put into effect the suggestion which I have made. This could be done as Codrington College is not now affiliated to Durham University; it could be affiliated to the West Indian University which has University status. But we do not know how well this will be accepted.
4.45 p.m.

It is also said in the Addendum that "however, as it is urgently necessary to provide accommodation for the new pre-Federal Organization, it is proposed to purchase the property at once and rent it to the Organisation temporarily. On the basis of the mandatory levy under the constitution of the former federation, Barbados will be required to contribute 46,8504 per cent of the rent." This is perfectly clear. Where does the hon. member who has just sat down see that the Government is bankrupt of ideas as to think of buying "Sherbourne" to establish a Capital there for the new Federation? That is absolute ignorance. If the Premier or the Minister of Education has suggested that we are buying this place for the purpose of establishing a centre for the Federation, I would be the first to get up here and oppose it; but they have said nothing of the sort.

The hon. member will remember that when they were building what is now called "Government Headquarters" and what was first mentioned in here as the "Ministerial Buildings", the now ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies mentioned that he was building this with a view that if the Federal Capital came here, he would be able to present them with Government Headquarters for temporary work; but it was not suggested that that would be their Headquarters. If you look around Bridgetown, where is there a place to rent in which you can put Sir Stephen Luke and the number of people he would have on the staff? You have selected this area of seven acres where there would be parking places; and I must repeat that there is no one in Barbados who would believe that Mr. Norman Leacock would be living in an old, broken down, ramshackled house. As I see it, at 30 cents a square foot, it would come to about \$90,000. I believe you are doing right in buying it.

Mr. Chairman, if Barbados is going to be the Capital, you must find somewhere temporarily; and since the old Federation is now defunct and Sir Stephen Luke is in charge of the Interim Commission, it looks to me that the quicker you can get out of Trinidad, the better you would be. The question of renting some place is out of the question. If you can buy a place like this and use it as offices for the time, you can at a later stage use the land. I strongly support the Government in doing this. The Addendum further states that certain repairs and adaptations will have to be made and the remainder of the provision is intended to cover the cost of these. I take it that they sent Captain Tomlin or somebody there to advise them that if they are spending \$67,000 on the place, the balance of money can so repair it that it would be adapted to the offices of the present Commission which is responsible for running the Federal Institution. I do not see anything wrong with this decision and I support it strongly.

I would like to say to the Government that there are a lot of these houses, Georgian or whatever you like to call them, which will come into the market, and unless you buy them, people will buy them and make money. Do not think that I am going to buy a place for the sake of buying it, and if you want to help people, you will buy it and do the same thing. If you buy it at 30 cents and spend 10 cents on it and then asked 50 cents for it, that would be reasonable. You could sell it at 40 cents for that matter; so I feel you are doing the right thing in buying "Sherbourne". I do not subscribe to the idea of the hon. junior member for St. George that if this Federation comes about you can have a Federation right inside the city of Bridgetown; it just could not work. You would have to go to Paragon which is next to the Airport to develop, because you could not develop the Capital within Bridgetown.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make comparisons with the place in England or with that in Fontabelle for which

they paid \$48,000. This is about two miles from Bridgetown, and therefore if you do not think that this place with seven acres of land is worth \$75,000, then I do not think it is worth anything at all. I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution, and I do feel that the principal thing this could be used for now would be converting it into offices presently to house the new Federal Commission which will be in charge of the winding up of the affairs of the old and now defunct Federal Government. I hope the Minister of Education will listen carefully to what I have said in dealing with this Institute of Education, the Liberal Arts College, to be affiliated with the University. Before you come to this House of Assembly for money for the purpose of purchasing, erecting or doing anything of the sort, I should like to say that there are vast acres at Society and Codrington in St. John where since 1700 the site has been conducive to higher learning, and therefore you should go into this matter with the Directors, Managers or whoever they are of these places and see whether we could not establish an Arts and Science Department there which could be affiliated with the West Indian University instead of with Durham University. I do not see Professor Arthur Lewis or anybody else having any objection to this, because Codrington as we have known it has been a tower of strength to the West Indies, especially in Barbados, because it has made Barbadians stand out prominently in the field of Education.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, these things are for the record, and we have to put them straight. Now the hon. senior member for the City spoke about the valuation of the property, and the hon. junior member for St. George spoke about my lack of knowledge of values. The average Barbadian has an idea that you know about values when you can charge people a lot of money for land. The hon. member is not in here, but it is no wonder that land values have risen so in this Island, because the mentality which the hon. junior member for St. George possesses is the type of mentality that has got this Island in a situation where more than half of the population has to live in squalor through this inflated idea that they know about prices of land which the masses cannot buy, and therefore have to live as people lived before the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia while they boast of their knowledge of land values. I hold no brief for anybody. I am not interested in who buys land; I am a revolutionary in my idea about the size of house in which people live. The hon. member likes to live in a big house, but I am the sort of man that if I had power to do anything, no man could live in a house over a certain size when there are so many naked people here with no place to live. I passed through Culloden Road and saw a house stretching from the corner until it got to a marl hole, when at the back of that house people are lying on the floor to sleep in small houses. I would drag that house out of the owner's hand, give him a decent house to live in and use that area to provide accommodation for people.
4.55 p.m.

That is why I do not live in one and I do not believe I will ever live in one. (A VOICE: What?) A big house. My whole outlook is different. I want big houses for organisations.

The hon. member has said that I am grieved. Do you think that I will be grieved at the Government not giving £100? I am leaving here next week and I am going half way around the world. My problem mostly is that part of the time I will be up in an aeroplane and I do not know if I will come back out alive. (A VOICE: But you are covered by insurance). Of course, I have insurance all over. That is by the way. The Government is not sending me anywhere. I do not ask the Government for favours or to send me anywhere; therefore, do not talk about my grieving.

The hon. senior member for the City spoke about the valuation and the comparison which I made was to show you the difference between the two Governments. The hon. junior member for St. George said that every Tuesday you talk about the past Government. I do not worry about the past Government. What the members of that Party are ashamed about is that each time you tell them about their misdeeds, they tell you that two wrongs do not make a right. The hon. member said that "Herbert House" was a good buy because

it was near the Deep Water Harbour. He is only a glorified idiot because you are not now talking about the development of "Herbert House". The Deep Water Harbour did not develop "Herbert House". In an age like this, the last Government went and bought that place with a lot of cubby-holes for the purpose of converting it into a Labour Department. They paid \$48,000 for that place and felt that it was a bargain. The hon. junior member for St. George made his comparison and then ran out of this House of Assembly. This is the froth which he was putting forward all along. He plays politics by air and when he talks of "His Master's Voice", he is not like "His Master's Voice" because that is a recording instrument but he plays by air just as anybody is playing a three-hole flute.

Sir, what we maintain is that if you are buying a property which can be valued at \$67,000 such as this property, then it compares favourably with anything which the past Government had bought. I do not give in for the stupidities which the last Government did. The last Government paid £27,000 for the Central Foundry site and they had not one clue of what to do with the land. Last week, the Hon. Premier made some statements about Bagatelle Quarry. I am different from other people: I will lock up half of the people in Barbados. When I talked about an investigation, the Premier said that he does not like investigation into a man's private affairs. I do not know what he is talking about. Something must be wrong when you work for so much money and you have got so much money to bank. I do not own any building out of the Government. In my organisation, there is an Alliance for Progress which is for the purpose of helping Trade Unionists. If I had to buy that property with the seven acres of land, I would have bought it for the Union and built houses on it for the workers. All the big ones that are going cheaply, we are going to buy them over. We do not want the homes; we want the land to build houses on for the people. Of course, I do not care who you are, you are not living in our houses for nothing. If that seven acres of land were made available to us tomorrow, I would say to the Executive of the Trade Union that it is a good investment and we can buy it. If we can get our property in Roebuck Street sold, we would sell it and go and buy seven acres of land so long as it was not priced extravagantly. You have this frothy business which the hon. junior member for St. George has brought up about buying this building with land; yet as the hon. senior member for the City has said, he has signed a certificate asking you to pay \$1.50 per square foot for land at Black Rock.

I believe this price of \$67,000 for this property compares favourably with anything which the Government has bought within the last two or three years. I cannot now remember the final price paid for the house of the Chief Justice, but that was regarded as a reasonable price.

I have different views from those of other people when the last Government was in power. I am not objecting to Government building houses. For example, I never objected to the idea that there should be a house for the Premier. There are some yard fowls of one Party who would say 'yes, you should build a house for the Premier' but if the Premier was of the other Party, they would say 'no'. I would tell you that if a Minister was keeping an official party and invited me to his own house, I would not accept the invitation. I do not go to Government parties: but, as I look at it, if a Government Minister had an official party at his house, it seems to me as if I have to beg his wife for a pass and if you were to break a flower pot, you must say that you broke somebody's flower pot.

Sir, I do not see anything wrong with the Government purchasing some of these large homes in Barbados for public purposes. That is the only use which you can make of them today. There is not that type of cheap labour in these days to maintain those houses for private use. The sum of \$67,000 is a reasonable price to pay for this property. Of course, the hon. junior member for St. George feels that he is performing a duty to his Party by criticising it on the grounds that it is too expensive. He has not brought in any argument to show that it is an unsound building. Ask anybody what was the price of converting "Herbert House" into a Labour Department and I am sure that they will tell you

that it came to more than \$12,000. Go down there and look at it. I went down there up to yesterday. It has a series of little roofs which when you start to repair them, they are going to cause you a lot of trouble. It also has a big old chimney up in the air. Maybe, it is all right for the National Trust to preserve some of these old buildings with old chimneys; but when the Government buys those types of houses, they do not want to preserve those old-time things.

I repeat, I think the price of \$67,000 for this property with seven acres of land is quite reasonable, providing the Government is going to utilise the land. I feel that the seven acres of land can give you a worthwhile scope for development. I am not dealing with the Federal part of it. The hon. junior member for St. George talked about a 100-room hotel in a country like this with 166 square miles. He is talking about Barbados as if you are talking about Nigeria. This is such a small country that as soon as you build a house somewhere, you find somebody else flying there to buy a piece of land. There is no place where you build a house now that people would not say "oh, yes, we would like to live there". If you go down to St. Andrew and build a nice house, people would say: "I am going to live down there."

When I was a boy, the District of Two Mile Hill was in the country; but now you will find that all of the middle-class people are going up to the Pine. What used to call the "Pine" before, you are now calling "The Pine Gardens". You would go into the Pine before if you were coming down with canes and you did not want anybody to see you; but nowadays the elite people are living in the Pine. From the Government's point of view, the hon. member was referring to where the buses converge; but the Government built Combermere School at Waterford because they said that it was the biggest area of land. One bus will carry you from Bridgetown to Two Mile Hill, but where anybody is not living in Bush Hall he must travel by two buses in order to get to Combermere School. I want to say that anybody can get to the Airport or to any point in Barbados in less than an hour nowadays. If you get into the car owned by the hon. senior member for the City, you can get to the Airport in half an hour; therefore, why are we worrying about getting at the Airport? That makes me remember a gentleman who was running as a representative for his parish in this House and he had the idea that the Airport should be in his parish. I think that the hon. member was criticised on the basis of Party loyalty more so than on other grounds. I am pleased to see that an attempt is being made to create a Liberal Arts Institution because, in Barbados, with the fight for more education and higher education, we have an outlet for our community to get this kind of education from which the community will benefit.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my small bit which will come into this Resolution. Having an opportunity like this, I think it is expedient for my Government to purchase this property. I have seen in former days that the other Government has purchased many places and I am quite sure that some of the places which they have purchased have served very little purpose for the people of this country. Think of the car park which the other Government purchased for the sum of \$96,000! They have purchased that land merely for the purpose of the parking of cars. Now we have a Resolution to purchase a property, a house with several acres of land, so as to build a College for the teaching of our children. We may talk about \$75,000 for the house but we also have seven acres of land. The Sandy Lane people are selling land at \$10,000 per acre; we cannot even buy the trash which grows on that land. I am saying that having an opportunity like this to purchase a house with seven acres of land, I am sure that if we bought it today it will be valuable to us. I am sure that there are properties today which yesterday were bought with silver and today those properties are sold for gold. If we pay this price for this property, I am sure that it will be to our benefit.

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution has substance in it and I agree that it should be adopted because it is for the help of the people of this island. This is not a question of buying property for the purpose of parking cars and it is not a property which we are purchasing for playing fields. We are buying this property for the purpose of educating the people

of Barbados. When I hear hon. members criticise this Resolution, I say that they ought to be ashamed to do that. This money, being for a good purpose, will not be wasted. This money will be spent in the right direction for the help of Barbados; (A VOICE: Latitude.) this is the right latitude and I do not think we should move off this latitude. (Laughter). When you come to "Herbert House", that is like a ship which has had a bounce underneath. I think that the Hon. Minister who has brought forward this Resolution has shown wisdom in doing so and I hope he will always be found acting in this way.

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63 No. 6
FEDERATION — PRE-FEDERAL, REGIONAL
AND COMMON SERVICES**

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$650,271 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed 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. 6 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

5.15 p.m.

I apologise to hon. members for the delay in the circulation of this Resolution for \$650,271 which is to be granted under Head 16 - Federation, Part I - Current for the Pre-Federal Organisation, Regional and Common Services. This is not really a new vote at all, because under Head 16 an amount of approximately \$780,000 was voted for the Mandatory Levy for the Federation with headquarters in Trinidad. We have received our requisitions of approximately \$130,000 from the Governor-General of the Federation, and there is a balance of approximately \$650,000.

As Your Honour is well aware, the West Indies Federation officially came to an end on 31st May, 1962. Under normal circumstances, that would be the day on which the Federation would have achieved independence, but as from that date, the money which we voted during the debate on the Current Estimates ceased to have any legal channel in which it could be appropriated. Now the United Kingdom Government passed a Bill some months ago called "The West Indies Dissolution Bill" which gave Her Majesty-in-Council the right to do a variety of things by Order-in-Council, and in effect it gives her Majesty-in-Council the right to set up Governments in any of the islands of the West Indies, to dissolve the old West Indies Federation, to set up a Pre-Federal Organisation, to set up any Organisations not only to look after the disposal of the assets of the Federation but also to make regulations about the Common Services or to regulate these Services themselves.

Now as soon as this Government received a copy of the Dissolution Bill — I think it is particularly Clause 5 of that Bill which is now an Act of Parliament — we cabled the Secretary of State and intimated to him that we in Barbados wanted a re-assurance that Clause 5 of that Bill did not apply to the Windwards, Leewards or Barbados. That is particularly with regard to the question of taking over the Government of the country because we saw very alarming implications in that suggestion. There were other parts of Clause 5 and other parts of the Bill indeed which we could not take seriously at all. Having achieved complete internal self-Government over a long period of time, and having, from the very early days of the foundation of this Colony, as it then was, asserted that right from time to time on more than one occasion, even before we had universal adult suffrage and even before we had the system of full internal self-Government that we now enjoy, it was the duty of this Government to reiterate and to emphasise that Barbados has never regarded itself as a Crown Colony in the ordinary sense of the term, and we have never recognized the right of the United Kingdom Parliament to legislate for us without our consent. We have never recognized the right of Her Majesty either in Council or outside of it, or the Sovereign for the time being of the United Kingdom, to pass any legislation that we did not specifically invite, except perhaps in time of war or national emergency.

The Right Honourable Reginald Maudling, Secretary of State for the Colonies, replied to me and said that as far as Clause 5 was concerned, he could give an assurance in so far as Barbados was concerned, but that the assurance did not extend to the Windward and Leeward Islands for reasons which must be obvious to all who have been studying the recent constitutional developments in these areas. We recently received a request — I do not even like to call it a request — perhaps I should say a statement from the United Kingdom Government to the effect that the Interim Federal Commissioner, who is not to be confused with the Council of Ministers which will be convening in Barbados from time to time, who is more or less the liquidator of the Federation — that is the old Federation of the ten territories — has authority to call upon the Governments in the West Indies to pay up a contribution from time to time.

Now as soon as I saw this, Mr. Chairman, I discussed the matter amongst the other Ministers here in Barbados, and we decided that although we did not in any way resent having to make a contribution towards the winding up of the Federation, in view of the fact that we had an unexpended balance of \$650,000, we were not going to sit down here and allow the Secretary of State or Her Majesty-in-Council or anybody else for that matter just to tell the Government of Barbados to pay Sir Stephen Luke or any other person any sum of money without coming to the Legislature. As far as they are concerned, in their ignorance — and I say that advisedly — they feel that all you have to do since they have all these colonies scattered all about the hemisphere like a brood of chickens, is to throw some corn out and then the chickens run and pick it up, and then when they issue a call for the chickens to come in and get locked up in the house, they call them in and lock them up on evenings. That does not apply to us here in Barbados so far as this Government is concerned, and they could send from now until the cows come home, they would have to send battleships down to Barbados to get us to take money out of the Treasury and send to Sir Stephen Luke without coming to Parliament.

This is money which was voted under Head 16 of the Current Estimates for 1962-63 and has now lapsed because the Federation has no legal personality. It has ceased to exist as a legal entity, and therefore we could not pay any money on behalf of the Federation, because the Order-in-Council did not justify the transferring of the powers formerly held by the Governor-General to Sir Stephen Luke. He is not carrying on a Federation down there; he is winding it up, calling in the assets and distributing the assets which are left over after paying all the liabilities of the Federation.

5.25 p.m.

As far as this Legislature is concerned, we are not going to have anybody in England telling us to send money to Trinidad. Any money which they get, they get it as a favour from us. The United Kingdom Government cannot send any gunboats here to make us pay money to Trinidad. The way in which they worded the Order-in-Council, it means that you can go straight to the Treasury and pick up the money and send down there. You can do that with people to whom you dispense charity. They are even trying to get the English Government to help us raise loans on which we pay interest and out of which they make money. Even in these projects, we have to do some mathematics, calculus, high finance and prove everything to them because they never present us with anything to help us come to a conclusion. I am talking frankly. Whenever we go to them for a loan, they tell us that the time is not ripe because there is a long queue of people waiting to get loans before Barbados. This is the first time, I believe, in the history of Barbados that we may be getting a loan so easily, and I say 'may be', because we do not have the money in our pockets. However, a little publicity does a little good. It was mentioned the other day in the Press that we had raised a loan of \$7 1/2 million. That was \$7 1/2 million (U.S.) and another firm in Wall Street that had told us over the telephone: "Do not come down here because things are panicky", as soon as they saw one investment house lending us \$7 1/2 million, they themselves have now offered us another \$7 1/2 million at a rate of interest which is one per cent lower than what they were offering us three months ago.

We have an offer virtually in U.S. dollars of \$24 million which is the largest single loan ever raised by a colony in the United Kingdom on the Stock Market. Jamaica went in 1956 and got a loan of \$12 million but it is the first time a colony have been offered \$24 million.

As far as I am concerned, with things looking as they are, I would like to say, but not too much, that all of this rigmarole which you have to go through even to borrow money for a legitimate purpose is really very tiresome; but we have had promises from the British Treasury. From the time of colonial rule, this Exchequer loan is the largest and it is the first time that an Exchequer loan was made to Barbados from the British Treasury directly. What I am saying is that despite all these things, despite the Order-in-Council, we can ignore it because there is nothing which they can do, I am a practical person. If you tell me that you want to take away my brief case, I tell you: "Go and take it". I told them that they will have to wait until the House of Assembly gives it to you although technically, the Order-in-Council gives them the power to take it directly from the Treasury; but, as far as I am concerned, they will have to wait until a vote of this House of Assembly gives it to them.

As regards this Resolution for \$650,000, it is not that we are sending \$650,000 to Trinidad; it is that we had voted this money earlier this year for the West Indian Federation which has gone out of existence and instead of coming in here every week or every other week for money for the High Commissioner's Office in London, the Regional Council of Ministers and the Interim Commissioner, what we are doing now is revoting the unexpended balance of the mandatory levy and telling the House what we are going to do with it.

I do not see that, even for the three organisations which I have mentioned, whether they are as extravagant as the last Government of Barbados, they can spend half of this money before the end of the financial year; but we are telling members of the Legislature right now that we will appropriate this unexpended balance of \$650,000 for purposes which are very close to the regional purposes for which the money was voted, and it is only constitutionally right that we should do this because according to our Letters Patent, Royal Instructions and all the Standing Orders of this House, you cannot divert money from one purpose to another purpose unless the new purpose is specifically approved by the Legislature.

The alternative to the bringing down of this vote for the amount of \$650,000 is that every time you want \$80 or \$90, you will have to come back to the House with a Resolution for the purpose. As I have said, there are only three purposes for which this unexpended balance may be appropriated if and when the House passes this Resolution. One is for the High Commissioner's services in London, two, for the Pre-Federal Organisation and, three, the Federal Interim Organisation in Trinidad, but for no other purpose. It will not be for the purpose of paying anybody a pension. 5.35 p.m.

I have said the purpose for which it will be used. I do not know where they are getting their pension money from, but they will not be coming to me as Minister of Finance for any money with which to pay pensions or golden handshakes. If they have some money which does not belong to us that they can pay immunities with it, then it is a matter for them; I am not concerned with that. If they can get money from any source other than the taxpayers of Barbados, then they are quite welcome to it. I would like to see our system of social security established; I would like to see everybody getting pensions. We cannot get any pensions now if we are turned out of this House, and we are not asking for any pensions until such time as we have a system of social security, until we have pensions for everybody from the cradle to the grave or, as it is sometimes put, from the womb to the tomb. We have an interest in Federal Ships, we have an interest in the houses and the buildings in Trinidad. We have services like the meteorological services in which we have large numbers of Barbadians employed and we have the Regional Labour Board in Washington; we

have the University of the West Indies both in Trinidad and Jamaica, and we have various other interests which we have to safeguard. You cannot just shut down the Federation by saying that it ceases to exist on the 31st May; long after it ceases to exist it may be jumping over the yard like a fowl which is being killed; it may throw some of the blood on your new doeskin flannels and if you want to prevent that you must have somebody to hold down the tail.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, to have to use that language but it is the only way in which we have to make ourselves understood. Some of them of the Federation are still flurrying all over the place and trying to splatter somebody with the blood. It is necessary that we maintain an interest to see that we are not denied what is our due in so far as the distribution of the Federal finances is concerned. On the 10th July there is going to be a Common Services Conference in which Jamaica will be taking part with the Windward and Leeward Islands and Barbados, and I believe there will be some representatives from British Guiana and British Honduras. The Bahamas have some interest in the Federation.

Mr. Chairman, this is no new vote and we do not envisage that this amount of \$650,271 will be entirely expended. You will see from the Addendum to the Resolution that we have agreed also to set up a representative commission in the United Kingdom. We set up a working committee during the conference at Marlborough House, with no representatives from the United Kingdom at all, to go into the question of overseas representation. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not now in his place because he may have some contribution to make to this part of the discussion. The High Commissioner in London used to spend something like \$600,000 per annum. That office is in a very expensive part of the metropolitan area of London. As a matter of fact, it is within a stone's throw of the American Embassy in Grosvenor Square and it is within spitting distance of Grosvenor Square, because it is only separated from that Square by the biggest Rolls Royce representatives in London where we can get cars from \$30,000 up. That will give you an idea of the economic rent which one has to pay for an office like that of the West Indies High Commissioner. When I mention 'spitting distance', I am not advocating that anyone should go into the United Kingdom spitting, because I remember once seeing a sign that men must not spit: "Gentlemen, do not spit". I am not advocating that anybody will try to put my theories to the test by trying to spit past the Rolls Royce premises. The rent for this office is \$32,000 a year and it is only part of the ground floor and the first floor of the building. The average Barbadian emigrant who goes to London feels that this place is not for him. I do not know if the hon. senior member for St. Peter has seen the place, but there is the Migrants' Division down in the corridors of the Crown Agents for the Colonies, down by Mill Bank. The average emigrant trying to find the Migrants' Division would be lost because there is no sign showing that there is anything like a Barbadian office in the vicinity. You could walk about the place for about ten hours and you would not know that there is a Barbados Migrants' Division there. How all the people who go to London manage to find this place is beyond my imagination. The offices are very cramped and it is just as if you have a little room underneath the staircase and the Barbados division would be using that. The High Commissioner's office is located in the most expensive part of England and it is equally as difficult to find. The average emigrant would be over-awed having to go to the street where the present Sovereign was born; there are those who has a champagne taste with a lemonade pocket and they knew why the new Federation was broken up.

The point is this: we had to decide once and for all whether our representation in London will be to represent people or to create a false image of West Indian prosperity in the minds of a few English businessmen who may want to go into an elaborate office in London and say that the West Indies have all of this nonsense on the wall; but I feel that anybody who has the sort of existence which a lot of us have to live, having the economy of the West Indies in mind, would not go in for that extravagance for which the last Government went in.

Mr. Chairman, the upshot of the visit of the Hon. Minister of Trade, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself is that we did not go around like tourists, but we did go through the districts and we tried to find new offices for our representatives in London.

5.45 p.m.

That is the new Commission which The Eight will be setting up. The upshot of our visit is that we have come to the conclusion that we cannot afford to keep that kind of charade going on in the United Kingdom and that our office should be moved somewhere closer to where the working class people, 120,000 of them, which is about half the population of Barbados, who have migrated to England from the Windward, Leewards and Barbados live. There are about 300,000 West Indians in the United Kingdom and about 120,000 of them at least come from these islands, and what we want to do is to incorporate the Barbados Migrants Division of the Labour Office into the High Commissioner's Office. As a matter of fact, whether it is a high or low Commission is immaterial to me.

What I personally would like to do eventually is to mobilise the savings of these workers — half the population of Barbados and more than twice the working population of Barbados or once and a half the potential working population of Barbados — and set up branches of the Barbados Savings Bank right inside areas like North Kensington and Brixton and places like that where our workers live, so that they could easily go and deposit money, and when they want somebody at home to get a small piece of change, they would not have to go driving all the way down to the West End of London six or seven miles away asking people questions like where to go and buy a Bank Draft or anything like that. They would be able to go right into a branch of the Barbados Savings Bank and say "account so and so, will you transfer something to Mary Brown in Boscobelle, St. Peter"? The next morning the Savings Bank would be able to send to that person, because you would have your ticker tape or teleprinters which they use in these Institutions, and they will have at the end of a day's business a long list of money they want transferred to Barbados, and it would be done in the twinkling of an eye.

Those are my ideas, Mr. Chairman, of how a Commission can serve people. I may be going off the subject a bit, but I must project to hon. members that we are not merely setting up a Commission because we believe in Ambassadorial paraphernalia, a big lot of cocktail parties and going to Claridges. We have had to turn down a lot of invitations when we were there because people wanted to impress us. There is nothing which anybody can show me which would impress me except a plan for the upliftment of the people of Barbados to the level which people in industrial countries of the world enjoy. If anybody could show me a plan to guarantee peace to mankind for the rest of our days, I would be impressed; but nobody can impress me with dinner parties nowadays. I do not think our money should be spent in that direction.

I must say that the Leader of the Opposition was in agreement with the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and myself that we must get away from the idea that we have to buy a house for every officer and that kind of nonsense. I had the privilege of meeting the Leader of the House of Lords, Lord Hailsham, who was also the son of a former Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, and he rides to the House of Lords on a bicycle; he was very proud indeed to tell me that. I have met several people in similar rank in the United Kingdom officially and unofficially. I know from my own days, and the hon. member on my left can also tell you this, Mr. Chairman, that we scrubbed our own floors and were proud to do it, and we also washed our own dishes; but when we send West Indians up there, they want a liveried chauffeur and want to employ people. According to the Resolution introduced by the last Government, they want a house where they can employ people. They should be employing employers and not employees, because in Barbados anybody who employs employees eventually gravitates to the place of employers and leaves the employees altogether.

Mr. Chairman, I am not reflecting on any individual in this community or outside, but I think members know

very well what my ideas are about these things, so much so that they call me a radical and all kinds of uncompimentary things; but that is the way I see things, and the sooner we remember that we only have a mauby or lemonade pocket, we will stop having a champagne taste and have a mauby or lemonade taste to accommodate the mauby or lemonade pocket we have carrying around with us. Nobody is going to look down on the West Indies because we do not throw a big dinner party every two weeks for the High Commissioner from Vietnam, Laos or the Australian Ambassador. We had people here working in the Federation who never used to speak to the working people at all. We have them there, and there are some at the British Broadcasting Corporation; but we will soon straighten them out. When a West Indian of a certain income group gets isolated from the community from which he has sprung, he becomes detribalized altogether and becomes a very third rate, pale imitation of the worst in English culture, and that is what we in the Eight are trying to avoid, because we have made it quite clear that there are people who feel lost when it comes to their social environment, and who are enduring very terrible housing conditions although they are working for good wages. They are being exploited not only by English landlords but by West Indians, and some West Indians who are using — and I am saying this advisedly and with all due seriousness — the Barbados taxpayers' money are the worst exploiters.

Mr. Chairman, the last Government had some idea that they should lend people money to buy houses to accommodate workers who go up to the London Transport, and in nearly every case, because obviously I cannot say in every case, the people to whom that money had been lent have shown themselves to be more avaricious and acquisitive and grasping and completely lacking in the milk of human kindness than some of their English and Continental counterparts, who think they are doing West Indians a favour by providing them with lodgings. Some will not even pay the interest on the loans they have although they have six Barbadians in a room charging them \$20 a week each, and as soon as one comes from a shift system, the other man has to get out of bed, so that there is a shift system with the bed as well, and the bed does not have a chance to get cool. That is the kind of thing that is going on in the United Kingdom; and if we do not look after these people and if we do not bring representation in London, not for Civil Servants going on holiday so that they can be introduced to a few officials in the Colonial Office, but for the workers, this state of affairs will continue.

As a matter of fact, let me serve notice on the hon. senior member for St. Peter as far as this Government is concerned, we do not consider that it is any part of the duty of the taxpayers of Barbados to give Civil Servants and their families money to take a boat or fly out to London to sit down there twiddling their toes, getting chilblains in front of a fire in Paddington, and then coming back here with a lot of picture postcards showing people. We consider it is a waste of people's money. Any Civil Servant who wants to go and get training to improve his productivity in this community is the type of Civil Servant we feel will benefit from a trip.

5.55 p.m.

I know that next year there is going to be a stampede for passages, but the stampede might be dictated by the exigencies of the work which the Civil Servants, the Ministers and I have to do. I have had the opportunity now to see again with even greater clarity the iniquities of the colonial system which is now catching up with the mentality of West Indies when the Africans were abandoning it a long time ago. These smug people who just take the taxpayers' money and go up to London and sit down are incapable of giving out anything, imparting anything or assimilating anything, but one of their conditions of service is that they get this six months' vacation. We have definitely made up our minds now. (Mr. WALCOTT: You are six months late now.) You cannot take away one of their conditions of service without serving notice on them. This is their second notice and you know what comes after the second notice.

I am glad that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has returned to this Chamber because he can vouch that after the three political representatives from this Island went to England and saw the conditions of the people and saw everything, we came to the conclusion that there should be a complete re-orientation of such representation in the proposed new federal set-up. The representatives must begin to represent people rather than be representatives. Do you think that we spent out time driving around in limousines going to cocktail parties?

The Barbadian people in London are satisfied that there is no contract between their Government and themselves; therefore the organisation would have to move straight into the district where these people live and set up its facilities. We will have to place in these districts legal advice. I have had a voluntary offer that such advice would be made available so that our people could get proper legal advice about purchasing houses and a lot of things which they know nothing about. We are trying to get them into contact with the Trade Union Organisations there. We are trying to get the Unionists there into accepting that Barbadians and people from the Leeward and Windward Islands are just as capable from the point of view of doing skilled and semi-skilled work as people from Germany and other parts of the world.

Now, Sir, these are the tasks which we as realists saw confronting us, whether we have a West Indian Federation or not. We must now begin to represent people. When we ask the House, therefore, for support of this Resolution, it is to infuse a new vitality into the idea of representation. As far as I am concerned, if any part of this money was going to be spent in perpetuating the kind of representation which we have been suffering from overseas during the past four years, I would not come to the House and insert that into the Addendum; but it is inserted clearly with the idea that this representation must now be of such a quality and such a nature that the West Indian people themselves, the expatriates, the people who have had to flee from the bad economic conditions which although they were not created were certainly fostered and encouraged by the policy of the past Government, would be represented. Over 60,000 persons had to leave Barbados in the space of four years up to July last, and one of the iniquities of the Immigration Act in the United Kingdom is that it is discriminating against the unskilled workers who are the very persons whom we want to help and the people whom we invested money on, the people whose parents and the community have invested their time, life and their care and attention on; and as soon as you bring them up and train them as skilled workers the British people are prepared to take them because it is still good to take people whom other people have invested their all on.

The people whom they send here largely are people whose jobs can be filled by West Indians themselves, but the real top level workers and technicians are people whom we do not get. They want our skilled workers but they do not want the unemployed unskilled workers.

Sir, I am getting very suspicious of what the present United Kingdom Government does, because there is no Act of Parliament which they pass now which does not set out to help themselves.

Now, coming to this question of representation, I say that those representatives whom we have must be representing people in the United Kingdom. When we set up the office in New York, it must represent West Indians. You must bear in mind that you are representing the people and the people must be free to come and get advice. They must have free access to a place where they can deposit their savings and get advice as to the buying of a house and having an affidavit made out. That is the sort of advice which we hope to be able to make on the kind of day-to-day running of the office.

I want to make it clear that I have spent very much time on this matter because I want to go on record as saying what this Government is voting money for; and if the officers whom we have in London do not understand that this is what we are voting the money for, then if we cut off the

source they have themselves to blame. Then, if they think that they can go to some international source where they can sue Barbados, they are at liberty to do so. We do not have any friends at all when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money. That is something which we want to make clear. Each one of us have to pay taxes of every kind and, therefore, we have a vested interest in seeing that people do not practise corruption.

The very people who are contributing to the economy of this Island and are doing everything, not a thing is done for them. They are like one of the lost tribes of Israel. They are the people whom we will have to look after. We have abandoned the people whom we have in Panama; we have abandoned the people whom we have in Cuba. Some of them were sent back here like cattle. We have abandoned the people whom we have in the United States but, fortunately, the people who emigrated to the United States were able to produce leaders from amongst themselves to protect their interests: but no West Government has ever protested about anything which was done to any West Indian citizen in the United States.

6.05 p.m.

I remember about seven or eight years ago when I came into this House and asked the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour a question about the treatment of West Indian migrant workers in Florida, the gentleman, using the word in its most loose sense, who was in charge stated that I was trying to embarrass the Government of Barbados by asking that kind of question. I said that even if the people had to put up with a little inconvenience the Americans are providing these people with jobs. As soon as this Government came into existence, we sent out the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Permanent Secretary to the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to Florida and other parts of the United States in order to investigate the complaints; but it is time that all West Indian Governments - we have the Chief Ministers of the other islands and the Ministers of Trade and Labour - agree with us on this matter that if there was only one failing of the past Federation, it was that they never represented the West Indian people; they looked after themselves. They were concerned about appearance and prestige which get nobody anywhere.

Dr. Eric Williams has told you that they never did any work; and if you look at the Federal Laws, I doubt if they have passed three laws during the four and one half years that they were in existence. The only laws which they passed nearly broke up the Federation. One was a Defence Act and the other dealt with the Federal Supreme Court and things of that kind. There was never a motion tabled protesting against exploitation by landlords or against the attitude displayed towards West Indian workers or anything like that. I will not spend any time dealing with the past Federation, but I am not going to have anybody fluttering about like a dead fowl trying to sabotage the economy of this island by making irresponsible statements or going abroad spluttering blood all over the place and trying to dirty up everybody. I am like the Minister of Communications and Works, that is to say, that we are two very serious people.

It is a well known fact that I do not believe in capital punishment; I think it is the height of ignorance. I, personally, feel that you should apply capital punishment, although I have been against it, to people who try to sabotage the whole community. You should keep capital punishment for those people because that is a crime against humanity. Anybody who goes outside of his country and tries to create unemployment, is worse than a traitor and the hanging which Mussolini suffered is too good for a man like that to enjoy. Such people have no usefulness, they have no jobs or skills; they only have treachery as far as the people of Barbados are concerned; and if capital punishment is to be reserved, it should be reserved for people like them and their like. I say that anybody who tries to sabotage the economy of Barbados, despite the efforts of this Government or any other Government to build up the economy and relieve unemployment, such people are worse than traitors to the country. Those people who pretend to be respectable and who go about bribing officials, capital punishment should be kept for them. Businessmen who lobby Government Officials and

give them presents and that sort of thing - when I say Government Officials, I mean Ministers of the Government - I say that those people should undergo capital punishment. Anybody who invests money in South Africa, in Rhodesia or such places, that is sabotaging the economy of Barbados and they should be given capital punishment, I would allow them to send out the money and then try them in the Courts and give them capital punishment. As to responsible politicians who try to crucify the whole economy of this island, I say that for them and their progeny hanging is too good. I repeat that hanging is too good for some of these people although I do not believe in capital punishment. A man who kills a boy in the heat of passion should get 13 years' imprisonment or so; but those who sabotage the economy of this Island should be given the extreme penalty.

Mr. Chairman, if you feel that I am the only one who feels in that way, ask any of these Ministers over here how they feel about it. A lot of people in Barbados do not realise what is happening. Imagine people in Britain are shooting their heads about, people with irresponsibility and they would pay salaries to sabotage the West Indian nation for their selfish aims! You have people talking about how conservative they are and they would have principles which are delegated to the overthrow of Democratic Government in their own Cabinets. That is the sort of thing we have, and therefore we have to watch the situation very carefully. I will not allow anybody, whether he be Civil Servant or anybody else, to hold up this community to ransom by his selfish aims.

6.15 p.m.

I have said all that I wanted to say on this point, but I have only digressed because what we saw in the United Kingdom convinced us that we have a most callous-minded lot of people filching over \$9 million from West Indies Governments and masquerading all about Europe, and paying no attention whatsoever to the working class people who are the backbone of the economy when they send back their remittances - which they can ill afford sometimes - when the migrants themselves are living in the most deplorable conditions, and being exploited even by the money which is coming out of the pockets of Barbadian taxpayers. Now, that is not good enough; and if I may appear, Mr. Chairman, to have been overstating my case, I want you to know that I am not overstating it, but I am very alarmed over what I have seen, and I do not want that state of affairs to continue.

I hope that when members of the House vote for this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, they can vote for it in the confidence that not only are we going to protect the interest of Barbados in Trinidad and the Common Services Conference, but when we set up an organisation in London, we are going to make sure that that organisation does not become so far removed from the people of the West Indies that they feel they are a race apart, and do not want anybody spoiling the sanctuary of sanctuaries by bringing their dirty feet over their threshold. That is the impression which has been created on the minds of West Indian people in London right now.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution....

Mr. WALCOTT: The only thing I would have to do now is to move substantively that the Hon. Chairman be no longer Chairman, because I believe that would be the biggest piece of sabotage. Now the Hon. Premier spoke for nearly two hours, you did not allow anybody to second the motion which he made, and yet you want to put the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution has been seconded.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I will "third it". Now, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier spoke for a long time on this matter, and you will agree that he had many digressions and excursions. I do not intend to follow him in the digressions; I intend to stick to the Resolution. I would like to say at the beginning that I am glad that he and the hon. senior member for the City have been to London. He has not been

back there in ten years, and this was the first time for the hon. senior member for the City. Now they have come back with a lot of revelations that have been repeated here, and they aided and abetted the people who continue these things.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I object to the hon. member saying that. The last thing the hon. senior member for St. Peter can ever say about me is that I aided and abetted anybody, whether it be this Government or any Englishman. I am a man who talks my talk when I have to talk it, and you can ask the Premier what I had to say. If you say that we have come back and revealed a lot of things you have been stating as going on, I would say "yes"; but I have never aided and abetted anybody; so that is not fair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you see how easily I can get them up? When Dr. Cummins was Premier in this House, the hon. senior member for the City said he was a congenial man, but a lot of his congeniality went a long way in permitting things which were inimical to the interests of this country. I do not want to go over things even about the migrant situation in London. I do not have any friends in politics; I do not care anything about people in politics as individuals. I have dismissed people for many years from my life, because I said that there are fanatics in political parties. There are some in the Party of the hon. senior member for the City, and there are some in the Hon. Premier's Party for whom I have no uses. When I talk about fanatics, I do not mean the Parliamentary members; but some of their supporters who are ignorant.

Mr. Chairman, there is a mass of ignorant people walking around this country who know nothing about politics or about the issues involved. I heard that one said one day that the Premier must do something with me, as if the Premier has any child my size over there. I told the man who came and told me that not to tell the Premier; but to let him come and do it himself, and see what he would get done. If I want to do anybody anything, I would do it myself. I say that because I saw this revelation which is being given now a long time ago. Now when the Hon. Premier talks about the Civil Servants, their salaries and payment of leave passages to England, I say he is four years late. I said that so long ago that a Civil Servant met me two weeks ago at Government Headquarters and said, jokingly I believe, that I am a bad-minded man, I was going all over the world, and yet quarrelled with Civil Servants going. I am not going all over the world with the Government's money. Where is the Government sending me? He feels that somebody is sending me on a holiday, but my home is not in Europe; it is here. I have never been to Europe for a holiday; I go to Bathsheba where I can mix with the people; but whenever I go to Europe, it is on business. The Premier therefore is not serving notice on me. He can only serve notice on me when he gives me some money for the bus drivers and conductors by the 19th June. Why did the Premier not serve notice on the Civil Servants that he is going to stop leave passages when he spoke to them at their meeting? They know that if I were a Premier of Barbados, leave passages would be stopped by the 5th December, and not one man would go anywhere. They would have to clean their boots down at Bathsheba.

Mr. Chairman, some of them were so scared that they would get no more leave passages that they hustled and took leave. I do not make any fun when it comes to these things.

On this Resolution for this Federal business, the Premier said he had been to London and had a hard job with Englishmen. I go to England twice a year, and I know the minds and attitude of Englishmen; they are polite, tolerant and firm. No matter how much you quarrel, and they say they are not moving, they are not moving. If a strike in transport is on, an Englishman is not going to quarrel with a Bajan, but he is not going to move the bus; so when an Englishman can pass an Order-in-Council and say it does not apply to you, wait until a crisis occurs and see if it means you. If a crisis took place in Barbados tomorrow, as took place in 1937, you would see if the Order-in-Council applies to you. When an Englishman intends to bring down something for which he has legal authority, nothing in this world is

going to stop him. Nobody believed that they would have suspended the constitution in British Guiana, but they were satisfied that they were going to withdraw it, and they did so and were prepared to go to the International Court at Hague, because the Englishman is a peculiar man if he feels he is right.
6.25 p.m.

There is nobody else in the whole world who can talk about fighting of their size. That is how the people are made up. You call them "Limeys". But put an Englishman's back to the wall and you will see who he is.

I know when it comes to the Order-in-Council which they passed in Parliament for the winding up of the West Indian Federation, they have passed it with a meaning. Have you heard what they said to Grenada? They have said that we are not doing this unless you do that. All of the talk which we talked in the West Indies, they said: "Stick your toes in; we are going to show you what we are going to do."

You do not say everything which you say in life on public platforms because you are dealing with masses of people; so what is the use of saying everything? I know that there are certain people who, if you ever appoint them to carry out anything, whenever they are finished, it is broken up. There are some people to whom you can give all the honour in the world; they are obliged to break up anything which you give them to do.

This Resolution pre-supposes a Pre-Federal, Regional and Common Services. What I am worried about is that we have Colonial rule. The Addendum reads as follows:-

"As a result of the dissolution of the Federation with effect from 31st May, 1962, an Interim Commissioner has been set up under the West Indies (Dissolution and Interim Commissioner) Order-in-Council 1962, to administer certain common services formerly administered by the Federal Government. The territories which formerly constituted the Federation are requested to meet the cost of these services in the same proportion that the Mandatory Levy was payable."

That means that we as a people did certain things before with our money, and now our money is going to be dealt with for other purposes. Sir, do you know why I feel that I, in some cases, am more non-Barbadian than anybody else in this whole House? It is because I see younger men than myself sitting by my side like Tom Mboya, who today is Minister of Labour in Kenya; R. M. Kawawa of Tanganyika and other African leaders whom West Indians laughed at, who today form the core of United Nations; and while the British Government was saying that they should continue their power in those parts of Africa on the ground that the Africans were not capable to govern, these Africans said that even if they were not capable, they were going to do it themselves. Today, Barbadians are still struggling to do things and have not made one step forward to do them for themselves. I have nothing against Sir Stephen Luke, but we are at the stage where we were at in 1947. We are back at Montego Bay, and somebody in England is telling us how our affairs should be run. Unfortunately, some of our own people gave grist to this mill; but at the same time, I am in favour of doing things myself, even if I do them badly.

The Hon. Premier said that nobody can tell him to pay any money out of the Barbados Treasury. That is all right to say if you are saying it in Fairchild Street, and to people who do not know what this Order-in-Council means. That is the reason why you have to pass this Resolution. You have said that you have got a loan from the British Treasury. You now say that you are not letting go this money out of our Treasury. Well, do not let it go and see what would happen! The British Government would be able to get it out of Barbados by one means or the other. What would the British Government quite sensibly do? They are people of honour and integrity. I know the phrase which they would use in a general way. They would not interfere with the constitution of Barbados which they have already given us in running our day-to-day affairs; but that does not mean that if you go and do something so stupid for which the Or-

der-in-Council would not apply, they would not make an Order-in-Council to apply. That is the reason why the Englishmen wanted to pass the Order-in-Council. The behaviour of some or the majority of West Indian leaders was of such a low degree that it made Englishmen believe that in order to preserve democracy and in order to preserve some state of order and proper understanding, it looked to them as if they would have to put on record something; and the opportunity of the dissolution of the West Indian Federation, which was a most childish action on the part of the leaders of the West Indies, made the Englishmen say that to give these people power suddenly, you could very well see what would happen to the whole community.

I will give you an example. The present leaders are struggling with the Eight. Watch the example of some of the leaders in the Eight. Do you realise that the Eight would have to go all over again if you were to have a General Election in some of the territories? You do not have a long tradition of Government in one or two of these territories. You find one Government trying to outdo the other. You have a situation existing in St. Vincent and St. Lucia, and I may say that in all of these territories in the Leeward and Windward Islands there is extreme opposition to what the Government is doing. There would be no Eight if we were to have elections in some of these territories tomorrow. You must also bear in mind that we are dealing with communities where you have low incomes, and some of the leaders of many of these communities are not leaders in the sense that they want to put their unit in front, but they are only leaders because they are running with the crowd pushing them on. Some of them even go as far as to make the people believe that they can be lazy and indifferent and yet get prosperity because the quality of some of the leaders has not reached the stage for which this advance is required.

I know the whole lot of West Indian Islands. I have been to all of them. I know the people because I have lived with them and I know their attitude. I have spoken in nearly every West Indian territory that is part of this place, from Jamaica to British Guiana. What I have found out is that the attitude of the West Indians when compared with Africans is that they feel that they are superior to Africans, yet the Africans are more willing to work and fight for their country.

Sir, I am afraid that this Resolution which we are passing to set up this Pre-Federal, Regional and Common Services is only a small beginning of the long road which we have to go. We are going to have to fight a very hard people in order to get the independence which we want. I have the fear and feeling that too many of the leaders are not working in the best interest of the colonies. The Hon. Premier said that many of the leaders in the past have been worried about themselves. Out of the dying bed of the Federation, you got the politicians protesting against the idea of the dissolution and not one statement were they willing to make on behalf of the Civil Servants whose job it was to work in the service of the Federation.
6.35 p.m.

I want to say that I have a lot of things to say about Civil Servants when it comes to bogus things; but I feel that the Federal Civil Servants of all branches did not get a square deal in the dissolution of the Federation. Some of them have been left out with three months' pay, which could not be regarded as a fair reward for them. They were our people and, in the majority of cases, they were our Civil Servants. I have no objection to this Advisory Regional Council of Ministers being set up under the Chairmanship of the Governor of Barbados because he is a most pleasant man. This is what is set out in the Addendum to this Resolution:-

"At the Marlborough House Conference in London in May 1952, it was agreed that an Advisory Regional Council of Ministers should be set up which will consist of the Premier of Barbados and the Chief Ministers of the Leewards and Windwards to consider any problems of common interest of the eight territories concerned in connection with the setting up of the new Federation. The Council would be under the Chairmanship of the Governor of Barbados and would have at its disposal a small secretariat concerned

with the necessary planning work in preparation for the new Federation. The Chairman would have the administrative responsibility of giving effect to the Council's decisions."

Now you see that there are two territories which are on the road to independence. The Colonial Office again pays the Civil Servant; the Ministers are ostensibly created so as to take charge of the running of these territories, and now you are setting up a pre-Federal Advisory Body of which the Governor of this Island is to be Chairman. The Colonial Office thought that that would be the best thing or that the best person to get for this office was the Governor. You have Sir Stephen Luke seeing about the administration of our money. He is a man from the United Kingdom, but he has to liquidate our money. You do not read that one of the Ministers should be Chairman; but the Governor comes in because the West Indies have given full tilt to the idea that the British Government has to take thing in its hands. Due to the old Federal Government, the attitude of the pussy-footing West Indian - I am sorry that I am a West Indian at this stage of the political world. Whenever you say you are a West Indian, people cannot understand what you are because for 15 years you were playing with independence. I am glad that the hon. senior member for the City went to London. When you go to Mill Bank to look for the Migrant Service Division, you cannot find it. When you take a bus you go all around the place and you cannot find this office. The only way you can find it is if you meet a person who is a porter and he will tell you that he walks around there every morning. I want to say, as the Premier has said, that it is a question of having a mauby pocket but you have a champagne taste.

The Migrant Service is an important Service. This morning I went to the Labour Commissioner because you want to deal with sociologists, men who understand men and women, men who have made a study of these matters. If England says that she wants skilled people, I am glad to be able to tell some of the ignorant employers here who would give people \$15 or \$20 a month that when the skilled people go to England they will earn £10 or £15 a week. The local employers will then see whom they will get to work. A man who is living in the plural society sees those whom he regards as being better off and of an unlimited pigmentation to which he does not get near; but when he lives in a society for which there is no barrier to his limited pigmentation and he see all of this flying hair, he says.....(Mr. MOTTLEY: Lord, let me die.) Well, the hon. senior member for the City must have seen some of his own people, and when they come towards him he has had to stand up and look back. (Laughter). The hon. senior member for the City would know that there are men in England who have children here and a man will write back to his wife and say: "You sign this; I have seen somebody else up here." I took somebody to the Labour Department with three children, two of them attending Secondary Schools. The oldest child is ten years, the youngest five and a half years, and the father of these children is not coming back to Barbados. That is only one of these cases. He says: "Sign this: I want a divorce." When you multiply these cases, you will see that there is a problem which you will have in the matter of juvenile delinquency in the next five or ten years. In the next five years, the child who is five years now will be ten years, and the one who is ten years now will be leaving school. We want a Migrant Service Division which is well planned from every angle.

6.45 p.m.

If there is a time that the West Indies really need strong and bold leadership, it is now. That is why I say that where you have to parry for anything, it is not the best way. I praise God that I do not have to look to any side for anything, because nobody has anything to offer me. I have been to conferences and have told people that I do not want a post, but that I have come to talk. I do not want to be in the position to ask somebody for a vote because I gave him one. I am President of the Caribbean Congress of Labour by saying that I would walk out and come back home. I am Secretary of the Trade Union; so I do not want a post.

Mr. Chairman, the West Indies today need the kind of leadership that they can tell other West Indians where to get off when it comes to extravagance. The only way we can make progress is to stop this stupidity. I am glad that you

have people to go up there to look at your services. I have nothing against Sir Garnet Gordon, but he has passed the stage of being symbolic of new West Indianism and the aspirations we have. He likes to be seen with people like Lord Rootes. I was at Sandy Lane Hotel one night and he came in that place where there were a lot of black people, but he could only find himself among the white people who came there. What use is he to West Indian thought? That Uncle Tom business does not suit our generation. You are sending a man somewhere, and all he wants to be is to be near white people like Lord Rootes. If he came here and you asked him if he knew Mr. Lowe, a member of the House of Assembly, he would want to know who is his grandmother, who is his father, where he went to school or what is his pedigree, as if he were a cow or a race horse. He would want to know if his father is "Jonathan G". I am not telling you that a man should not have the dignity attaching to his office. I do not want him to go down to the East End and buy fish or go in a pub and let people spit in his face, but at the same time I want a man who would look after the West Indians in Paddington and Brixton.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot look like an Englishman if you are a West Indian like me, unless you paint your face like Al Jolson when he is made up. The best thing they could have done was to give Sir Garnet Gordon a Knighthood, because he feels he can now die as Sir Garnet Gordon. He is not the man suitable by mentality for this thing. He wants to carry you at Claridges or the Dorchester or to the Savoy. These people feel that you are not living unless you go to the Savoy and eat, have a boy with epaulettes on his shoulder saluting you, and they dash £10 in your stomach-bone.

I have often said that Mr. Brewster is my friend. I am going to England next week and I have to see Mr. Brewster; but I talk my politics. We have sent people to England from Bawdens and Boscobel who have just dropped the hoe and gone there, and they know nothing about West London; but people talk about it as though it was Eagle Hall. I asked the sister of one of the people who went to London how she was going to get to where she would reside, but the sister seemed to have the idea that somebody would come with a pick-up and give her a lift. That is why you must have people to go to these places and investigate.

As far as housing accommodation is concerned, this is one of the problems we have to watch. Englishmen do not understand how West Indians live. A West Indian woman may drop in a place after being on a ship or an aeroplane, and is put in a bed among four or five men whom she does not know, and the next thing you know is that before she leaves she is pregnant. The Englishman does not understand how these people can come there and become pregnant. If he is told that a woman has two children, he usually asks where is her husband. The European way of life, in so far as the cultural standards which they have set, is different from ours. If you tell them that a man has two children and wants to bring over his wife, they will accept that, not knowing how many wives he has to bring over. That is why I agree that you need a strong Migrant Service in the United Kingdom for West Indians. Let us be quite frank about this. Nobody who has studied the background of the African and the West Indian believes that you can root out this West Indian habit - and the Englishman calls it promiscuity - and that sort of thing. You will not get it out of them in a day or a year, because he is going to England and when he sees people like himself, it is just like telling a Bajan in London not to laugh hard. If I were travelling by train and a Barbadian saw me, he would shout "Hi, Skipper; is that you there?" He would be nothing to do with anybody. But an Englishman does not shout so loud. The Migrant Service, therefore, is an important service.

I would like to say to the Premier that we are all eager to see a beginning made of the new Federation which we are about to start. What I am worried about is that West Indians themselves are trying to create areas in which West Indian unity would not work. I have seen it at work in the Windward Islands, and it is beginning to work here in Barbados, because unfortunately in Party politics if one side is successful in projecting something, the Opposition wants to come in and say that what you are projecting is wrong, in order to create an area in which the Opposition must exist.

In the Windward Islands, there are groups which were in favour of Federation before, but because they are out of step with those who are in power, they want to create an area.
6.55 p.m.

I say this to those who want a unitary state with Trinidad. Any lazy indifferent person would always want to climb up on somebody's back that appears to be stronger and more powerful. I will say this if I happen to go to Grenada and St. Lucia. Any territory which is not willing to pull its socks or its petticoat straps up but wants to be climbing up on the back of a big brother will find that that brother would only want to treat you as an appendage.

Barbados is making a substantial contribution to this venture, both in money and leadership. I know that Barbados has the men who are capable of helping this Federation. As I have said, I have been to all of these territories already, and I am going to be very factual with all the statements which I make. The average West Indian in the other territories is not as prepared to stand up to the hard work which the Barbadian by force of his geographical position is prepared to do. As a Barbadian politician, I want to say this. I do not think that Barbados should enter Federation just for the sake of unity. That is not good enough. Barbados must not bend over backwards; therefore, tell them not to expect us to bend over backwards and do not let them think that we should take up all this weight which is coming at us. I am not taking an attitude like Trinidad; but I am taking the attitude that if you want to live like me, you must work hard like me. I have no fear for the Ministers as such, but for people who are not sensible enough to know that psychologically you gain a lot more by having a lot of prudence. I have seen for myself that by employing prudence and not being extravagant, the Trade Union movement which I have the honour to run has been so built up that today I challenge you to go to Jamaica or to Trinidad, powerful as they are there, and see if they have the structural organisation like that which we have. Do you know the reason for that? I, as the leader, do not have one of the biggest houses in Barbados. I am not like the other people who only want to use these organisations for the sake of riding on the people's back and not using them for the benefit of the people themselves. Unfortunately, the West Indian is possessed with the individual cult. I do not know what will happen tomorrow if West Indian leaders were to wake up with typhoid fever, because the majority of leaders are of the opinion that the communities cannot exist without them and they are not willing to forego personal aims and ambitions for what these sort of organisations need.

I see what Barbados is going to produce here. Our vote in this respect today is \$650,000. Do you know what that means in the economy of the people of the other islands? I understand that the Hon. Premier had to speak to one of the Ministers of the other colonies. I have been to Montserrat, and workers there were getting 90 cents a day eight years ago. That is the sort of people with whom we are joining in a Federation.

The Hon. Premier spoke of the European Common Market and expressed his fears. I think it is a means of making the people in the West Indies see themselves in the true perspective. This is where the Eight have some example to guide them from those European countries. When those countries in Europe came together, Britain and all the bigger countries had what is called the European Free Trade Association and they did not join with the Six. Now today, the Six are becoming stronger and more economically viable. You must have political viability first before you can talk about economic viability. You can only be economically viable after you have become politically viable, because you will then have control over the things which you are going to deal with economically. As I have said, this is where I see that it would be a means of making these West Indian countries see themselves in the true perspective.

Sir, I have been asked to move that the Committee report progress and ask for leave to sit again and I now formally make that motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Sitting of this House be now suspended until 8.30 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

7.05 p.m.

On re-assembling,

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

FEDERATION - PRE-FEDERAL, REGIONAL AND COMMON SERVICES

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension of the sitting, we were in Committee of Supply considering a Resolution for the sum of \$650,271 under Head 16 - Federation, pre-Federal, Regional and Common Services - of the Schedule. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will have to be as long as I have already been in finishing what I have to say on this matter. What is evident from this Resolution is that there are three main things which will have to be clarified because they are overlapping. The first thing is the Pre-Federal Commission, our legislative body and the decision made in paragraph 4 of the Addendum to this Resolution to deal with the services as they are in England. I will deal with these services as they are set out in the Addendum. The Interim Commissioner is to administer the services which were formerly administered by the Federal Government. All the Federal services which were formerly performed by these people will now be dealt with by this Commissioner. At what stage will the Interim Commissioner not be the Interim Commissioner? The next point is that the Advisory Regional Council of Ministers is to consider the common interest and that common interest is one in which you are already involved. The Pre-Federal Organization does not have any extra federal services with which to deal other than those which have been already dealt with. We are not now dealing with the Report, and what is not clear to me is when the services of the Interim Commissioner will cease. If you read paragraph 2 of the Addendum to this Resolution, you will see what the Interim Commissioner has to do. It is stated in the Addendum that this Interim Commissioner who has been set up under the West Indies (Dissolution and Interim Commissioner) Order-in-Council 1962, is to administer all the services which were formerly administered by the Federal Government. Trinidad is independent, Jamaica is also independent; and if Jamaica says: "I do not want to continue the meteorological services in the West Indies, I can go on with something in Puerto Rico", what will we be administering? We have the Federal ships and to what extent can Jamaica say: "I do not want to have anything to do with you and the Federal ships"? The main thing which will remain is the University College of the West Indies which is in Jamaica and you cannot lift that out of Jamaica lock, stock and barrel unless you say that you will buy it over.

The West Indies are very famous for setting up Committees and Commissions; they are also famous for spending lots of money on these things and they last for years and years putting a stop to doing duplicating work. This Addendum states this:-

"At the Marlborough House Conference in London in May 1962, it was agreed that an advisory Regional Council of Ministers should be set up which will consist of the Premier of Barbados and the Chief Ministers of the Leewards and Windwards to consider any problems of common interest of the eight territories concerned in connection with the setting up of the new Federation. The Council would be under the Chairmanship of the Governor of Barbados and would have at its disposal a small secretariat concerned with the necessary planning work in preparation for the new Federation....."

You have an Interim Commissioner and then you have a Pre-Federal Advisory Council. That is dealing with the services of planning for the new Federation. The Chairman will have administrative responsibility to give effect to the Council's decisions. The Governor of Barbados will be the administrator of the Advisory Council of the Commission which you are setting up. We know that we are paying a Mandatory Levy, and as to the amount of money to be paid under that levy some of it will be used in different ways. Some will be used to give effect to the decisions of the Interim Commissioner and of the Pre-Federal services. Paragraph 4 of this Addendum states this:-

"At the Marlborough House Conference in London in May 1962, the Representatives of the eight unit territories comprising the proposed East Caribbean Federation agreed that as from the date of the dissolution of the old West Indies Federation, an office should be established in London to represent the interests of the eight units in matters of trade, migrant services and industrial relations."

I am not clear as to what is meant by industrial relations. If Barbados should set up an industrial relations service, that will be in conjunction with whom? The workers in Britain will be British workers for practical purposes, so that your industrial relation service will be only giving assistance here and there. I do not know what discussions these members had with the British Trade Union Council as to be in relationship with these people. I am not clear as to who is going to control these services as set out in paragraph 4 of the Addendum to this Resolution. Is this service to be under the control of this Advisory Regional Council of Ministers or is this part of the Mandatory Levy which included the West Indian Trade Commissioner Service in England? Our Mandatory Levy was part of what the Federation spent on the West Indies Trade Commissioner in London. I am of the opinion that you have too many commissions in a "Little Eight" territory. The British Government without any consultation says that you are incapable of doing this job which we want done and therefore we will set up somebody to do it. The eight territories are now going to deal with two different administrations; Sir John Stow is administrator of one group and Sir Stephen Luke is the administrator of the other group.

These territories have these administrators to deal with this new thing. What are the proposed dates when these relations will really cease to exist? Why is it that we have, at this stage of our lives, to set up another Pre-Federal organization when all the information known about the Federation could have been laid before us and therefore it would be a question of cost? What I really want to know is this; West Indians like Conferences, and very often you will have a lot of talk until the position gets so strong that if we decide to have another Federation somebody will break away from it too.

8.40 p.m.

If you want a Federation, you should prepare a plan and say this is what you want. I have in my mind that the British Government has got the West Indies just where they want them, that is, at a point at which they can play for time. The British Government in my view has got the West Indies in a position where they are playing for time so cleverly that in all the territories where they find something can grow up, they are prepared to wait, as in the case with St. Lucia. They are not breaking away and dividing themselves, so that if there is an election, you do not know who is going to win. Mr. Compton says he wants a Unitary State. In Dominica they are not clear about what they want.

Grenada says that it wants a Unitary State, and I would say that you should be glad that Mr. Gairy is meeting opposition for a Unitary State, because the mere fact that he is meeting opposition for a Unitary State means that he does not want a Unitary State; otherwise you would not have Grenada.

Mr. Chairman, there are Gairies all over the other Territories, and I do not want to say too much of what I know. The characteristics of the Leaders of the Federation are known to people in London and to many of us for many years, and that is why the British Government is playing for time. It would be impolitic for me to say what everybody knows about the Leadership that exists in all the territories; and this delayed action is a means of seeing if something different would emerge. Have you not seen that in one territory a Bill was passed indemnifying the income taxes of Ministers which caused a big furore? You had a Commission of Enquiry in one case and a breakdown in another case, and with all these, you are trying to make something out of the situation. That is why I say it would be wise if you got along quickly, so that you can bury quickly the Leaders who are no good and liquidate all that you should liquidate, rather than waste time. When you have finished having all these little bit of commissions, you are going to end up at the point like the last Federation. Take an analysis of it. Do you realise how the leadership has changed since 1947? Do you realise that Jamaica got to the stage where people were playing they were so smart? Manley tried to be too smart and out-smarted himself; therefore the only one left was Eric Williams in Trinidad of the new group.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that with the establishment of an Interim Commissioner and Advisory Council and this little bit of thing in London, you are trying to satisfy the wishes of certain people in the West Indies. Finally, I believe the Government of Barbados is making the same mistake as the former Government about Federation. There are some men who take women for granted, but they may go home and find that she is not there and they have an empty house. You are taking the West Indies for granted with this Federation, because you believe that everybody understands. Barbadians do not understand what Federation means. They think that it means everybody outside fighting, and people spitting blood. They refer to this as federation, where somebody gets killed or a person's home is burnt down.

Mr. Chairman, which of the leaders have told the people in Barbados what are the implications of this new Federation? Even in this House, if you ask some of the backbenchers what are the implications of the new Federation within the context of the West Indian situation as it is today, with Jamaica and Trinidad out of the Federation, and what they see themselves doing in the Little Eight or the Big Eight vis-a-vis Jamaica and Trinidad, what reply could they give? We have to make ourselves so strong as a Unit that Trinidad and Jamaica will talk to us or we will force them to talk to us, and British Guiana will also talk to us. In so doing, the impact of the European Common Market which is going to hit all of us will force us into an economic union even in our political studies, in order to be able to talk to the British Government in the same way that Australia, New Zealand and Canada are talking to them about their entry into the Common Market.

I am not a prophet of gloom, Mr. Chairman, because I see that even with the problem of the Common Market which will affect the area, we have to tell the British Government or tell the world that there must be compensatory economic schemes built in by the British Government to help emerging countries and these new developing countries with their primary products. The Trade Unions stated that in their submission to the United Nations Economic, Social and Cultural Organisation last month on behalf of all its workers. We said that they could not allow the situation to dissipate whereby developing countries with primary products could not do anything. What are we doing in the West Indies to make it known how we feel about Britain's entry into the European Common Market?

I came back here in March, 1961, and made an Address on that, and an ignorant Barbadian told me that I had run out of things because I was talking about the European Common Market. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Who was that?) I cannot call the man's name, because he will prosecute me for saying he is ignorant. He thought I had run out of ideas because I was not talking about standpipes in Boscobelle! I say that because I am satisfied in my mind that the grouping of the territories together will give us the impetus to fight stubbornly to protect the primary products we are producing, and we can only do that on the basis of having compensatory schemes. You have heard what Charles De Gaulle told you and you have heard what Adanaeur told you. The Americans smile at the British protectionist policy in so far as preferential tariffs are concerned. Sooner or later preferential tariffs will go, but something else will be built in. Do not call them preferential tariffs; call them compensatory schemes.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that Barbados cannot do it by itself; it can only do that in collaboration with bigger and more powerful groups, and therefore the grouping of these eight territories is a necessity and is the only means of surviving. Unfortunately we are passing through a period in which political parties are struggling with each other for power, and sometimes they do not even know what to do with the power they possess. I have read a little of the White Paper, but as this is outside the White Paper, I would really like to know what effect this Pre-Federal Organisation and the Interim Commissioner will have on the quick implementation of what the West Indies are looking for. Are we looking for another Standing Closer Association conference, and having a series of meetings which will end up near the time when somebody will have an election?

8.50 p.m.

The Barbados Government itself has a lot in its plate. They say that they have a three-year programme and I can make a prophecy. Six months have gone and with what you say that you have to do, I prophesy that you cannot hold any General Election in three years' time. You cannot hold an election for the Federal Parliament unless you have an election on the old bogus system. If you are not having Barbados as being a constituency and you are having a Boundary Commission for single-member constituencies, the Boundary Commission will take time to set up. On top of that, your own economic programme is going to take time to implement. Then, all this Pre-Federal setup takes time because as soon as you put Civil Servants to work for money, they are like carpenters whom you have to pay to build a place. The carpenter always wants to know if you have a week's work; and when you put a Federal Civil Servant to do something, he will want to know if he can work long enough to get a pension. He will tell you that you have got to get somebody to come in and build a desk. Then he is going to want a telephone put in. Then again perhaps he will tell you that you have a door in the office on the wrong side, and therefore you will have to change the hanging of the door. All of those things require time; and I am afraid, from what I see — and it is five months fully since you had your first meeting in Trinidad — that you are not much further from the stage which you were when you were in Trinidad, because you decided then to set up a Federation.

Sir, I do not know how long Sir Stephen Luke is going to stay in the West Indies because he has the Federal ships to run. I do not know what they are going to do with the meteorological services. You are bound to do something because you have your aeroplanes coming in. You are not going to get Pan American bringing any expensive planes down here if you do not carry on your meteorological service. They are not going to be satisfied for you to have a man putting up a red handkerchief. I say that because I too am impatient with these unnecessary delays. The reason why I am impatient is because in 1947 I was at Montego Bay prior to the Conference and I met Mr. Creech Jones; and today, we are at the same place or a little further back than when we started at that time.

The final point which the Hon. Premier made was about the Order-in-Council. I am sorry that I cannot share his sentiments. What should have been said to the British Government is what the lawyers say and that is, the *status quo*

ante should be the position for Barbados in respect of our constitutional position as soon as the Federation was dissolved, and Barbados should have gone back to its original position.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I rise on a point of order. On that matter, the Hon. Premier had a lot to say at the Conference. As a matter of fact, I believe what he said did sort of antagonise the leaders of the other territories. We stated the position of Barbados fully.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not suggesting that it was not raised. I raised this question here in Barbados when we were dealing with the mandatory levy and that was long before there was any conference. I said so when the Hon. Premier said that he had received a telegram from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. So far as I am concerned, a Resolution should have been passed in this House of Assembly protesting against the Order-in-Council being applied to Barbados because Barbados did not give up her constitutional position to an Order-in-Council; it gave it up to the Federation which was going to become independent and, therefore, with the expectation that we soon were going to be a territory of an independent nation. If the Secretary of State can agree that Jamaica and Trinidad should become independent, and then they come and make their Order-in-Council for the Eight, they must remember that prior to that, they promised to give all these territories a position stronger than when they left the Federation. Jamaica and Trinidad are now going to enjoy a constitution which the Federation did not achieve because the Federation was not yet an independent federation when it was dissolved.

Sir, that is where I say that I am not as sanguine about this matter as the Hon. Premier. I believe what has happened is because the Federal Prime Minister was protesting against the Order-in-Council, may be for different reasons, but I can go along with the devil up to the point of going into hell. If the devil brings it, I can say that the Lord sent it: and if you are doing something good, I do not care who you are, I welcome it. What I believe operated here in Barbados was the result of what the former Prime Minister was saying about this Order-in-Council. The stature of Barbados has been diminished, and even now we will have to wait until those boys behave themselves because our constitutional position is still dependent upon the behaviour of the eight territories. Our gaining independence is coupled with theirs.

I hope that this would not take place, but suppose any of the other territories begin to disintegrate. For example, how do you know, if you were to have an election in St. Vincent tomorrow, what is going to be the net result? Nobody knows what is going to be the position in St. Lucia. The Deputy Prime Minister of the West Indies Federation is going back to St. Lucia and you do not know who is going to get back in power. If I had my way about it, I would prevent certain people from serving. I know that if certain men get back into the Federal Parliament — and the way how certain things are run, some are likely to get back in — if some of those people get back in, down comes the thing again. You cannot make a dishonest man honest. If a man is no good, he is no good: and the reason why the Federation broke up was because certain people wanted personal aggrandisement. Have you seen what some of them did? Some of them asked for a lump sum payment and were even so shameless as to say that it was something which they were deprived of. They had the brass to look into people's faces and say that. That is what I am speaking of and what the people should be told.

9.00 p.m.

You have innocent people in Barbados — the Premier says that people must pull their belts, but there are some people who have no belts to pull. A man who is working for \$15 a week is eating a little stewed yam and things like that, and some people eat out of a paper plate and some have to drink tea without any milk this week and promise it the milk next week. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to know the number of people who are going to sleep hungry tonight. You go through some of the villages in this island and you will find some children who were running about semi-naked

throughout the day. If you were to ask a Barbadian politician in a general way if he knows what is the average age of the wage-earner in Barbados, he does not know. If you were to ask him the number of people who are living in St. Michael and who are not working, if you ask the average politician how many of these cases exist and how many have come up for poor relief — I will say that it will surprise you if you were to be told the names of these people. At a dance the other night, a man told me that he wanted \$40 to pay for ten weeks' house rent; so that when you see people having a dance, it is not a matter of social fun, as you would have a cocktail party; it is for the purpose of helping the economic situation. There are people who live in rented houses and they have not paid any rent for six or eight months; there are people who are living on borrowed time; and it is these people for whom you have to make the Federation something which is worthwhile. You have to make these people understand what you are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that on these vital issues the people should be consulted intelligently, not on any mass basis. Those are the facts of life: so that if you want to do something which you consider to be in the interest of the people, they should be aware of it. As to those who dislike Dr. Eric Williams, he is one man to whom I will pay some credit. Despite his failures, Dr. Williams is not afraid to go to the people with fundamental issues about which he feels the people should know something. On this vital issue of Federation and all its implications, I feel that the Barbadian public has not been brought up-to-date with what is taking place.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is very unfortunate that we should be called upon to discuss this Resolution before the Hon. Premier has actually had an opportunity to go to the public and give the people an account of the Conference which was held in England. As you will recall, as Leader of the Opposition, I was selected to join the Barbadian delegation on that Conference. I do not like to say what Mr. Bramble said, that is, that we are facing a common enemy, but I feel it was a national issue as far as the West Indies are concerned, and therefore I offered the maximum co-operation to the Barbados delegation of which I was a part. Lest the Premier should take this as a criticism, I believe that everybody knows that after the first week he became ill and had to be away from the Conference for a week in consequence; therefore he had to follow, although being ill, the day-to-day happenings, not from the newspapers, but from what we of the delegation could take to him. I say it is very unfortunate — and I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter — that this entire question of Federation was not discussed before this Resolution was brought in here.

I hope that it will not be very far from now when we will be discussing the White Paper. I hope the Hon. Premier will not make the same mistake as was made by the members of the now defunct Federation, of going to England, coming back to this House of Assembly and taking it for granted that they had the power and they could do what they wanted to do. I quite agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that whatever may be said of Dr. Eric Williams, he goes to the people with issues. I believe that the public are aware that the Premier's illness primarily would have prevented him from going to the public with this question of Federation. I myself was rather itchy to go out in the Lower Green with it, but I thought it would be out of place from the point of view that I was a member of the delegation and that the Premier should go and tell the public about the matter.

While I offered the maximum co-operation to the Hon. Premier in this matter, I made quite clear my position on my landing here. I made it clear that I would refuse to make any statement on this question of Federation before the Hon. Premier could have the opportunity of making that statement.
9.10 p.m.

I believe in the democratic principles of running a country, but that does not mean that I am not going to the public myself to give my point of view on how I look at it. When I listened on the last evening of the Conference to

one of the most brilliant speeches I have ever heard made by the Premier of Barbados in straightforward punches to the Secretary of State, the problem was brought home to me very strongly. I was satisfied that here was a man who was conscious of what he was doing, and you could see in his face exactly how he felt. That speech, Mr. Chairman, was made when we could not get the Secretary of State and his English delegation to commit themselves to the financial assistance and economic implications which would be involved. I could see then that the Premier understood what he was talking about, I could see that the Colonial Office representatives had a great respect for him, and I could see also that the members of the other territories depended greatly upon him to deal with the economic aspects of the Federation.

Mr. Chairman, I was more than pleased, and I made it quite clear then, that while I was a Conservative and the only elected member of the Opposition sitting around that Table, I would have to part company with my colleagues, if I could so call them colleagues, who were Conservatives on the British Delegation, and vote strongly along with the Premier of Barbados, because I could not agree with the sentiments which the members of the British delegation had expressed. That is why I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that to the average West Indian we are no further than when the Hon. H. A. Cuke went to Queen's Park with Sir Grantley Adams and in a little play-play talk, as I call it, told the people about Federation and that they would get the sun, the moon and the stars.

Let me say that I am not happy about the Federation. I am sorry that we will not see the speech which was made by the Hon. Premier because it was not taken *verbatim*, but those of us who sat and listened to him — and I believe he was not very well that evening — regard it as a speech of which we can be proud. I understand that when I was away, somebody asked what I had gone for. I am not a hypocrite, but all the talk that Sir Grantley made to the one and a half million people about constitutional matters was stupidity. I would have liked you to hear what the Premier put up for the people of the West Indies. I had implicit faith in the speech which the Premier of Barbados made, and I was quite satisfied that he was honest about it and was not living in the clouds, nor was he making a speech with an eye on some recognition at all. As a matter of fact, at one time I was sitting at his side, and I told him I do not think he should get so hot at that stage because he had just come from hospital. I will counsel him that the average man in the street in Barbados thinks that Federation means a lot of people tearing off each other's clothes or having a fight at a standpipe, and in his own style he should go to the people.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the papers sent to me were marked "Confidential". I belong to a Party and I have had 100 odd copies cyclostyled and sent to members of my Party who are interested so that they can give me the necessary statistics and financial data, and we will meet and discuss them very shortly. I hope to be able to discuss them before we come with the White Paper. There can be no secret in a matter of this sort, because it concerns 750,000 people and they should know about these things through their leaders. It is unfortunate that we have come to discuss this Resolution for \$650,000 first, but what is my position? I am bound to vote for it. While doing this, I always remember Mr. "Chrissie" Brathwaite praising the now Sir Grantley Adams, but my praise is not of the same nature at all; this is from the depth of my heart.

This Resolution for \$650,000 is to carry on the Interim Commission, the Regional Council of Ministers and the Overseas Commission in the United Kingdom, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said. Nothing has been made abundantly clear to the public except what the Premier has said in here tonight in a two-hour speech of which the *Advocate* will print possibly two columns; but if you could carry 15,000 people in the Market Square, and talk to them, it would be infinitely better. When I looked around this House this evening and saw the young boys with school ties, between 16 and 18 years of age, it struck me that they are the people who are becoming interested and are the future generation. When you feel a little better, I counsel

you to go in the Green and let the people know how you feel, not in a rabble-rousing speech, but in a speech of the type which you made on the evening before the Conference came to an end, and when you allowed the Secretary of State to know what was the true position, when you confronted them with Sir Sydney Keynes' own thesis on economic theory and so on, and when you made it clear to them what was the position in the West Indies, and in Barbados in particular, I can tell the hon. senior member for St. Peter that the Premier made it clear that as far as Barbados was concerned he had no intention at all of giving up or giving away any of our constitutional rights. In anything we did, we intended to pull the others up rather than going backwards.

To discuss the matter here, Mr. Chairman, the general public will not get to the root of what has been discussed and agreed upon in England. The old Federation came to an end at the end of last month, and it has been agreed upon that a Council of Ministers with the Governor of Barbados as Chairman will administer affairs. Something had to be done and some start had to be made. I want to tell the hon. senior member for St. Peter that that took a great deal of argument, but who else could we have but elected Ministers? I am going to predict on the floor of this House that any Federation which starts next year or the year after next on pure Party politics in the West Indies is doomed to failure, like the other one which, I consider, was conceived in iniquity and died as it started. Eric Williams made it clear that he was not a socialist; so the Socialist Party came back and changed its constitution so that he could come in and give them more power. They were power mad. How could it last if the Leader of the Socialist Party in the West Indies made room for Eric Williams so that he could have enough members to run the Federation? The hon. senior member for St. Peter rightly stated just now that we have got power politics in the West Indies.

9.20 p.m.

Quite frankly, it is not my opinion that some of the leaders who are not in Government in the other territories are against any association of states, a federation or whatever you may call it; but if you understand your politics, and you say that you are going to give the people the moon and somebody comes along and say that the stars are better, if you can argue with the people that the moon is better, well, they will agree with you. I realise what the position is. As the Premier told you, we did not need any lessons. Nobody was going to England with the leader who had the majority to make a row with him. Instead of making a row with him in any conference room, when we got outside and there was any disagreement on any matter we would say to him: "Well, you should do so-and-so". We acted as one. From Jamestown back to Bridgetown, the people of colour have one thing in common. Let us take Jamaica. However prosperous that country may be, they have one thing in common and that is poverty. The hon. member said a few moments ago that Barbadian people in England are still getting a lot of children. I really believe that most of us have the propensity to get children and you cannot decide that birth control is the thing to stop you from getting children.

Now, Sir, the British Government decided that there must be an Interim Commissioner, a Regional Council of Ministers and a Pre-Federal set-up. You have all this lot of Civil Servants to lay off from the West Indies Federation. I want to say here and now that I believe that when you put Civil Servants out of a job, they should be compensated; but I believe that the politicians who were in the Federal Parliament should go and work for a living. They worked for a lot of money when they were in the Federal Parliament, and they were doing nothing for it. The salaries which they were drawing were out of proportion for what they were doing, and they should not get one cent pension or anything else. I repeat, they should go and look for work. You cannot be representing people of the ordinary barefoot type and all you are doing is bleeding them! When these politicians were in the Federal Parliament, the Ministers were given a cook, butler and a maid, a chauffeur to drive them all about, and they drank out \$900 a month at the Queen's Park Hotel. They were doing all that while the people were walking barefooted. You have right here in Barbados people who are undermining you. I am telling you

what the position is. Nothing can change me from being a Conservative because I do not have to beg for one thing.

We have to vote this money. This money which you have here is for the Interim Commissioner. What is this Interim Commissioner here to do? He will have to decide on a question of pension for the Federal Civil Servants. I made it clear that the Colonial Office must have gone drunk to think that we could compensate or give pension to English Civil Servants. We made it clear that those people who can find jobs commensurate with the type of job which they were doing should accept those jobs as long as those jobs paid not less than five per cent or ten per cent of the money which they were getting. In other words, if a man had a job in the Federal Service for which he was paid a salary of \$400 a month and he was a man 34 years of age, if he got a job for \$360 a month, he should take it. Let us face facts. If he got a job for \$360 a month, why should he talk about getting pension? If a man was getting \$400 in Trinidad and he got a job here for \$360, of course, he could live better on the \$360 here than on the \$400 there. Well, Sir, all these things must be looked into by the Interim Commissioner. A number of Civil Servants would be kept on with him, and they will in turn have to decide on what should be done with the buildings and so on.

A few moments ago, the hon. junior member for St. George was criticising the buying of "Sherbourne" and I agreed with the Government. Everybody agreed, from Antigua back to Grenada, that the capital of this Federation should be Barbados. There was one thing which you could see permeating the conference which was held in London, and it was that, whatever happened, everyone had the greatest respect for the views of the Hon. Premier, his sincerity of purpose; and they were all dependent on him to put the case for us from the point of view of the economic conditions of these islands — and I can tell you, Sir, that the Hon. Premier did it with a dignity which we in Barbados can be very proud of.

However, Sir, it still leaves me in doubt. There are no two ways about it. You have to be very careful. As you know, Sir, at a conference like that, you should do nothing to offend; but the time came when naturally I had to break the rule and offend Mr. Gairy after he did not want certain things done. We in Barbados are accustomed to having things done in a certain way; therefore, I had to speak out.

The Hon. Premier has told you that, may be, in the end the new Federation would decide that some of these services which are called essential might not be needed. Do you know what a sense of bitterness of feeling there is in all of these Islands, not so much against Jamaica, but against Trinidad? The Windward and Leeward Islands never had much to do with Jamaica until 1947 when the U.C.W.I. came about; but when it comes to Trinidad, everybody in these parts has a cousin or an aunt in Trinidad and they feel somewhat annoyed that Trinidad has left them out and gone it alone. They made it quite clear, and there was some plain talk by the Premier of Barbados that the Colonial Office was passing the buck. And everybody could see it. The Colonial Office brought in somebody to talk to us — a very brilliant man, in my humble opinion — on the European Common Market: and after three or four hours, though it was a brilliant lecture, we got no further. That was the position which worried the Hon. Premier. When it was realized that we would have to put up reserves to the Federation, the Premier got more annoyed and he used a remark which caused Mr. Bramble of Montserrat to get over-annoyed. We have got to be very careful. It is my considered opinion that it is our duty to go to the public and put these things before them so that they would know what they have to look to carry and to bear.

9.30 p.m.

Those are things which, in my considered opinion, should be done; it is the common duty of politicians to go to the public and put before them what they will have to look forward to carry. We are going to help others, but they must help themselves too. We are not running from our responsibility, like Trinidad and Jamaica, but we have to say things. These are things which should be brought to the people. The Interim Commissioner will carry on these

essential services until such time as you have an Election. There cannot be any Election in any first year of the Federation or anything like that; a lot of people thought that a new Federation would come in on the 1st June. These things were hammered out and it was decided that that could not be so. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for St. Peter was out of the island at the time because you could only put those who were in power as the Advisory Regional Council of Ministers; you could only put as such Council of Ministers those who are running the Governments of the other islands and the Hon. Premier of Barbados. The Governor could not be any dictator; he would have to be instructed by the Ministers.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be too long in dealing with these things. On the first morning I met Sir Garnet Gordon, I saw that he was a real Rolls Royce man. I went to England prepared, because my son had told me who this man was. I do not intend crossing the floor of this House, but the truth must come out. When I heard about this Commissioner and his office and all of these things down there, I wanted to see what it was. I asked my son to take me to see where Sir Garnet Gordon's office was; I saw it next to the place where they sell these Rolls Royce things. When they appointed us as a Committee to visit these places like Portobello, Shepherd's Bush and Brixton, the Premier was then out of hospital and he got me up one morning early and told me that they did not want to see Sir Garnet Gordon, but they wanted to see this place. As we walked through the streets and the markets where everything is being sold, we met people from St. John, from the City and from all over the place. One man said to me: "We want somebody like a Solicitor who can be in charge of this office." There is a boy who was working in British Guiana and who is now working for a lot of money. I asked about Sir Garnet Gordon and they told me: "To hell with Sir Garnet Gordon". I was annoyed because I was cold. We saw people buying all sorts of things. The Premier asked: "How are you getting on?" And they replied that they could find money to spend and have a better standard of living, but it was a question of the housing conditions. They said that if they want to buy a house, there is nobody who would show them what to do. A man called Sydney Skinner told the Premier this: "You are the first Premier of the West Indies to stand up here and have so many people around you." Mr. Linton's son said: "Skipper, you are the first man to come down here and visit us." The people complained that if they wanted to go to Sir Garnet's office, they would have to leave working and go six miles in order to get there. I said that the office should be brought to the people.

The Hon. Premier's wife also went into that area. My son went with me, and I am satisfied that the minute you hit the area you begin to see West Indians. In the other places you will stand up there and you will not see one West Indian. This office is costing \$600,000 a year to run, with 56 people employed, and there is nobody to tell you that they are paying so much money. The policy of Barbadians is that they will want to own houses as soon as they go anywhere. They want to own one half of London as soon as they get there. *(Laughter)* You have Jamaica offering so much for the site, Trinidad has offered so much for the site and it was made clear that Jamaica wants a site like that; but we are going into the area and putting up houses where the people can come in. You know what it means when a woman goes home hungry and sees that there is an amount for income tax and she cannot get it off? There is nobody to advise you.
9.40 p.m.

You know that when a woman comes home from work hungry and sweaty, and though she may have some trouble with income tax and getting no allowances off — and in England a deduction is allowed for illegitimate children — she has nobody to advise her. Whether my Party likes it or not, it is people that matter, and not Sir Garnet Gordon. As a matter of fact, I got a letter from him congratulating me a few days ago. I will say that Sir Garnet Gordon is not the type of person for the job. You have to get a man who likes people to be in charge of that building. You know, Sir, there are 56 people working in that building. I told the Premier that what he wants is a young West Indian solicitor, and a

man who likes people. I do not admire a man who only looks after Civil Servants or nurses, because there are people who have gone to England from St. Andrew and St. Lucy. You will remember that when people started going to England and I was in the Opposition with hon. members on the other side, we told the then Government to give assistance by lending money, but they replied that they could not lend money to Tom, Dick and Harry. At that time, only \$88,000 used to be remitted by way of money orders from England to Barbados.

The first day I landed in England, while travelling along Oxford Street, I heard someone shout "Hi there, Brother Motts!" Before I got ten feet further, I met another woman. Today the Premier can tell you that remittances have gone into the millions; therefore, they have brought up the economy of this Island. When you are going to look after people, you do not look after a few students only. I went to a Party at the Students Centre, and the majority of students had parents who could look after them. I feel that the Premier's heart is in the right place if he continues that way, and if he does not get spoiled like the other Prime Minister — but he did not get spoiled; he was born spoiled. I will tell the Premier that if he does not want to look for trouble, he should not talk about getting \$2,000 a month, because it is not fair to the people of the West Indies.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you where I suffered great humiliation. I was carried from this country as a member of the delegation, and I am going to tell you this story because I do not want you to misunderstand it. Every day we had conferences among ourselves before we met the other islands, because we had to decide what we would do. The Premier told me one day that he had been asked to come to the B.B.C. by Tom Adams; and if you hear me in the Lower Green becoming nasty, you will know why; and I will be so stink, it is not going to be funny. I have never been stink, but I will be worse than stink in the Lower Green. The Premier showed me a list of 13 questions from T. M. G. M. Adams, and at the bottom of this list was a note asking him to bring along another member of the delegation. If you think I am not telling the truth, you can ask Mr. Ian Gale, who saw it. The Premier told me that in view of the fact that Mr. Crawford is a member of his Party, he would carry a member of the Opposition. We went to the B.B.C. and were shown into a room and for a long time I was not spoken to. There were a lot of gentlemen in the room.

Mr. Chairman, I want all the yard fowls who are listening in here to carry this back, even those who say that my son is not a 'true-true' lawyer. We went into a room, and the Premier said "But surely you know Mr. Mottley", by which time Tom Adams had shaken hands with everybody else and I put my hands in my pocket. Mr. Chairman, the Government paid my way to go to the Conference, and I had to pay my daughter's way to go and cook for me, as I cannot eat hotel food and I was not going to kill myself for anybody; so if they say that Barrow paid the way for myself and daughter, they can go to B.W.I.A. and find out.

Tom Adams pulled down a lovely cabinet in which there was every possible drink you can think of, and looking around in his usual effeminate style — I do not know if he has grown out of it yet because he is married now — said "Gentlemen, will you have a drink?" I said I did not drink, because I have not had a drink for twenty-two years. He is so affected, but his affectedness seems to have moved off, because there was going to be no more Prime Minister in a few days. He then asked whether we would have tea. He reminded me of a Barbadian lawyer who came back here and went into another lawyer's office and was all the Englishman in the world; so the lawyer went into his room and brought a mirror and asked the other lawyer to look into it and see what he looked like, told him he was not an Englishman, and to stop talking that damned foolishness. Anyway, we sat down. Now I want you to see the rudeness and how far things can go. He ordered tea and started to talk to the Premier, and the Premier pointed out which questions he would answer, and which I would answer. Mr. Adams asked the Premier whether he thought the statement which he had made in Barbados about the financial position was such that

it could interfere with those people coming into the Federation.

Mr. Chairman, do you see the worthless, low type of mentality that was inherited, if there can be such a thing inherited? He then said "Well, Dipper, I was not prepared for Mr. Mottley to speak; I only want you to speak." The Premier then asked him why he had invited him to bring a member of the delegation. Do you know what that indifferent, uncouth swine said? (A VOICE: Order!) Order what? I was elected here. Those who want to can go to Tyrol Cot and tell his father and see whether he can shut Lyndingrove's gate. He said that he thought the Premier would have brought along somebody who would like to have a free drink on the B.B.C. That is as true as John 3:16. I told Adams that I had never asked his father for a drink, and I said, "Mr. Premier, I will go."

9.50 p.m.

The Premier turned and said to him: "You are insulting a member of my delegation and I will go too." That is what you saw in the newspaper. I had to tell you this, but I will deal with it in the Lower Green. He is coming back here to practise. Then he goes around telling people like Mr. Lawson Bailey that he had made me know my place. I have never been a lackey. I do not want to talk in here about this; I am going to do it where I can do it well. That is really what happened. My son had a party and they had a row. Let Mr. Mapp go into the office of the House of Assembly and take up the papers and carry them away. I say now that Mr. Mapp has been coming in the House of Assembly and taking out papers before they get to the Speaker and it is embarrassing the Clerk and certain employees here. (A VOICE: He should be locked up.) The employees say that he is an ex-member of the House. I do not know of any ex-member of the prison who goes back in there. When I become an ex-member of this House, I will stay at home.

Now, Sir, we come to the important part as regards this Overseas Commissioner. The delegates worked very hard on this. Sir, I am happy that I went on this delegation because I have learnt a lot, and I am satisfied beyond any doubt that the Premier of Barbados has done a good job; but I must counsel him that merely to come in here and discuss this Resolution is not good enough nor is it fair to the people of Barbados. You will only be falling into the footsteps of the last Prime Minister when you do that. You should go to the public and let them know something about it. I believe that I can handle myself on it. Do not let anybody fool you. I am a Conservative. It is my duty to come back here and let Messrs. Bryden, DaCosta and Haynes know something about it. There are about 100 people who pay three-quarters of the taxes which are paid in this country. I made it quite clear to those people that I am holding this seat, and the way I am able to hold it is by being able to represent the people in Chapman's Lane, Bulls Alley, Suttle Street and so on too.

This matter is very important. What I admired at the Conference in London was that it was not a Civil Servant's conference; it was not one of those conferences which Civil Servants had to tell the leader what he must say. They had to sit behind and the Hon. Premier was the man who was putting forward the figures.

Sir, I am going to vote for this Resolution; but I regret that I have to vote for it before everything has been made clear to the people. There are things which you must let the people of Barbados know. You have to let them know that we have to pool our Customs Duties with the other units of the Federation, and the balance of money which they do not want will come back to us. When it comes to this matter, I was satisfied with the Hon. Premier because he said it loud enough for the Prime Minister to hear that it was not his view that there should be any reserves accruing to the Federation. We have 130 schools in Barbados. He made it quite clear that we are not prepared to put up any reserves for any Federal Government for any question of squandermania and that he wanted to get out of the British delegation what was going to be their contribution. Up to now, they have not told us.

I feel very happy in supporting this Resolution. Sir Garnet Gordon would be selected for the setting up of the High Commissioner's office in the United Kingdom. Naturally, you are going to employ people from the eight territories. A young solicitor - if I say a young barrister, you may think that I am canvassing a job for my son - came to me and I told him that we came to the conclusion that the office must be set up within an area where it can be within reach of our people because those are the people who are remitting money to Barbados. There are a lot of things which I can say of the Liaison Officer, but I do not propose to do so. My son is very popular, as hon. members know; he is like me; but I am not prepared because he told me anything to say anything, because I would not like it to be said that he is against Mr. Brewster or anybody. However, I would say that all is not well in that office. A lot of people who are there came to see me. They only had to know where I was to come to me and they explained all sorts of things. They told me that sixteen people sleep at night in one room and the other sixteen sleep in it during the day. They told me that all sorts of things are going on, but I am not prepared to scandal or say anything about anybody. What I do hope is that a proper office will be set up. These fifty-six people whom you are employing are absolutely necessary. As regards all those soldiers whom you were going to have, that was a wicked, wilful waste of money. All those people whom you are paying for now to put in embassies will be going. We made it clear at the Conference that we want somebody to represent the people whom we have there. Every other Barbadian is an ambassador. I was surprised the other day to go through the Bronx and meet an old lady whom I knew and she told me that her son is District Attorney in the Bronx. There is no necessity for spending all this money. I hope this will be the last year in which we will have to spend in this way this sum which we have under the item Mandatory Levy. The Office which we have in England should not cost us anything more than \$300,000 odd. The present building which we bought for \$72,000 we would have to sell and buy another building in the area where the people are living.

Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution with the reservation that I hope this would be the last time this amount would be coming to this House.

Another thing which the people of Barbados must know is that Barbados is the biggest of the Eight and we have the biggest population. We also have the largest revenue; therefore, we are going to have to pay the most money to the Federation. Of course, we are going to get the most seats. We do not mind doing that, provided always that the British Government realises that in the Government's Manifesto, there is provision for free education; therefore, there is no question of putting aside a Reserve Fund. If any member of this House of Assembly or any Assembly in these parts agrees to it, he is nothing but an enemy to the people. We just cannot afford to do it. I cannot understand the effects of the European Common Market to the extent which the Hon. Premier understands it, but I do understand something about dollars and cents and it looks to me that certain people - and I am thinking of Trinidad and Jamaica - have got everything they want without firing a shot.

10.00 p.m.

It looks so to me. It must be brought home to us that those persons who are learned in economics should offer to come down to the people and explain. There is as much difference between economics and the classics as there is between one flying an aeroplane and one driving a donkey cart. There is a difference between the practical side and the theoretical side. However, this matter will have to be discussed. As Leader of the Opposition, I will not oppose just for the sake of opposing, but I am hoping that the British Government will not shirk its responsibility. You have people offering criticism when you ask for £200 million: but when you think in terms of the development of the West Indies and the poverty of the West Indies, that is not a lot of money. We hope these people will see the wisdom of coming to the West Indies and developing the area. But what is it going to cost the average Barbadian? Can we afford to pay more than we are paying? Our Income tax, our Trade tax, our house tax, our land tax and the tax on the clothes which

we wear are all very high, and therefore can we afford to pay more? On the other hand, we see that it is the desire of the British Government that we should federate. We are glad that the Premier is in a position to borrow money from England and from the United States of America; and when you hear the statement that persons are like Castro, that is a wicked, worthless and unwanted statement by a man who rose to the position when he did not realise that he should have resigned at the present time and not fallen at the present time.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad if we could spend this money on the roads in St. Andrew. With this amount of money which we have to pay out, I am quite sure that my people would praise God Almighty if this amount of money could be spent on those roads down there. Dealing with the old Federation, I would say that it profited us nothing at all. We were only throwing away money because I am certain that we cannot see anything for the amount of money which we have been contributing to that Federation. Mr. Chairman, I must say that the old Federation never had in it anything in the way of unity; it was not built on any principle at all. If the old Federation had any unity it would have existed, but they did not know the meaning of Federation. Federation means that we should grow and unite and bear one another's burdens. As far as Trinidad is concerned, they felt that they were the true vine and that we were the branches; because they have two hundred million and we have only twenty-five million. They felt that we would be nursing from them and so they left us off in the steep of the hill. I want them to realise that these eight little territories will bind themselves together in unity; I want the Trinidadians and Jamaicans to realise that we are the branches, but God Almighty is the vine and we are nursing from him and not from them. We hope to survive without their contributing to us.

Some time ago I was in my land and I heard the sound of a motor car horn. When I came out I saw Mr. "Josh" Haynes, Mrs. Daysh and Mr. Jack Dear in a big motor car which was as long as this House. (Laughter)

Mr. Haynes said that the lion was coming; I replied that I was not devouring anybody. They said that they came to talk to me about Federation. I told them that I did not hear anything about Federation and they said; "We are going around in order to see if the people would vote for us." I asked: "Will Federation carry a national grievance throughout these territories?" Mr. Dear who was reading a paper threw it down. They said that if you will send people into the Federation, it will carry a national grievance because it will look after the welfare of the territories. I said that that would be a nice thing and I will give them my vote if you tell me that. However, as soon as the Federation started, Trinidad and Jamaica said that they were coming out and they had us in a position where we did not know where we are. I could not find out what was the reason for the Federation; the money was being voted for the Federation, but after four years they would not provide anything for the Federation.

We have been taking the money for the Federation; our poor people have worked and they sent the money to Trinidad to give it to people who were eating and drinking the very best, running up to England every now and then and having cool baths. While we were trying to get the pennies to send to them, they ate and drank until they came to their end.

10.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, if the eight units of the Federation are willing to join together, I bid them God speed, because I am certain that if they come together, they will show Trinidad and Jamaica and all the world that the eight units meant to federate. They will also show to the world that we can be united and cause England, America, Canada, Australia and other big countries to look upon us more, and I believe they will contribute to us more than they did in the past. United we stand and divided we fall. If we do not have unity, we might as well stay as we are. I will tell the Premier that if he is going to spend money as it was spent in the last four years, it would be better for us to work out our own welfare,

and eat, drink and praise God, because we would then not have to work so hard for money to give away. You should remember the ex-Prime Minister; he tried his best, but his best has come to nought. He fooled as many as he could, but how long can he continue? Soon and very soon he will have to sit down and rest, though he said he is coming back with a different Resolution. He has been to the height and is coming back to the bottom to fight again. I have never seen a Crown Sergeant come back to the rank of a Private; and if he is coming back to that state, he is coming back to death, because it would be impossible for anyone like Sir Grantley to come back to fight with this modern generation which does not want to hear or see him or his colleagues, because they are deceivers and liars.

Mr. Chairman, what profit has the money which we sent from Barbados to Trinidad been to us? What have you got out of it? Yet here is another Resolution for more money, though the Federation is dead. Is this money to bury Sir Grantley? I am certain that some undertaker would be glad to bury him free of charge. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that we have to vote this money today. I would like to know who is going to pay Sir Grantley Adams the \$800 a month pension if the Federation does not come back into power. I hope the English Government is going to pay him that money; he is not going to get a cent from Barbados, because he has worked sufficiently and has got sufficient that he can live happily. He never gambled or went around drinking, as far as I know; so he should have money on which to live. There are a lot of his colleagues, ex-Ministers included, who have lost their latitude and are butting about from side to side. They will never be reinstated as long as they live, because they failed to perform their duties. They oppressed the poor and made themselves rich and fat, while the poor people are starving and naked. Do you think the people of Barbados have borne a little? If we did not have a good climate and the mercy of God, there would be no one living today. They spent over \$30 million on the Deep Water Harbour, thousands of dollars on the Ministerial Buildings and on the Airport, and now we have to look for \$8 1/2 million for the Hospital which is not yet completed.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this discussion came up tonight, because I think it is the Premier's duty along with the other Ministers to preach to the people so that in everything we do they will have confidence in us; and whenever the Premier leaves and returns to this country, we will be willing to accept what he has done and not feel dissatisfied like Grenada, St. Lucia and the others who are still grumbling. They do not have any confidence in their Ministers. When we send our Ministers abroad and they bring back a good report, we should try to live to the standard set, and not grumble and talk about self-government for these little territories. Those are gymnastics being played by people who have no confidence in their Ministers. We should accept the report which our delegation has brought back, because we believe we sent honest and truthful men to look after our welfare. We hope that we will have help from the other countries when they see our willingness, and I hope that they will grant to us the things we need so that The Eight can survive under the power of Almighty God, because I am sure that with His help we will survive.

10.20 p.m.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$650,271 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

STATEMENT BY HON. G. G. FERGUSON re DIFFICULTY OF BARBADIAN EMIGRANTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What about this Resolution?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Michael gave notice of this Resolution earlier today:-

WHEREAS by virtue of the Commonwealth Immigration Act, 1962, of the United Kingdom, entry in the U.K. will become increasingly difficult for Barbadian emigrants as from 1st July, 1962;

AND WHEREAS there are almost 400 would-be emigrants with issued passports who are willing to bear the ban but are without means of transportation to cause them to arrive in the United Kingdom before the said 1st July, 1962;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call upon the Government to provide such means of transportation as may be necessary, by charter or otherwise, for the said would-be emigrants without delay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, for information of the hon. senior member for St. Michael.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is very unusual procedure. The hon. senior member for St. Michael gave notice of a Resolution earlier today and he signified his intention to deal with it after Government Business was over.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Government Business is not over.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I was saying, Sir, is that this is a very unusual procedure to deal with this matter. If it were a question of the Hon. Minister just making a Statement, it would be quite in order; but it is not going to take fifteen minutes to deal with this Resolution. You should let the hon. senior member for St. Michael introduce it.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I am merely making a Statement for the information of the hon. senior member for St. Michael. After his hearing that I have been making preparation for the transportation of these emigrants who are finding difficulty to get to London before the end of this month. I do not think it would be necessary for him to move the Resolution.

I want to state that Government is making preparations to relieve the situation so that these emigrants would be able to beat the ban.

Mr. SEALEY: Sir, I talked with a few of these emigrants. I am not trying to criticise anybody, but it was brought to my attention the difficulties experienced by large numbers of prospective emigrants who are trying to get to England before the 1st July next.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Anything which I am saying will not prevent the hon. member from dealing with what he has in mind after Government Business is finished. I rise only to say that Government Business is not finished and Mr. Deputy Speaker has already called Order No. 2 which the Hon. Premier is about to proceed with.

It was only because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated to us by way of question, "What about this Resolution?" that the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism got up to make a Statement to enlighten the hon. senior member for St. Michael. We do not want to sidetrack him or prevent him from exercising his privilege. He may do that, if he still wishes, when Government Business is completed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The members of my Party will be always playing the parliamentary game and you should be always above board. The hon. senior member for St. Michael gave notice of this Resolution. He is a member of this House. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy is the Acting Leader of this House. I asked: "What about this Resolu-

tion?" I am aware that Government will be as interested in this as the hon. senior member for St. Michael. But, after all, he represents St. Michael; he is not a Minister; and if things are brought to him, give him an opportunity to express his views.

We are conscious that you are as eager as we are to help these people to get away. If he gave notice of this Resolution, it is only fair to let him have his say. Let him move his Resolution and then get up and say: "We are very conscious of this and we are doing everything possible to help these people." The matter will be finished and the hon. senior member for St. Michael will get what he wants, that is, that the people in the parish of St. Michael will see that he is doing something for them. That is how I see it.

I asked the Hon. Minister whether or not Government Business was over. If Government Business was over, then it is only for us to pass this Resolution. It is no row; it is no censure of the Government. Do not get yourself in the same tricks which we have had to accuse the previous Government of doing. I was about to telephone the Hon. Minister of Communications about this matter. I am an old member; therefore, I can telephone the Hon. Minister and get anything done. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is in his first year as a member of this Assembly and he must show that he is doing something. Let us be fair and play the same of politics fairly. This is no criticism of the Government and I counsel Your Honour that it is only fair to let the hon. senior member for St. Michael proceed with his Resolution.

10.30 p.m.

With an hon. member who has just come into the House, he has got to do something for everybody to see. I am submitting that it is only fair to the hon. member that the Hon. Leader of the House should allow him to make his speech on a matter of this sort.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should just like to get this matter clear. The next item on the Order Paper is item No. 2 standing in my name to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Highways Act; and as far as I know, no hon. member has asked leave for Private Members' Business to be dealt with before the conclusion of Government Business. I rose and then I sat back down in my chair because the hon. member asked "What about this", holding the Resolution in his hand. I asked the Minister of Communications what the position is. If the hon. senior member for St. Michael is prepared to wait until the consideration of Government Business has been concluded, he may then deal with his matter under Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I did not hear any Order being called. I waved this Resolution to the Hon. Deputy Leader of the House and asked "What about this". I really thought that the consideration of Government Business had come to an end; otherwise I would never have intervened. I heard of this matter and I am in a position to say, because I have done it in this House, that a new member of this House has got to show that he is doing something on behalf of the people. However, Sir, we are quite prepared to wait until Government's Business is finished.

HIGHWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Highways Act, 1900 and certain other enactments relating to the period of notice required to be given to road authorities by the Public Utilities before opening up public roads.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I am saying that hon. members will remember that at the time of the introduction of the Estimates for the period 1962-63, I drew to the attention of hon. members certain modifications, if I may call them so, I had made in the presentation of the Estimates, and one was in connection with the self-balancing items like Customs, Drawbacks, Refunds and money for the purpose of reinstating roads after they had been dug up by the Public

Utility Companies. Under Section 58 of the Highways Act, 1900, the Public Utility Companies are given the right to dig up the highways, provided that they pay for the damage done by so doing to the Highways Department. This is a very simple Bill. We have asked the Public Utility Companies which unfortunately are not at all. (*Asides*).....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing about four voices whereas one hon. member is on his feet.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we could ask the Public Utility bodies which, unfortunately, are not under Government control - the Public Utility Companies in Barbados are holding the banner high of 19th century tenets. We believe that Public Utility Companies should not be allowed to hold the community up to ransom. I do not think that we have anything of which to be proud that when a utility company was on the market or was supposed to be on the market, a few greedy people should have been allowed to hold the public up to ransom and make something like one-third of a million dollars in profit. I mean that privately owned public utility companies are allowed to dig up the road and hold people up to ransom. We are now saying that you have the authority to carry out your undertaking under the Act, but if you want to dig up the streets you must pay the money before you dig them up.

I want to say that any money we borrow from overseas or from local sources from the same group of people who are interested in these Public Utility companies like the Telephone Company, we have to pay these people interest on any such money which we borrow. If they have carried out a programme of installation when they dig up the streets of Bridgetown or any other part of the island, then it is only right and fair that they should pay the money into the Treasury in advance after an estimate has been submitted to them by the Director of Highways and Transport as to the cost of reinstating the highway. This is nothing which we are springing on Public Utility companies; this is something which I indicated to hon. members some three months ago. In moving these self-balancing items out of the Estimates, we are introducing this Bill in order to make it abundantly clear that the Director of Highways and Transport would have the legal authority to make the Public Utility companies pay the money into the Treasury before we give them permission to dig up the road. With those remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the principle of this Bill is all right. I think that the hon. member will agree with me that this is nothing new. In Canada or in the United States there is a question of privately owned Public Utility companies. All it means is that a private company can be supported by public funds.
10.40 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I see nothing wrong with the Bill. This deals with the Waterworks, the Gas Company and the Telephone Company, but it does not deal with the Electric Company. As you know, the Act at present says that any person digging up the road must pay into the Department of Highways the money for repairing the road before they actually can do the work.

Now a large majority of persons who apply for water in this country are among the small people who according to this must pay all the money to the Waterworks before they get the service, because the Waterworks Department is going to say that they have to pay over every cent to Government. The Government has a regulation whereby a person who applied for water is allowed to pay down one-third of the amount. If the water must cross the road, then they have to pay all the money, and I would like the Premier to tell us how this applied. In this case, you are saying that the Waterworks Department must pay all the money before they can dig up the road. As I understood it before, when the Telephone Company dug up the road, they in turn got the Highways and Transport Department to repair it and the money was paid to them. I do not know what will be the position of the vast majority of small people who cross the road

to get water. Will they have to pay all the money or will you make allowances for them? I would like to hear what the Government has to say on that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: As far as I know, I have heard certain complaints within the past week about the Waterworks Department; so judging from that, I gather that the Waterworks Department insisted that you pay in the cost for reinstating the road before the service is actually installed even before this Bill was introduced. The grumbling which I have heard is to the effect that people who had paid in a long time ago, and who have not had their services installed yet, are receiving an additional bill from the Waterworks, because of the rise in wages since the Jacobs recommendations have been implemented. Judging entirely from the state of affairs which has been drawn to my attention about the additional cost before they actually have the service put in - people may have paid in money five or six months ago and have not got the services yet, and I understand that the Waterworks have asked for a 25% increase or something to that order, I am not quite sure about the amount - people are a bit dissatisfied about this, not understanding that the increased cost is due to the increase in wages since December, 1961.

Mr. Chairman, I really do not know what the situation at the Waterworks is, but I gathered that is what it is. I am sure the Minister will be glad to find out from the Waterworks Department and give the information to the hon. member. I would like to remind the hon. member that this is the second reading of the Bill and he is entitled to speak once. He may however speak again in Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I am only making a suggestion. As far as I am concerned, the principle of the Bill is all right, but I will wait until the Bill goes to Committee.

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

Clause 1 was called. It reads as follows:-

1. This Act may be cited as the Highways (Amendment) Act, 1962.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, while I agree with the principle of the Bill, I have this suggestion to make. The Hon. Premier said that the Minister would be able to answer my question. I am quite serious about this, and I am making this point for the benefit of the Hon. Minister in charge. I agree with the principle of the Bill, but what I am drawing to the hon. member's notice is that there is a Regulation which gives people the right to pay money to the Waterworks Department on terms. When the Premier said that people have been getting bills since they have put in water, that is something I have heard. The point I am making which can also be made in Clause 2 is that while we agree with the principle, we should be in a position to know whether you are creating such a hardship on persons by having them pay all the money. If business people have to pass money on first, they are not going to take it like this. If you are paying 8% on \$10,000 you are not going to pass it on first and then ask them to pay you. You have said that if a person is putting in water, you will allow him to pay a certain amount and pay the balance on terms over a period of years, and that is why I am saying that I agree with the principle of the Bill, and suggest that it should be postponed until you can satisfy yourself that that provision is there for you.

The question that Clause 1 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 2 was called. It reads as follows:-

2. Section fifty-eight of the Highways Act, 1900 is hereby amended as follows -

- (a) by renumbering the section as subsection (1);
- (b) by adding the following subsections as subsections (2) and (3) of the section -

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1) of this section or of any other enactment to the contrary every person shall -

- (a) before opening up the surface, causeways or footpaths of any road or part thereof which he has authority to open up; and
- (b) on the demand of the road authority under whose control or management the road or part thereof is,

deposit in the Public Treasury, or in the case of a road under the control or management of a Council established under the Local Government Act, 1958, with the Treasurer of such Council, a sum estimated by the road authority as the cost or repairing, renewing or restoring the road.

(3) Where the sum deposited by any person pursuant to subsection (2) of this section is less than the expenses actually incurred by a road authority in repairing, renewing or restoring a road, then nothing contained in this section shall be construed as preventing a road authority from recovering from any person the difference between the amount deposited by such person pursuant to subsection (2) of this section and the expenses actually incurred by the road authority in repairing, renewing or restoring the road."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Clause 2 of this Bill amends Section 58 of the Highways Act, 1900 by adding this subsection as subsection 2:-

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1) of this section or of any other enactment to the contrary every person shall -

- (a) before opening up the surface, causeways or footpaths of any road or part thereof which he has authority to open up; and
- (b) on the demand of the road authority under whose control or management the road or part thereof is,

deposit in the Public Treasury, or in the case of a road under the control or management of a Council established under the Local Government Act, 1958, with the Treasurer of such Council, a sum estimated by the road authority as the cost of repairing, renewing or restoring the road.

Now, what the hon. member said has nothing really to do with what arrangement the Waterworks Department will make with the consumer, because it is the Waterworks Department which will have to pay in the money, and then they can make their own arrangement as to payment with the individual consumer. It is the undertaker, the person who is in control of the Public Utility who has to pay in the money, not the person who is getting the service. That is a different thing altogether. Under the present Bill, the Waterworks Department will be able when any negotiations like that takes place to make such arrangements. It does not preclude such an arrangement between the Waterworks Department and the consumer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All that I am drawing to your attention is that the Waterworks Department itself is not going to pay in any money into the Treasury if Mrs. X from Rock Gap

wants to turn water in her premises. This applies to the Gas Company for that matter, because they are doing business like this every day.

May I ask this question: "Where is the Waterworks going to get this money to pay in?" You yourself have got the Regulations. I am really trying to show you something which is in your own interest. Suppose you are going to put water in Free Hill, Black Rock, and the water main was on the other side of the street, it would cost under the old system \$65 or something like that. The actual cutting of the track costs \$55; so you will see that if this comes to \$120 you will be asked to pay in \$55 for cutting the track and the balance by the time they put in the service. I am suggesting that it will effect a hardship on the people and I am asking that this section be postponed so that you can get these people together and see whether you can prevent this hardship. The Waterworks Department is not going to pay in money for somebody who is going to put in water. I cannot see how you can have this section worded as it is. I do not think it is correct as it stands here. The Hon. Premier thinks that I should see it in his way, but I want him to see it in my way.

Mr. BOXILL: Sir, for the benefit of the hon. senior member for the City, I just want to say that I said this same thing to the Government Department a little while ago. In former years anybody who wanted to instal water paid 30 cents per square foot for digging up the highway, but that price has jumped to \$1.50 per square foot. The Hon. Premier said, those people who put in applications for the installation of water, say, six or seven months ago and did not get it and who were notified recently that they are eligible, they can get that service if they agree to pay the remainder of the charge. The installation of a service which formerly cost \$50 or \$60 has jumped now in the vicinity of \$87 and \$90. Those people who put in their applications ever since can only get the water service now, provided they pay the extra \$30 or \$40. Therefore, as the hon. senior member for the City has pointed out, it really has created a burden on the consumer, whether the Waterworks Department is paying the money into the Treasury first or not, I do agree with what the hon. senior member for the City has said.

Mr. CORBIN: What I want to say is this. A man brought a bill to me from the Waterworks Department which showed that he formerly agreed to pay a certain amount of money to the Department for installing a domestic water service for him and now he has been sent another bill asking him to come in and pay more money before they instal the service. I thought that, after a man had entered into agreement for some time to pay a certain amount of money towards something, the Waterworks Department would not send a bill asking that person to pay an extra cost before they had installed the service. But that is the trouble today. After applicants have been asked to pay a certain amount of money for installation of the service, then they are tendered another bill to pay an extra amount before they can have the service installed. I thought that the Waterworks Department was under the old system that whatever agreement was made previously, the applicant would pay that cost and then pay the balance in instalments.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, while I am in agreement with the hon. senior member for the City, I would go a little further. The Director will have to survey again these places to let the undertaker know what money he would have to pay. That will also take time because if the Director does not have the staff to do the necessary work, he is not going to leave his other job to send right away to measure up to find out what would be the additional cost, and the person would have to be awaiting the Director until he sends someone to measure the premises. As I have said, that will also take up time and keep back the installation of the service.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, if you look at the Objects and Reasons, you will see that the burden is put on any Public Utility authority. This particular subsection is drafted as follows:-

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1) of this section or of any other enactment to the contrary, every person shall —

(a)

(b)

deposit in the Public Treasury, ... a sum estimated by the road authority as the cost of repairing, renewing or restoring the road."

The Hon. Premier may not have been here when this was drafted. If you are right, you are right. If you are wrong, you are wrong. All I am saying is that this is bound up with your own regulations. They are going to make everybody pay money beforehand by this.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is not so, because every person does not have the right of obtaining the authority of digging up the highway. Only certain authorities undertake to dig up the highway, like the Barbados Light and Power Company, the Gas Company or the Waterworks Department. Only those people are authorised to dig up the highway.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. That is not so. Any person can apply to the Highways Board for the purpose of digging up the highway.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is not a point of order. As far as we are concerned, only certain authorities can dig up the highway.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I repeat that is not so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member cannot tell me that is not so. This matter has been carefully considered and only persons having the authority can come along and dig the highway up. The hon. senior member for the City is concerned primarily with people who are getting installation for the purpose of paying water rates. 11.00 p.m.

If the hon. member were to look at Section 58 of the Highways Act, 1900, which is one of the last sections in the Act, he will find that this is what it says:—

"If the surface or the causeways and footpaths of any road or any part thereof shall be opened up by any person having authority to do so, for the laying of pipes for oil, water, gas, or electricity, or railroads, tramways, telegraphs or telephones, or for the making of tunnels, or for any other purpose whatever, the road authority under whose control or management the same may be, if they are of opinion that it is desirable to repair, renew and restore such road or footpath or causeway so opened up, may repair, renew and restore the same and recover the expenses incurred in so doing from the person opening up the same."

As Section 58 of the Act was worded, the repairs came before the recovery of the expenses. The Act says before the opening up of the surface or the causeways or footpaths of any road or part thereof etc., but the person has authority to open up the road and, on the demand of the road authority under whose control or management or part thereof is, he shall deposit in the Public Treasury, or in the case of a road under the control or management of a Council established under the Local Government Act, 1958, with the Treasurer of such Council a sum estimated by the road authority as the cost of repairing, renewing or restoring the road. The person has to pay that money into the Public Treasury or to the Treasurer of the Council. It would be a matter of policy for the Minister of Communications and Works himself to direct the Director of Highways and Transport that you do not demand more than one-third of this money. He is, however, protected by Section 2 of the Bill which allows the collection of the balance of the money after the repairs have been done.

I am not making or I cannot make any pronouncement; I am not accusing anybody of anything, I am only saying what the policy was. This is not an injunction on the Director of

Highways and Transport to demand money; it gives him the authority to demand the money if he feels like doing so. We were directing our attention to the Barbados Light and Power Company and the Barbados Telephone Company. We do not intend to interfere with the present policy of the Waterworks Department, but I am pointing out what I said was that the Highways Department need not demand the money you pay them at all; but if it is demanded, it must be paid before permission is given to break up the road. If the Director decides (*ASIDES*) I wish that the hon. member would not interrupt me. The Act does not say that the Director must demand the money, but that the person who is digging up the road must pay it on demand. The Act does not impose any absolute duty on the Director to demand money at all. If a Minister is controlling two departments, he can get the Head of the Waterworks Department, for instance, to go to the Head of the Department of Highways and Transport; but the Act does empower the Director of Highways and Transport to get the money from the Public Utilities for the work which they have done. But we feel that this may prevent these protracted operations from going on.

I just want to tell the hon. member that we do not impose any absolute duty on the Director of Highways and Transport to demand this money; but if he demands it it will have to be paid. We expect him to carry out what is a matter of policy and that policy is the policy of the Minister of Communications and Works.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Is the hon. member saying that the Minister can break the law? What the hon. member has said is that the law is enacted and the Minister can break it. I have listened very carefully to the Minister and if he feels that I am wrong, then he must convince me that he is right. You have a road in common which becomes a public road and a main is laid for the purpose of development; but the Waterworks Department decides that whenever that main is run for development anybody can tap that main. You can carry out your own work, but they must come along and tap the main. You can cut the road yourself; you have the authority to dig up the road; but you cannot tap the water.

In my opinion, the hon. member has interpreted this matter wrongly. This amendment says this:—

"Every person shall

- (a) before opening up the surface, causeways or footpaths of any road or part thereof which he has authority to open up; and
- (b) on the demand of the road authority under whose control or management the road or part thereof is, deposit in the Public Treasury, or in the case of a road under the control or management of a Council established under the Local Government Act, 1958, with the Treasurer of such Council, a sum estimated by the road authority as the cost of repairing, renewing or restoring the road.

The authority to tap the main comes from the Waterworks Department. I do not know that you should pass this Bill as it is now. The Bill refers to the existing authority and it tells you who is the existing authority. 11.10 p.m.

It tells you here who is the existing authority. The Highways and Transport Department has the power.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are talking about a private road.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When is a road in common a public road? All the roads in New Orleans and Carrington Village were private roads, but as soon as Government took them over, they became public roads; and therefore when you make application to cut the road, you can do so without interfering with the main, but then you have got to pay down the cost of repairing that road. It is stated here quite clearly "a sum estimated by the road authority", not part of it. If I knew that the Hon. Chairman applied for a pipe, the estimated cost for installing which was \$25, and the Act says that the authority shall call upon him to pay the estimated

amount, and the Minister comes in and says he should pay down \$5, I could get up and ask what the Minister is practising. That would be partiality, because the law says you must pay in the estimated amount and not \$5 or \$10.

Mr. Chairman, as this stands, the Government can say that you can pay in \$5 or \$10. You have the Electric Company, the Gas Company and the Telephone Company, and you yourself run the Waterworks Department; so it is not necessary to put in a person here, because I maintain that the Government has authority in the case of the Waterworks Department to say that a person can pay one-third of the amount. Suppose in one of the areas to be developed according to the Town and Country Planning Officer the estimated cost is \$10,000! I have paid an estimated cost of \$6,000 for laying mains already. As a matter of fact, the Waterworks Department makes an estimate and you have to pay in the money. When it comes to land for development and selling, if the money is less, they give you back because the Executive has the right to say what you should pay in. If you cut out "every person" for "any public utility", that would cover the whole situation, because I do not want to see any hardship worked on people. The Minister may never have heard that ordinary persons like carpenters and masons get permission from the Highways authority to cut a track in the road themselves when they come in on evenings and lay the galvanised pipe; but the Waterworks Department has to instal the water. There are pipes and mains running through Licorish Village which has become a public highway, and these people who have made application from time to time are allowed to do that. According to this, they will have to pay the whole estimated cost to the Waterworks who will estimate the cost of doing the road, because they are going to get it from the Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for the Government to accept an amendment, but I maintain that Section should read "not withstanding the provisions of sub-section (1) of this Section or any other enactment to the contrary every public utility company shall -"; that is how I feel it should read; but if the Government feels it should be passed this way, that is a matter for them. I am giving the benefit of my experience along this line, and I would suggest to the hon. member if he does not see it my way, to postpone it and ask the Director of Highways and Transport or Mr. Parfitt at the Waterworks Department if what I am saying is true.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should like to inform the hon. member that I have no intention of asking the Director of any Government Department for a legal opinion on the interpretation of statutes. I challenged one or two things which the hon. member has said tonight, because if it is happening it is a very alarming state of affairs that anybody can go and dig across a highway. Both the Highways Act and the amendments to it state that before any person digs up a highway, the Telephone Company, the Waterworks Department and the Electric Company have got to be consulted, and all of them send in their maps to show where their lines are. This proposition being now advanced that a carpenter can go home on a Saturday evening and dig up half a highway because he is not supposed to have a lot of money is a very alarming state of affairs to me, because I have never come across it with my limited experience, and I have had some dealings with this kind of thing, having had cases in Court for the non-repair of roads. They have to submit their plans to each other; therefore no carpenter can go on a Saturday afternoon and say he is digging across the road and leaving a little piece for the Waterworks Department to do.

When it comes to referring the matter to Mr. Parfitt or anybody else, I am telling the hon. member that my personal opinion on the question of interpretation is that the Act does not impose any duty on the Director of Highways and Transport to collect this money at all. As a matter of fact, if you go right through the Act and look at the objects and Reasons, and if you look at the amendment itself, you will see that it is not mandatory that he must demand money at all; so he need not even ask the Waterworks Department to deposit any part of the money, and if the Waterworks Department want to collect one-third from the consumer, it is a matter for them. I say it is a question of policy for the

Minister. I do not care how you suborn the Heads of Departments to say I am wrong, I challenge any member to put me in Court and prove I am wrong. All you have to do is to take out a writ of prohibition or mandamus, and that is the end of the matter. As a matter of fact, no Director of Highways and Transport can come and tell anybody in this Government how to interpret a statute. If a member of the public feels aggrieved by our interpretation, all he has to do is to take us to court and prove we are wrong.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Thank you very much for telling me that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think the hon. member really understands what I am driving at at all. I am not saying that the Minister is going to say not to collect the money when the law says that you must. The hon. member is a member of a Local Government authority, and if he looks at the Objects and Reasons of this Bill, he will see that "to give effect to this change, therefore, this Bill seeks to amend the Highways Act, 1900, and to make certain consequential amendments in the enactments specified in the Schedule. However, since some public roads are under the control and management of Local Government Councils, the amendment to the Highways Act, 1900, has been so worded as to enable a Council, if it so desires, to adopt the new system referred to in paragraph 2 above." So there is no separate Clause dealing with Local Government Councils. 11.20 p.m.

The whole spirit of this amendment has been permissive and not mandatory, but as a matter of policy we will be insisting that the private companies would be paying in their money beforehand. That would be an arrangement with the Minister. I am not going to ask any Head of any Department for legal opinion on a matter of this sort. As a matter of fact, the Crown Law Officers complain that we do not ask them for opinions. We do not go to the Head of a Department for any opinion. Let the shoemaker stick to his lathe.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you think what I am saying is not true, ask them. I am going to send you somebody whom I know you would ask. You know quite well the Garden Road in Christ Church where Mr. Freddie Clairmonte used to live. That is considered a public road. A house is being built on that road. The Cotton Factory is running a water main in that road and permission is sought from the highway authorities for the purpose of laying a water main to that house. That happens day after day. You have permission to run these water services. I am talking about roads in common, where tenantry roads have been taken over. I am bringing to your attention one road which you know quite well. The person makes application to the Highway Department for permission to cut across that road, but you cannot interfere with the water main. That is all I want to say. If you want to pass it so, pass it so. I am telling you what exists today. If you were to go into Welches, there is a water main and we paid \$5,000 to put in that main. We were allowed to run the main because it was felt that labour by the Waterworks Department was too expensive and we were allowed to do it under supervision of the Waterworks Department. Of course, you have to get permission from the highway authorities to cut the road. As I have said, if you want to pass it so, pass it so.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. F. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER No. 7

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I ask leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day, after which Government Business will come to an end.

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

RESOLUTION re COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT WILCOX

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works, Housing and Tourism: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, of the lands described in the Schedule situate at Wilcox in the parish of Christ Church in the Island of Barbados for the following public purpose, that is to say, for a road diversion leaving from Seawell Airport along Wilcox Road to Highways No. 7.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: The Resolution, Sir, reads as follows:-

RESOLVED that the House of Assembly approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, of the lands described in the Schedule hereto situate at Wilcox in the parish of Christ Church in the Island of Barbados for the following public purpose, that is to say, for a road diversion leading from Seawell Airport along Wilcox Road to Highway No. 7.

The Schedule is as follows:-

ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land (being part of the lands of the Estate of Lionel W. Beckles deceased) situate near Wilcox in the parish of Christ Church and Island aforesaid running from North 88° 33' East joined by a curve of 392 feet radius and a clockwise angle of 91° 11' containing by admeasurement 34,567 square feet or thereabouts abutting and bounding on lands of the Estate of Lionel W. Beckles on lands of Leotta Moseley to the North West and on a public road leading to Highway 7 or however else the same may abut and bound.

According to the Addendum; in accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, the approval of the Legislature is sought for the compulsory acquisition of the parcel of land described in the Schedule.

Difficulty has been found in negotiating for the acquisition of the above parcel of land due to the fact that the beneficiaries of the Will of the late owner are resident abroad and all the formalities attendant upon winding up the estate would create a great deal of delay.

I beg to move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that closes Government Business for the Day.

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

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

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

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to ask leave to deal with the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier today.

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

11.30 p.m.

Mr. SEALEY: Sir, this Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS by virtue of the Commonwealth Immigration Act, 1962, of the United Kingdom, entry in the U.K. will become increasingly difficult for Barbadian emigrants as from 1st July, 1962;

AND WHEREAS there are almost 400 would-be emigrants with issued passports who are willing to beat the ban but are without means of transportation to cause them to arrive in the United Kingdom before the said 1st July, 1962;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call upon the Government to provide such means of transportation as may be necessary, by charter or otherwise, for the said would-be emigrants without delay.

Sir, it has been drawn to my attention that there is difficulty being experienced by a large number of prospective emigrants who have already obtained their passports for the purpose of proceeding to the United Kingdom in search of employment, but owing to the non-availability either of sea transportation or air, they are unable to do so before the immigration ban becomes effective, (ASIDES).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am hearing several voices. I should not be hearing so many voices when only one hon. member is on his feet.

Mr. SEALEY: I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I am asking the Government whether they will take immediate steps to alleviate the undue pressure on, and the plight of, these people by calling upon the airlines to provide specially chartered planes to carry out the necessary air lift, or any other means of transportation. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that motion. In doing so, however, I would like to suggest an amendment in the second paragraph of the Resolution. That amendment is that the words "beat the ban" be deleted and the words "enter the United Kingdom before the abovementioned date" be substituted therefor.

Mr. SEALEY: I accept that amendment.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to say this: on Saturday, 9th June, 1962, a travel agent communicated with my Ministry and stated that his Company was exploring the possibility of chartering planes to take a number of prospective emigrants from here to England before the end of June in order to assist such persons in getting there before the restriction recently imposed by the British Government becomes effective. This particular travel agent is presently awaiting word from London as to whether or not charters will be available. The Government would be prepared to grant the necessary permission to operate any charter through Seawell provided that the planes to be used are satisfactory. The travel agent intimated that there were approximately 200 people whom he knew required passages. The Government is at present awaiting word from London and will do anything within its power to facilitate these people in getting to England.

Mr. SEALEY: I thank the Hon. Minister.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to say that in ordinary circumstances the hon. member would have to give notice of a question and he would not have to give notice of a Resolution. The necessary information has been provided by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, but as to the Resolution which calls on the Government to provide such means of transportation as may be necessary, I want to say that we do not have the means of transportation, neither do we consider it desirable to provide the means of transportation for people who have made up their minds to go to England.

The next thing is that all the Government could do is to undertake to give the aircraft the necessary landing permits when they are required. Perhaps the hon. member, having quite rightly brought this matter to the attention of the Government, will withdraw the Resolution because we have not got the means of providing this transportation. In any case, the reply which the Government has given will allay the fears which the hon. member might have had.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that the hon. member would be quite willing to withdraw the Resolution, but the Hon. Premier must realise that the new members of this House are not all blessed with the means of writing as it should be parliamentarily done. I do not think that the hon. member means that the Government should provide such transportation; the hon. member really means what the Hon. Minister of Communications has answered. There was some thought of travel agents not getting any permits so as to remove these people. I think that the hon. member is very grateful for the information which has been supplied by the Hon. Minister of Communications. We actually said to people who approached us in connection with this matter that we were absolutely certain that this Government would give the necessary permission for the use of chartered planes, which would be the better way of getting these people out in time so as to beat this ban. We were absolutely sure that this Government would be willing to give the necessary permits so long as the planes were airworthy because it would not be of any use for anybody to get some ramshackled plane and then these people would be in danger of losing their lives.

11.40 p.m.

I associate myself with the remarks of the hon. senior member for St. Michael and thank the Hon. Minister for his useful explanation, so that the public will now know that when they go to the agents and are told that they would be glad to get them to England, but cannot get permits, the truth is that the Government is willing and has been willing for some time to grant permits to airworthy planes to take these people to England.

I would suggest to the hon. member to withdraw the Resolution, as it is not now necessary to pass it in view of the explanation which the Minister has given. While I am on my feet, I would like to say that as Leader of the Opposition, I would like to see the junior members in this House given an opportunity to raise matters in the House, and I am going to press for it, because they must show to their constituents that they are mindful of their plight.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw the Resolution. I should also like to thank the Hon.

Minister for what he has said and hope he will do all he possibly can for these people.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Michael is asking leave to withdraw the Resolution, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I move the Adjournment, I would like to give notice of the following Resolution:-

'RESOLVED that this House approve the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962, held at Marlborough House, London, from 9th May to 24th May, 1962 and the proposals and recommendations contained therein.'

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is the intention of the Government to move the passing of this Resolution at the next Sitting of this House and to make arrangements for the broadcasting of the debate of this particular Resolution because of its special importance.

EXTENDED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Philip that his leave of absence be further extended for one month with effect from the 9th June.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education is asking for extension of leave of one month from 9th June on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Development, Trade, Industry and Labour, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 19th June, 1962, at 2.30 p.m.

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

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

11.47 p.m.