
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th June, 1962.

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

PRESENT

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

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.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Other Place returning a Bill further to amend the Local Government Service Commission Act, 1959 with amendments.

PAPERS LAID

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

Barbados Statistical Service Quarterly Digest of Statistics, No. 20, March, 1962.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution relating to the action taken by the United Kingdom Government in suspending the Constitution of Grenada.

It is my intention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to ask for leave to proceed with this Resolution in all its stages today.

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

A Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 and to extend its dura-

tion for a further period of one year from the 9th day of July, 1962.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 and to extend its duration for a further period of one year from the 9th day of July, 1962, be now read a first time.

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

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

2.40 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the first Order is called, I am making application under Standing Order No. 19 to draw to the attention of the Government a matter of extremely urgent public importance.

Before coming to this Chamber, I had to try my best to avert what I regard as an essential service being broken down in the form of complete stoppage in transport work, as a result of non-payment of wages agreed upon for persons in the Transport Board Service.

As hon. members are aware, I am leaving the Island on Thursday and it is my duty as General Secretary of the Trade Union of the Island to avert such national disaster. I feel sure that the Government will do its best to remedy the situation; therefore, before proceeding with the debate, I think I should let the Hon. Premier be aware of the situation before I make the formal application for leave to deal with this matter.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the hon. senior member for St. Peter proceeds with a motion to discuss a matter of public importance, I, as Minister of Finance in the Government, am aware of the urgency with respect to the arrears of back pay between the Transport Board and the Transport Board workers. I do not want to initiate discussion at this stage. However, as I will be out of the Island on what I would call business of national importance, I would just like to say that the matter was brought to my attention this morning and permission was given for the payment of the arrears.

I would like to assure hon. members that these transport workers should receive the arrears which are due to them within the next few days. I am sure with that assurance that the hon. member would reconsider whether he would maintain the motion which he was about to make.

Mr. WALCOTT: In view of the Hon. Premier's assurance, I would like to thank him very much and I am sure all persons concerned, including myself, would accept that assurance because we feel in due course that these workers

will receive this outstanding contribution which is due to them. I thank the Hon. Premier very much.

STANDING ORDERS Nos. 5, 16 and 18
SUSPENDED

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

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

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

RESOLUTION re ACTION TAKEN BY U.K.
GOVERNMENT ON SUSPENSION OF
GRENADA'S CONSTITUTION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution which was given notice of earlier today relating to the action taken by the United Kingdom Government in the suspension of Grenada's Constitution, be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was the intention of Government to deal with the White Paper issued shortly after the Marlborough Conference in London which was referred to as the "Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962", to make that the first Order of the Day, and to discuss the proposals contained in that White Paper which was released on the 6th June, 1962 in order that hon. members who had other business outside of the Colony — and that does not mean only Government Ministers, but Private Members as well — should be accommodated as early as possible. We had considered that the matter was of such pressing importance that it should be given a high priority on the legislative programme and on the Order Paper of this Honourable House. It was not the intention of the Government at no time to conclude debate on that Report at today's sitting.

It was felt that we should not end the discussion, but initiate discussion in this Chamber today and not to wait until any voluntary organisation may have dealt with this issue.

Notice of this Resolution was given by the Hon. Minister of Education last Tuesday, on the motion for the adjournment of the House of that day; but prior to that, publication has been made of every possible detail of the proposals contained in the White Paper in the local Press. It is a matter of opinion whether two weeks is a sufficiently long period for the nebulous machinery of public sentiment to be brought to bear on a matter of this kind.

It is still our intention to continue with the discussion on the Report of the East Caribbean Conference of 1962 after we have cleared Order No. 1.

An emergency meeting of the Cabinet of this Island was held this morning because during the past twenty-four hours there was released from London an Order-in-Council which indicated that the United Kingdom Government had decided as from today's date to suspend the constitution of the neighbouring territory of Grenada and to dissolve the Legislative and Executive Councils of that Island.

I am sure that hon. members would forgive me and other members of the Cabinet if as West Indians and if as persons who are looking forward to the eventual emancipation of the area from imperial rule under which we have suffered so long — and I make no apologies for stating unequivocally that I am anti-Imperialist; as a matter of fact, even the leaders of the Conservative Party in the United Kingdom are anti-Imperialists in their declaration when

we see the rapidity with which they are dissolving the British Empire.
2.50 p.m.

I therefore make no apology whatsoever to the members of the Opposition in this House, to the members of the public or to the United Kingdom Government if I reiterate what the general public already knows — that is, my stand in matters of this kind. I am not in favour of any form of Imperialism, whether it is British Imperialism, American Economic Imperialism or Russian Economic Imperialism. (*Hear! Hear!*). I am opposed to Imperialism in any form, shape or disguise, no matter from whatever quarter that Imperialism happens to emanate. The terms of the Resolution which the Cabinet has agreed upon read as follows:—

RESOLVED that this House strongly protests against the action taken under the authority of the West Indies Act, 1962, by the Government of the United Kingdom in suspending the Constitution of Grenada and in dissolving the Legislative and Executive Councils of that Island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the Resolution which we will be calling upon members of this House to support. I think, Sir, that you will forgive me if I give a little background history of the dissolution of the Executive and Legislative Councils of Grenada and the drastic action which the United Kingdom has elected to pursue. Sometime in 1961, subsequent to the London Conference of that year, the United Kingdom, in its wisdom — and I use that word in its very loosest sense — decided to permit the re-enfranchisement of a gentleman, who, at one time, enjoyed the confidence of the majority of the electorate of the island of Grenada and who had been disenfranchised by the electoral law of that colony and was still suffering under the disability of that disenfranchisement. Mr. Gairy, the Chief Minister of Grenada, attended the London Conference in 1961 as an adviser to the Government of Grenada, and it would appear to me that, with the connivance of the Colonial Office in London, the law under which Mr. Gairy was suffering this disability was abrogated and a new enabling Act passed in the Grenada Legislature so that Mr. Gairy, with whom the Colonial Office could have been in no agreement on any constitutional matter in view of the fact that it was the Colonial Office which had elected to banish Mr. Gairy to the neighbouring island of Carriacou some seven or eight years previously — it was with this collaboration and connivance that the electoral law was flouted and the Legislature was allowed to pass a Bill which enabled Mr. Gairy to take over the reins of Government in Grenada. That was taken by people in the outside world as an indication that the Colonial Office was, at that time, satisfied that Mr. Gairy had manifested his intention to behave like a responsible politician and statesman and that the Colonial Office had now become enamoured of Mr. Gairy's claim for leadership.

So said, so done, Mr. Deputy Speaker; and after the victory of Mr. Gairy's Party in the election campaign of that area, Mr. Gairy was duly chosen as the Leader of his Party and as the elected Leader of the people of Grenada. In that capacity he attended all of our Conferences on Federation and made some kind of contribution towards the conclusions at which we arrived at the London Conference held in May this year. Subsequent to the election of Mr. Gairy as the Leader of the Grenada Government, the people of Jamaica manifested an intention to turn their backs on the rest — I should say, on the Eastern Caribbean — and to pull out, as it were, of the Federation which was then in existence by a Referendum held in the last quarter of last year, sometime around the 11th and the 13th of September. We all know from recent history that the United Kingdom Government, after receiving a clear expression, not from the Government of Trinidad or from the people of Trinidad — and I offer this as no criticism at all, although criticism may be justified; I am merely making a statement of fact as to what took place — after receiving, as I say, an expression from the General Council of the People's National Movement which is the Party of the Government of Trinidad, a clear indication that, not one, but two members of the Federation of the West Indies were anxious to dissociate themselves from that most unfor-

tunate grouping, it was at that stage that the United Kingdom Government decided that the only thing which could be done in the circumstances was to break up the existing Federation in a manner which would leave no doubt as to its existence or non-existence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that it would be entirely keeping faith either with history or with the members of the public in Barbados if I did not disclose that there was no West Indian man or woman of goodwill who would be entirely in agreement with Mr. Gairy; but it is clear that there is no West Indian politician in the Windward Islands or Leeward Islands or Barbados with whom I happen to be associated at the time, who was in disagreement that steps should be taken to dissolve the existing Federation provided that they were legitimate steps.

3.00 p.m.

It was, moreover, the opinion of most people who had some kind of acquaintance with the constitutional aspects of the matter that as long as one member of the partnership withdrew from the partnership, the Association automatically ceased to exist. There was no provision in the Federal Constitution for a Referendum, neither was there any provision for secession of any territory, neither was there any provision for a declaration by any political Party in the area of their disinclination to continue with the association of the territories at any stage; and in view of the absence of such provisions, and in view of the fact that we have now considered that at this stage of the 20th Century we could not, as some ill-advised persons and sections of the Press wanted people to do, that is, enforce the territory of Trinidad and the territory of Jamaica to remain in an association reluctantly, in view of all these considerations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said — and I repeat — that not only were men and women of good-will, but also responsible politicians with whom I happened to be associated were in agreement with the dissolution of the existing Federation, and that is still our point of view.

The Federation as it then existed, moreover, had become associated and tainted with the suspicion that it was not working in the best interest of the West Indian people, particularly those people from the Windward and Leeward Islands and Barbados. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, amidst some kind of protest, but with firm resolve, the United Kingdom Government pressed through first in the House of Lords and later in the House of Commons a Bill which provided for the dissolution of the Federation, *inter alia*, a Bill which provided for the suspension of Unit constitutions, if necessary, and a Bill which was known at that time as the West Indies Bill, 1962, and later became the West Indies Act, 1962. Under Section 5 of this Act, an Order-in-Council was made in May, 1962 which dissolved the existing Federation. We in Barbados as members of the Government scrutinised the provisions of this Bill. Members of this Honourable House expressed fears that this Bill was capable of being employed as the thin edge of the wedge, which, driven right home, would divest Unit Legislatures of their constitutions and authoritative functions of presiding over their own destinies which they at that time happened to enjoy. It was because of these fears and because of our own suspicions that I decided on my own initiative, and after consultation with the members of my Cabinet, to address a telegram to the Secretary of State on the 21st March, 1962, the contents of which I have already disclosed to the members of the House, but which perhaps, it would not be inopportune to read at this stage.

This telegram, Mr. Deputy Speaker, reads as follows:—

"While it may be necessary to make provision for certain limited aspects of Government in individual Islands consequent on dissolution of existing Federation I strongly urge that to allay fears and dissipate suspicions you should give firm assurance — as result of my representations to you — that nothing will be done by Order-in-Council to render inferior or retrogressive the constitutional gains already achieved in Barbados, the Windward Islands or the Leeward Islands. As I am receiving almost daily protests from Chief Ministers of Leeward and Windward Islands it would be greatly appreciated if assurance could be given immediately."

No member of the House, therefore, could be in any doubt during the course of this debate as to what attitude I would adopt if an occasion such as the instant one arose. On the 26th March, some five days later, I received a Priority Telegram, also Confidential, addressed to me which read as follows:—

"No. 60 PRIORITY

Telegram No. 43

WEST INDIES BILL

Please pass following to Premier.

I can give you the assurance you are asking for in respect of Barbados. Indeed the Minister of State speaking on Clause 5 in Lords on March 7th said:—

"It is not the intention of H.M. Government to use any of the powers under this clause to derogate in any way from constitutional status those territories which are already enjoying full internal self government."

2. I cannot however give any such assurance in the case of the Windward & Leeward Islands. One of the effects of the Bill is to transfer responsibility for administration of grants-in-aid back to the United Kingdom. In the circumstances I must have the power ultimately to ensure that moneys voted by Parliament are properly spent especially in view of growing evidence in recent months of mismanagements in some quarters. I shall be seeking for an opportunity in Parliament this week to make this point plain."

You will notice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that was a Confidential Telegram addressed to me personally; but as I have said on frequent occasions, except where the security of the realm is threatened, I do not believe in Government by conspiracy; I believe in Government by consent. I do not believe that the affairs of the people should be conducted in a conspiratorial atmosphere, and I consider that by addressing a confidential, private telegram to me, the Secretary of State was not aware of my attitude on matters of this kind, and if he was aware, he was placing me in a rather invidious pattern, *vis-à-vis* my other colleagues from the Windward and Leeward Islands. Because of this, I could not make a disclosure to the House as I had already some weeks ago indicated, and I sent another telegram to the Secretary of State which reads as follows:—

3.10 p.m.

From GOVERNOR Addressed to SECRETARY OF STATE

Sent 12th April, 1962 (1600)

No. 56 PRIORITY

Your telegrams No. 60 West Indies Bill and No. 67 Conference of Eight.

Following from Premier begins.

Prior to receipt of your telegram I had promised the House of Assembly to make public your reply to my request for assurances regarding change of constitutional status of these Islands by Order-in-Council. This promise received newspaper publicity and I must now say what is your reply.

2. I am meeting Chief Ministers of Leewards and Windwards in Antigua on April 16th to discuss arrangements for providing Migrant Services in U.K. on dissolution of Migrant Services division of the West Indies Commission in London and also to discuss the general situation in regard to Federation of the Eight. Chief Ministers are becoming increasingly restive at the present uncertainties.

3. Grateful if you would send me by telegram repeated to Administrator Antigua a reply to be made public in Barbados as well as at the meeting of the Eight on April 16th."

I received the next day from the Secretary of State for the Colonies the immediate Telegram worded as follows:-

SECRETARY OF STATE

Sent 13th April, 1962 (1640) Addressed to GOVERNOR

Received 13th April, 1962 (1500)

No. 75 IMMEDIATE

2. On the question of the exercise of powers under the West Indies Act, 1962, I have no objection to your releasing reply given in my telegram 60. You can also draw attention to my comments on this matter in Hansard on March 26th column 855 to 856 and April 2nd Columns 146 and 147."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as soon as I received this reply from the Secretary of the State for the Colonies, I came into this House and I disclosed the full background and all the relevant information. I also managed to secure in a remarkably short time copies of Hansard for the relevant dates and I stated what the Secretary of State said in the House of Commons which was substantially in accordance with what he disclosed to me in his telegram, No. 60.

If I may be permitted just to sum up the attitude of the United Kingdom Government, it was that Clause 5 of the West Indian Act of 1962, which was then a Bill — it had not yet become law — and which had been initiated by debate in the House of Lords and then filtered down to the lower regions of the House of Commons, gave the United Kingdom Government power by Order-in-Council to dissolve the constitution of any Unit Legislature in the West Indies and to set up in substitution therefor some alternative form of Government which would be entirely at the discretion of the United Kingdom Government for as long a period as the United Kingdom Government in its discretion thought fit. It was also stated that these provisions were not meant to apply to the people of the Island of Barbados, but they could give no assurance that they did not intend to use them against the Windward or Leeward Islands.

The effect of the disclosure which I was permitted to make was to make the people of the Windward and Leeward Islands view Barbados with a certain amount of suspicion, and the Barbados delegates at subsequent meetings of the Chief Ministers and their delegates, whether in the West Indies or in London, had the greatest difficulty in impressing upon the people of the Windward and the Leewards and their representatives that the Barbadians were not, if I may be colloquial, sucking up to the Colonial Office, that the age of Uncle Tom in Barbados was over and that we were no imperialistic stooges who were prepared to sell the other Islands so that we could get some advantage for ourselves.

I think hon. members will bear me out that in reply to the Secretary of State for the Colonies at the London Conference, I had to remind him that it was not a question of not giving Barbados some special privilege, but that we were anxious to see that the constitutions of the other islands were brought up to the same constitutional advancement which we are now enjoying. We were accused by the same Mr. Gairy of sitting down and not saying anything because we had been promised something, and I asked Mr. Gairy what it was that the Secretary of State had to promise us which we did not have already. I asked that because in this colony we have only been inhibited for the past sixty years, not even for six months or fifteen years, by our own philosophy of accepting that certain things are not for us. Even now, we have people in Barbados who do not understand the politics of nationhood and who are pusillanimous of the advantages of independence. Perhaps the only Barbadian politician who in the last sixty years can claim that he has done something for the constitutional advancement of this colony is the late Deputy Speaker, Mr. A. E. S. Lewis, a former junior member for Bridgetown. He insisted at all times that Barbados had got to the stage

where we should be given Universal Suffrage. I still regard Universal Suffrage as the major and perhaps the only real constitutional advancement in Barbados in the twentieth century. The introduction of Ministerial status, the paying of salaries to Ministers and to members of the House, and such things, I do not regard as any substantial constitutional advancement because you should not have to ask anybody for those things. The Executive Committee Act of 1891, which I think is Chapter 22, is the real mainspring of the constitutional advancement of this Island, although I would like to disclose that I have not been an admirer of Sir Conrad Reeves who has been the author of that Act. However, we must recognise that this is the real instrument which puts control of the economy of this Island firmly into the hands of the elected representatives of the people of this Island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I very much appreciate that you have permitted me to digress somewhat from the original theme, but I was merely pointing out that the telegram of the Secretary of State sent to me as Premier of Barbados was one which I did not view with any joy at all, and I regarded it as another attempt, even although it may not have been done deliberately, to create the impression that there were two grades of citizens in the Eastern Caribbean; one, the citizens of Barbados, and the other, the citizens of the Windward and Leeward Islands. As I have said, with the assistance of the independent members of this Honourable House, like the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the hon. junior member for St. George who attended one of our conferences, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think we were able in some measure to dispel some of the fears which existed in the minds of the leaders of the Windward and Leeward Islands.

During the currency of our discussions, both here and in London, a Commission of Enquiry had been set up to enquire into certain allegations of mismanagement by the Government of Grenada in general, and by the Chief Minister in particular, at the instance of the Federal Government, and a Barbadian judge was appointed to preside over that enquiry. That enquiry made one or two false starts, but it eventually got off the ground; and while we were in the middle of the Conference in London, Mr. Gairy, the Chief Minister of Grenada, was greatly agitated throughout the proceedings, and he could hardly sit in his place because the Sword of Damocles was hanging over his head; and if at times he appeared to be slightly on edge, we very much were appreciative of the position in which he found himself and to which he could have somewhat contributed himself. 3.20 p.m.

I am not making any pronouncement or passing any judgment. When the Report was released, it more or less castigated the Ministers and the Chief Minister of Grenada for mismanagement of public funds and for attempting to intimidate members of the Public Service of that Island. The Commission made no recommendations whatsoever, neither was the evidence of the Commission published. Anyone who has any knowledge of the procedure of these Commissions of Enquiry or who has had a nodding acquaintance with the procedure in a Court of Law, anyone who has been aware of the publication of the reports of Commissions of Enquiry in the Island of Barbados would realise right away that that slender document, which was elevated to the plane of a Stationery Office publication, issued by authority of the United Kingdom Government — any such person would realise that that publication must have been a very much abridged version of the Report which must have been originally submitted to the United Kingdom Government by the Commission of Enquiry.

It was a remarkable document in that none of the evidence was published, and it made no real recommendation except that there should be a tightening up of the financial provisions relating to the Government of Grenada. When I was approached by members of the delegations, by members of the United Kingdom delegation as well as by other people in the United Kingdom as to what was going to happen when the Grenada Report was published, my answer was always the same. A Commission of Enquiry has no right indicting anyone; the purpose of such a Commission is to

bring in a forcible manner to public opinion any irregularities which may have been existing in the body politic. The next step was that, having elected not to proceed by way of indictment in a Court of law, you set up a Commission of Enquiry because you do not consider that the behaviour complained of merits such a drastic step as the prosecution of an individual or of two or three or four persons, but it is a matter which is sufficiently grave that the electors of the area should be acquainted with and get their information on an authoritative level. That is my personal view of the invoking of the machinery of a Commission of Enquiry. I think it would be very high-handed for any Government to short-circuit a legitimate prosecution of a person before the Courts of Law of the territory and save that person from incarceration or a fine or some kind of punishment which the law would demand, by setting up a Commission of Enquiry. A Commission of Enquiry cannot act as a preliminary Magistrate's investigation; you cannot set up a Commission of Enquiry and ask an Attorney General of an Island to take proceedings on the findings, when the Commission has already fully ventilated a case in the public arena of the territory itself and right through the stratosphere; the matter is disseminated by the Press and the radio, not only in the territory, but outside the territory as well. Therefore, it would be placing a prosecutor in a highly invidious position if after a Commission of Enquiry has gone into the matter, he is asked to prosecute the case; the minds of the jury would have been prejudiced already. I do not know of any instance - there may be some - where a Commission of Enquiry in the Island of Barbados has been followed by an indictment in the Courts of Law; that is why I say that one would only take the step of setting up a Commission of Enquiry if the matters complained of were of so nebulous a character or one did not consider them serious enough to make a public prosecution. One may allow public sentiment at election time to take control and decide who is wrong or who is right, or, on the other hand, whether the people elect a particular person to manage their affairs, whether he mismanages them or not. The Sovereignty of the electorate is such that the electorate sits down in Barbados and chooses people, even although it is manifest that those people are not acting in the interest of the masses who have put them there. We, in Barbados, have to suffer because of this built-in foundation in the democratic system of Government - the freedom of the people, whose representatives may pass a law to expropriate property or send people to a cross. Each and every one of us has paid that price by having Governments who were not interested in carrying out the wishes of the people.

The purpose of my illustrations and argument is to demonstrate that having elected to set up a Commission of Enquiry as to what was going on in Grenada, it is clear that the Commission of Enquiry has not got the power to indict anyone. It would be highly undesirable for a prosecution to take place when the intention is to bring matters to public notice. My idea is that the gentlemen who were appointed to sit on the Commission of Enquiry were members of integrity, who had sifted the evidence, and they were making it available so that public sentiment and public opinion would be brought to bear on any future occasion that these mismanagers may offer themselves to the people. I have spent some time explaining the background because I want my premises to be clear.

3.30 p.m.

Unless members of this House understand the premises from which I am arguing, they would not be able to understand the Resolution which is now before the House, and at this stage perhaps it would be advisable for me to state that this Resolution is in no way intended to condone or connive any mismanagement which may have taken place in the Island of Grenada. But all of us feel as Government Ministers, having met in Cabinet and considered this matter from the constitutional and every other point of views from which it should be considered, that this is a matter for the people of Grenada themselves. (*Hear, hear!*) It is not a matter for the Colonial Office or the people of Barbados whether they approve or disapprove. The ballot box is the place where this should be decided, and nothing should be done by anyone to try to influence the exercise by the voters of that territory of their democratic right to

elect whatever form of Government, whether it be a Communist Government, a Fascist Government, a democratic Government or any other form of Government that they want.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is neither the business of the United Kingdom, the people of Barbados, the people of America nor the people of the Soviet Union. It is a matter for the exercise by the people of Grenada of their democratic rights and privileges, and I want to get that clear, because if one does not understand that this Resolution does not in any way cast aspersions on the integrity of the members of the Commission - I am prepared to accept that everything that the Commission said has been proven by the standard which is demanded in a Court of Law for all criminal offences. It has been proven without reasonable doubt, because I do not imagine any of those gentlemen, knowing some of them in the way I know them, would accept any kind of third or fourth hand evidence that certain irregularities occurred in the matter of the finances in the colony of Grenada.

I am not a personal friend of the Chief Minister of Grenada, neither is he or anyone else my enemy, and I am prepared to defend the suppressing of the constitution, whether or not I agree with what he has done. I see only constitutional issues which are involved; and if any member of this Chamber wants to wash his hands of this matter and say that he could never agree with Gairy, and that he could never agree with what was done in Grenada, I am urging upon him that that is not what we are being called upon to consider now. What we are being called upon to consider is this: what you hear the bell ringing, ask not for whom the bell tolls: it only tolls for thee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not my intention to continue any longer on this matter, because I am sure that other members both on this side and on the other side of this Honourable Chamber will want to express an opinion for or against this Resolution, and it is our intention to allow them to do so. I am sure that Your Honour will not in any way curtail debate on this matter, except in so far as Your Honour considers that a speaker is being irrelevant, or alternatively, that he is in breach of the Standing Orders of this House - those Standing Orders which have not been suspended already by the Acting Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

In order to highlight the action which we are asking the House to take, I want to invite hon. members to cast their minds back to certain similar actions on the part of the United Kingdom Government. Now as you will know, the historian of my Party is the Hon. Minister of Education. I am entirely innocent of any knowledge of historical dates, because from the time I was at school, I found it impossible to consider dates of any importance except roughly to indicate different phases in the world's history which may have taken place. But if I remember rightly, some time between 1953 and 1954 the constitution of British Guiana was taken away by a Conservative Government in the United Kingdom. I am reminded by the Hon. Minister of Education who is a walking encyclopaedia on these matters that it was in October, 1953. If that date is wrong, he must take the responsibility for it; but according to him, in October 1953, the British Government decided to take away the constitution of British Guiana after the British Guiana Government had been in office for a mere six months.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the difference between that occasion and this one - or the differences, because there are several differences - are that on that occasion they were not alleging that there was any financial irregularity. I understand that a senior Government official who was an Englishman was invited to bring a glass of water for the now President of the Senate, and that they felt that was lowering the prestige of the public servants from the metropolitan country; not that that was the only reason, if that is a reason at all, but there were a lot of silly, little bagatelles - somebody painting the statue of Queen Victoria in one of the streets of Georgetown or somebody writing something on a wall. Well, Barbadians and people from England as well are in the habit of writing all kinds of things inside the

doors of public lavatories all the time, and no constitution is taken away for that. There were a lot of silly, annoying incidents which one would normally expect from a country like British Guiana - I am not being derogatory in any way - which did not have the long history of constitutional development which we have enjoyed in the Island of Barbados. Here was a trading post of a company like the Hudson Bay Trading Company where the contractors carried their furs; British Guiana was the tropical trading post of the Hudson Bay Trading Company which suddenly found itself with a large measure of internal self-Government, after a fairly bitter struggle by the political parties and the different sections of the community. Therefore, if they did not have a long period of tutoring, it was only natural that there would be certain expressions of enthusiasm, if we may put it that way - and I challenge any hon. member here to tell me that I am wrong - and it was seen that there was no allegation of fraud or of financial irregularity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was neither riot nor civil commotion; but certain of the entrenched, vested interests - and I am not now referring to Bookers - McCollin Limited, because it now appears that they are the most enlightened apostles of the constitution in British Guiana and are carrying the banner way in front of the Premier of British Guiana himself in the advancement towards socialism of some kind or other, whether Eastern or Western, I am not sure yet. They are carrying the banner for reasons which I have not had sufficient time to analyse, but it is a very happy augury for British Guiana that we find the entrenched interests now being prepared to carry the banner of socialism in advance of the political Party itself. In October, 1953, no indictment was made against the leaders of the Government of British Guiana on the grounds that there had been any financial irregularity or anything like that. There was no riot or civil commotion.
3.40 p.m.

The constitution of British Guiana was taken away. The other difference is that we were assured by the then Secretary of State for the Colonies that he did this after consultation with the Leader of the Government of Barbados, Sir Grantley Adams; the Leader of the Government of Jamaica, Sir Alexander Bustamante; the Leader of the Government of Trinidad, Mr. Albert Gomes; and he also added the rider that he had even called up the Leader of the Opposition of Jamaica, Mr. Norman Manley. The impression given by the Secretary of State was that all of these leaders had not only approved, but some of them had heralded him and even urged the British Government to take away the constitution from the people of British Guiana. Are we therefore surprised now that these architects to the destruction of the constitutional rights of the people of British Guiana, that these people who found themselves as leaders of the West Indian embryonic nation, that these people as soon as birth was given to the West Indian nation, decided to begin to strangle it in its birth? How can we be surprised when they strangled the constitution of the people of British Guiana after it was only given to those people six months previously?

Members of this Honourable House must be abundantly clear about the principles involved in the passing of a Resolution of this kind. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the constitution of British Guiana was taken away, I, along with some other members of the then Government, backbenchers as we were at the time in this Chamber, gave expression to our disgust over the action taken by the British Government. I remember saying on more than one occasion - and some hon. members who are not gifted with short memories will remember that I said, echoing the words of Mr. Edmund Burke in the House of Commons - you will forgive me if I consult my historical encyclopaedia - that in 1780 when Mr. Burke was protesting against the action of the British Government in the United States, the then American colonies, what he said was that you cannot draw up an indictment against the whole nation. If I had to choose a theme here today as the theme of this Resolution, I would borrow the words of Mr. Burke and say: you cannot draw up an indictment against a whole nation.

Sir, what I said on the floor of the House of Assembly in 1954 and 1955 and subsequently was that if an individual

Minister of the United Kingdom officially expressed adoration for those little things which he knew and things such as hegemony which he knows little about, if he expressed admiration for forms of Government over which he had no opportunity to exercise any authority, if this was seditious or illegal, the good Lord in Heaven knows that the laws under the British constitution are so watertight that sometimes if you did not stand up quickly when they played "God Save the Queen", you may be hauled into the Courts and charged with sedition. No one can deny that. But my attitude was that the laws of the constitution should not be revoked if there were any seditious practices or something which is called seditious libel in the laws of British Guiana, Barbados, Trinidad and other West Indian colonies. Not only seditious but actions are noticeable; even painting Queen Victoria's statue with red paint, as I understand was done in British Guiana, was noticeable - and even the statue of Lord Willoughby. All of that can be construed to be seditious and you would not have much trouble in getting an indictment under the colonial statutes under which we are suffering. But my contention is that if you are guilty of an action which was susceptible of public prosecution before a Court of Law, it is not only right but it is the duty of the members of the Attorney General's Department and it is the duty of the Officer administering the Government of the Island or the territory, as the case may be, to invite such public prosecution in order to bring the person to book. The purpose of my saying that is that I think it is grossly unfair that if some little schoolteacher in Berbice who one day hopes to be a lawyer and is burning the midnight oil reading constitutional law, exercises his right to choose whom he wants to represent him, somebody should sit down in England and on the advice of a certain administrator take away from him his right to choose the person he wants to preside over his rights.

That is why I echo the words of Mr. Edmund Burke. No one has devised a way of drawing up an indictment against a whole nation. Adolf Hitler was the only person who did it, but the way in which he did it was to sign the death warrant of six million people without an indictment at all. The next step to taking away a constitution is to exercise that kind of authoritative function which Adolf Hitler and other dictators exercised.

Sir, you will understand why I say, if the people of British Guiana had done something, then you would have been justified. If the people had taken arms against the sea of troubles which we call the Colonial Office - those are troubles at sea - if the people of British Guiana had made dykes and prevented a landing of British troops or businessmen or had expropriated property of the Crown or done anything of that kind, perhaps you then would have investigated the drawing up of an indictment against the whole people or you would be justified on the banner of public opinion to the taking away of the constitution from the colony.

We would have mismanagement in these Islands of ours. In the United Kingdom, a sum of £2,000 million was voted between 1935 and 1940 for armaments to protect Great Britain; and when the British Army was confronted by the forces of the enemy at Dunkirk, apart from about three squadrons of the Air Force and the small pond boats which pushed out from the East Coast, they hardly had parasols to hold over their heads because that money was misspent. Up to now that money has not been accounted for. I want to make that clear. I invite you to read your history. Such things do not percolate down to the Colonial Press, but they send out pictures of the Queen shaking some old lady's hand!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, between 1947 and 1958 when the Federation came into being, we witnessed in this Federation, with the active benevolence of the United Kingdom Government, a seduction of British Honduras and the rape of the constitution of British Guiana.
3.50 p.m.

In that period both of these islands through their elected representatives and heads of Government had expressed a willingness to join the West Indies Federation. The Rance Report was published in January, 1948 - I am speaking purely from memory. In 1953 in the Legislative Council of

British Guiana, Dr. Jagan was the only member to vote in favour of the Federation. Those Leaders I have mentioned did nothing to encourage Mr. Richardson or Mr. Jagan who became Chief Minister of British Guiana; they did nothing to assist them to make their countries available to the people of the West Indies, but they connived not only at the taking away of the constitution of British Guiana, but they actually assisted to make sure that the West Indian nation was starting off as a puny infant without these territories in which to settle their people or to assist the people of these territories to develop. I say that the doom of the West Indies was sealed when those Leaders decided to take away the constitution; but, of course, Mr. Jagan is now in complete control of British Guiana. To take away the constitution from British Guiana is to take away the constitution from the electors; you take away the constitution from the people who have the right to vote because you do not give them the right to say how they want their country to be managed when you take away the constitution. I was privileged to witness within a couple of years the same British Government under the same political Party give back the constitution to the same country of British Guiana. I was further privileged to witness that, in this year of grace, 1962, a lot of people not necessarily including myself but not necessarily excluding myself either - (*Laughter*) you have fought and you have had bloodshed, civil commotion and a clear expression of the tendency of the Government in power to go against the wishes of the people; there was greater justification then for suspending the constitution, even if temporarily of British Guiana; but the same Conservative Government in Britain sent in British troops by plane at the expense of the British taxpayers to shut down the constitution. Just imagine that when the Leaders do something, you do not punish the Leaders but you take away the constitution of the people! (*Cheers*). Can you blame any member of the Government of Barbados if we do not repose any kind of confidence whatsoever in the discretion of the United Kingdom Government which appears to be so preoccupied with the defence of Liberalism that they did not have any attention to pay to what they were doing in these areas? As a matter of fact, they have reached the stage of being so demoralised that they want to let go these colonies like some kind of hot potato, but they want to squeeze out all the pulp before they let them go. That is how it appears to me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the constitution has been taken away from the people of Grenada by an arbitrary act of the United Kingdom Government. What is more deplorable to us in Barbados as a Government of the people of this Island, is that within twelve months, the United Kingdom Government, the same Government which we now have re-enfranchising the Leader of the Grenada Government, in the same manner they have overruled the judgment of a Judge of the Supreme Court in St. Lucia. You must ask if we must have any respect for their pronouncements on democratic procedures. In the neighbouring colony of St. Lucia a Judge of the Supreme Court ruled that there was a breach of the election law and that certain Ministers would have to forfeit their seats because of that breach. There is no law which is passed in any of the Windward or Leeward Islands which does not have to be approved by the United Kingdom Government. Their election law is actually sent down, like the Decalogue from Mount Sinai, from Church Street. It is not as it is in Barbados where any private member can pass a Bill, and if we do not scrutinise it carefully we have to abide by the consequences which follow; there are only certain Bills which are reserved for the Royal Assent or signification; there are very few of them. A law like the one awarding the Princess Alice Scholarship, as the hon. senior member for the City would know, has got to be reserved for Royal signification; but all the Bills which deal with the constitution of the island, we can decide to pass and make a lot of mistakes; but it is not so in the Leeward and Windward Islands. These Ordinances are sent down from the United Kingdom. Under that law in St. Lucia certain Ministers had to forfeit their seats; but because they had somebody in Trinidad, in the Federal Government whom they could not do anything to offend, because the Deputy Prime Minister of the Federation was a St. Lucian who rejoices under the name of Dr. LaCorbiniere, they turned the whole law upside down. Despite what Mr. Jus-

tice Chenery found - Barbados always seems to be on the wrong end of the stick; we seem always to have Barbadians involved in these things, Mr. Justice Chenery ruled that the Ministers should lose their seats; and the Colonial Office said that, despite anything which Mr. Justice Chenery did, despite anything which he may have ruled in a Court of Law - and it could not be challenged - the Ministers can still be Ministers. In those circumstances, can we repose any faith in those people? They are playing the game of politics strictly by air all the time; they have no settled policy on anything. Those of us who have been following what is taking place in St. Lucia, in British Guiana or in Grenada - well, I cannot say that it came as a surprise to me; I know that the hon. senior member for St. Peter will say: "I told you so". 4.00 p.m.

I cannot pretend it is anything that has surprised me, because last week the Secretary of State said he did not like this kind of thing that was going on, and that was five or six days before they actually exercised the Order in Council in this matter.

What we regard as being particularly depressing in this matter, Sir, is that we are now trying to build a nation, and by taking arbitrary action of this kind, they are focussing some strictures which are already levelled at the Caribbean area as a whole. We had Mr. Castro in Cuba, Sir Grantley Adams in Trinidad, and Mr. Jagan in British Guiana, and now they say we have Mr. Gairy in Grenada, giving the impression that the Caribbean area, because of the failures and lack of appreciation for the finer points of democracy by some of the people, if not all of them that I have mentioned, is an area which is always seething, dissatisfied, bordering on Spanish South American Republicanism, and an area in which no one should repose any kind of confidence, because of the gymnastics of a few irresponsible people, and people who, every time they open their mouths, are prone to put both of their feet in them. They now want to project an image, as they always do unconsciously, due to their ignorance of the real aspirations of the people of the West Indies, and the real solid basis of West Indian advancement - something which is based on the struggles of the masses of the West Indies, and not on the political leadership of the West Indies. I want to make it clear, and that goes also for this or any other Government in Barbados, that any advancement which we have attained has been due to the demonstration of the submerged tenths of these populations and not anything that a leader has condescended to give to the people of the West Indies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will always find a leader; and a lot of these Governments have been crisis Governments. Their political parties have been crisis organisations; they have never had any sound basis either from a business point of view or from a political point of view. There have always been crisis organisations in the West Indies. The idea is: we are having a Federal election; so let us get together, although we are not birds of a feather; that is to say, we belong to certain political parties. That is the kind of theory that gave rise to the Bolshevik Group in the Soviet Union. We are not really birds of a feather; we are of different plumage; we are, as one member of the Opposition has said, blackbirds among the pigeons all over the place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I promise you that I have said enough, because other hon. members are entitled to express their opinion on this matter, and we want to get a vote taken on this matter as a matter of urgency. I want to make it clear before I sit down that, in passing this Resolution, we are in no way reflecting on the Report of the Commission of Enquiry in Grenada. We are not in any way giving the stamp of approval to any action taken by the Chief Minister of Grenada, because although we may have a certain amount of concern that the people to whom we are looking for leadership sometimes do not act in the way of leaders, we are not in this Resolution concerned about whether Mr. Gairy was right or whether Mr. Gairy was wrong. What we are concerned about, Sir, is that in the 20th Century, in 1962, after all the struggles of the starving people of the West Indies have been frustrated by the action of their own so-called leaders, because through

apathy they permitted their leaders to completely wreck all their hopes and chances of fulfilment of joint nationhood, because their own political leaders did that to them, that must be considered to be an authority for the British Government or any other Government to come into the West Indies and say that they are going to take away a constitution and dissolve a Legislature; whether it is a nominated Chamber or an elected Chamber, it really does not matter.

It would be a major constitutional innovation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even if it is an elected Chamber, to take away the constitution, if that is the constitution of the country; and I would not like Mr. Gairy to feel that the members of the Barbados Government or the people of Barbados intend to condone this high-handed action on the part of the United Kingdom Government. I have never made any secret that I am not in sympathy with the present United Kingdom Government anyhow. That does not prevent me from being personal friends with any member of that Government, like the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who is on my right. I believe he has more friends in the present Government than he had in the last Labour Government, and he has a peculiar way of happening to know on the 'first-name-calling' basis all the leaders in England at any time in History. No matter whatsoever King may reign, he is able to contact these people and discuss matters with them. I am not in that happy position, but at the same time I have never either to the Leader of the Opposition or to any other person failed to disclose that I am not in sympathy with the present British Government; and the sooner they go, the better would we be able to negotiate with the members of the Opposition Party in Great Britain. We have had the advantage that the Opposition Party in the United Kingdom has committed itself — it has always made the mistake whether they are sincere or not in their protests — that they want to help along the people of the dependent territories and to assist us in our march towards nationhood; and it was Mr. Creech Jones who by some trick of fate happened to be in the same hospital at which I was confined, if that is the correct word to use, or in which my freedom was detained for some ten days — Mr. Creech Jones having started the West Indies on the march to nationhood — and that he and I should have ended up at the same hospital at the same very crucial period in the history of the West Indies.

I am sure that hon. members would wish Mr. Creech Jones every success and a happy recovery, because he has done his work and he has laid aside his arms in this battle for the colonial peoples. He has done us good in so far as he was capable; he may not be capable of carrying us very much further, because everyone has his limitations. Yet there are people, whether or not they are sincere, who have gone to the trouble of having committed themselves as being interested in the advancement of the people of the West Indies, and therefore I have no hesitation in moving any vote of censure against a Conservative Government in England, because I am not a Socialist in Barbados and like some ex-hon. friends of mine who by the time they get to Canada or the United Kingdom say that the people in Barbados accuse them of being Conservatives, and they are really more conservative than the Leaders of the Conservative Governments in these countries. When I go to England, I ask them if they know to whom they are talking, and tell them they are talking to people, who in the days when Police used to be armed with bayonets and bullets, stood up for the masses of these countries.

4.10 p.m.

When Mr. Gairy went to Grenada there was a political vacuum. The middle-class people in Grenada had abdicated their right to leadership by ignoring the sufferings of the people of St. George's. It is in that kind of atmosphere, where people do not recognise their political responsibilities and their responsibility to the community that you get dictators and people who are perhaps not fully ripe for leadership issues.

If it is the same people who inspired the British Government to think that they can treat the representatives of Grenada with disdain and contempt and to go one step further and take away the constitution not only from the

representatives but from the people of Grenada, then I say that it is time when we must raise a protest; and even although the same people who abdicated their right to leadership by ignoring the masses are the people from whom the constitution has been taken away, I say it serves some of them right, because they are too anxious to play a single game.

A lot of people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, accuse me of talking the same way now that I am in Government as if I am still in the Opposition. They say that I do not remember that I am in Government. I did not know that you had to change your tone when you got into Government, or that the same tonic sol-fa which you had been singing, you had to change to sing some other kind of oratorio. I do not understand that at all. I thought that the people had put us on this side because they liked the way we were talking, because of the things which we wanted to do, and the harshest criticism which we can get is that we are still in the Opposition. We will be in the Opposition until we get the things which we want done and stop those things which we say that we do not want to be done against the people of the West Indies and the people of Barbados. Mr. Edwin Burke said: "I do not know of any method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." I say that I do not know of any method of drawing up an indictment against the people of Grenada, and nowhere in the Report which was released on the 6th June, 1962, do I find that the Commissioners had any indictment to make against the people of Grenada. It is in that sense and spirit and those phrases underlined in this Resolution that I move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to second this Resolution and for multifarious reasons. Before coming here today, I spoke over the Overseas Telephone Service with the Secretary of our regional organisation — the Caribbean Congress of Labour — and without any knowledge whatsoever that it was the Government's intention to introduce a Resolution of this nature, the Secretary and I agreed that a statement should be made on behalf of the C.C.L. condemning the decision of the British Government to take away the constitution of Grenada, and that that statement would be published this evening in Trinidad. Therefore, it is a happy coincidence that the biggest regional Trade Union organisation in the area will be publishing a statement condemning this action of the British Government on the same day that the Barbados Government has introduced a Resolution in this House of Assembly protesting against the action of the British Government.

I do not know whether I should say that the Barbados Government is following the good lead of the Caribbean Congress of Labour because our organisation represents a wider area than the Barbados Government or if to say that the two organisations are thinking alike simultaneously.

I must say that I compliment the Hon. Premier on his speech. Today the Premier and I are like twin brothers on this Resolution. I hope that he and his Government will continue in this trend — what I would regard as a very frontal, militant and progressive trend — in challenging at the very moment any intrusion into the fundamental rights of the people of this area.

I do not like to say that 'I told you so'. That is now becoming too hackneyed for me; but I am sure that I introduced a Resolution in here recently asking the House to agree to the constitution of a West Indian Federation of the Eight — and I will use the phrase of a good friend of mine, a student in this Island from Northern Rhodesia, who said that we should not phrase the Eight Territories of this Federation in the insulting language which we got from our sister territory of Trinidad but that we should phrase them in more elegant language. That was coming from Africans who are in the vanguard of progress and from people who are trying to assist us. He said that we should be called the "Brave Eight".

The Hon. Premier was then on his way to the United Kingdom and I reminded him that if the Resolution which

I was then presenting to the House was treated in any lukewarm manner, the day would not be too far distant when the Government would want to come back to this House of Assembly and seek the assistance of me and other colleagues in support of a measure to stop the Colonial Office in its rush of blood in these things.

I have not lived too long from that day. It was on the 2nd May, 1962, when that Resolution was dealt with in this House, four days before the delegation from Barbados left these shores. It was then that I brought that matter to the notice of this Assembly and I pointed out to the Hon. Premier that I have a way of knowing the people at Colonial Office. Not later than last week I reminded him that they passed an Order-in-Council, although an Order-in-Council existed in Grenada prior to the West Indian Federation, and my view was that they passed it because they intended to use it. I also reminded the Hon. Premier that if a situation arises which in their opinion amounted to a crisis, then they would say even in relation to Barbados that they would pass an Order-in-Council to apply to us. I will not say to the Hon. Premier that 'I told you so' because it is in his power to preside over the destinies of these territories; but I will remind him as a young Premier not to be too gullible with the telegrams or the pledges which he gets from the Colonial Office or the Secretary of State for the Colonies, but to be very insistent on what he wants and see that what he wants is given and is written in precise terms. 4.20 p.m.

The Hon. Premier has said a lot today about the past history of these territories. All I would say to the Premier is that my philosophy is in the words of Patrick Douglas or one of the American politicians, that the price of liberty is personal vigilance. I have never stopped watching people or being vigilant. Some people ask me "Do you ever stop canvassing?" I say "No, never". That is the vigilance I exercise in the vested interest which I have in the representation of the people. I have already warned them and I warn them again today. I not only protest strongly against the action taken by the Government of the United Kingdom in suspending the constitution of Grenada and in dissolving the Legislative and Executive Councils of that Island, but I condemn it. I can add that because I go to the Colonial Office and I can say that among the members of this Chamber, I have visited the United Kingdom more frequently than any of them for the last sixteen years. I have been going twice a year, sometimes three times or four times a year to the United Kingdom. I expect to be in London next Monday, as a matter of fact.

It is on this ground that I say that the Barbadians, more so than the majority of West Indians, have been very slow in protesting against the action of the Colonial Office in matters in which the Barbadians are very smug. They say: "This does not apply to us." Barbadians have been brought up in an atmosphere in which they believe that they are better than any other territory in the area or that, by some dispensation, we are operating in a different part of the planet and that nothing anywhere else interferes with us. I am not subscribing to that point of view. There were many Barbadians who were willing to condemn Mr. Gairy for his action. I am saying that if you had to carry out a sound investigation in Barbados as to many actions which have taken place, many people would be in prison tonight. There are some Barbadians who are more fit for prison than they are fit for freedom. I have said that broadly and any member can qualify for it. (Laughter). I say that without any apology. The smugness of the Barbadian society is that people are too prone to say that if it is Mr. So-and-So's grandson, if it is Mr. So-and-So's son or if it is Mr. So-and-So, then we cannot discuss him; but if it is somebody else who is nobody, then jail is meant for him.

I am in complete agreement with the Hon. Premier when he says that you set up a Commission ostensibly to produce information which you want the public to judge. I will remind the Hon. Premier of the Gomes Commission of Enquiry into the Mucurapo Lots of Trinidad. Sir Stanley Gomes, then Mr. Stanley Gomes, said that the Ministers who were holding positions in the Government should not have been in the Government and that charges should have been laid against them. Did the Colonial Office suspend

the constitution of Trinidad? Let anybody read the Stanley Gomes Report in Trinidad and ask anybody what were his views in that connection.

As the Hon. Premier has said, when different people begin to preside with these philosophies over the destinies of the people in these territories — well, people are always apt innocently to agree with the Colonial Office with the precipitant action of suspending constitutions because there are those people who did not run these countries before. I can give a recital of places where the constitution was suspended. Why was it not suspended in the Bahamas? When the drivers demonstrated, then they decided to do something. We had to shed blood; as it is said in the Biblical injunction, unless there is the shedding of blood, there is no redemption. When we come to the other side, when the shoe is on the other foot, in order to get the Colonial Office to do anything, we must be charged with sedition, just as how an innocent man in Barbados was put on a seditious charge for saying: "Tonight is going to be a funny day". That man was sentenced to a term of imprisonment for nine months or three years. He simply said: "Tonight is going to be a funny day." That is the sort of price which we have to pay in a territory in which nobody suspended the constitution in those days. Whenever the constitution was suspended prior to 1939, it was suspended at the express wish of the people in these territories. In 1865 when the Jamaica Constitution was suspended, it was suspended by Resolution in the Legislative Council in Jamaica; it was not suspended by any Order-in-Council. The reactionary power started off the position for conflict to take place to show that these people cannot rule; they start off on the basis that they should be so extravagant in spending money that you will have to watch them. They having had the charges made by the Commission against Mr. Gairy, I do not consider it is the business of the Barbados public to sit in judgment over the people of Grenada in relation to their elected Ministers in whom they repose confidence. 4.30 p.m.

Sometimes it is a matter of opinion what people regard as extravagant. If a man's wife can play a piano and he buys a Baby Grand Piano, that might not seem to him to be extravagant as compared with another man doing something else. I believe all of us have our aspects of extravagance, but it is only to what extent the public has to pay. If you read the debates of all legislatures, you will find that at one stage or another people are accused of being extravagant. A debate lasted for seventeen hours in this House of Assembly on the basis of an extravagant expenditure, because the Government in power wanted to give the Governor a new motorcar, when other members of the House felt that the car which he was using was in good condition. It was felt that the car would not suit a tall Governor, because when he was getting into the car he would hit his hat.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the Hon. Premier that the British Government has absolutely no right to suspend a constitution, unless grave constitutional matters arise that interfere with the fundamental right of the citizen in expressing their freedom and liberty in the State in which they exist. These are the exceptional circumstances for which you should suspend a constitution. If you elect a Government to power and they start to exercise their right in a manner that goes against the very rights of the individual, that is, if they start telling women that they should not wear dresses, but must wear short pants and a vest, and that all men must wear nylon short pants, and if they wear a proper pair of pants, they would be prosecuted and sent to prison, or if they ask every man who has passed the best days of his youth in figure to parade the streets in a pair of nylon short pants, or if there is some outrageous conduct that interferes not only with the liberty and decency of the individual, but strikes at the heart of the life, custom and practice of the community, then the constitution should be suspended. Those are things which the Government was not given power to do. Or they may want to do as was done in some mediaeval days, that is, take all the women and say that they would look better if they shaved off their hair and make them look like Yul Brynner, or tell all men that they must start wearing beards

or some other stupidity in which they are trying to interfere with the fundamental liberties of people. Those are grave and exceptional circumstances against which the rights of the citizen should be protected. Even if they were in an independent State, they could only be protected by a civil commotion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we all know, a revolution and a rebellion are the same, the difference being that one is successful and the other is a failure. When a revolt starts off and it succeeds, they call it a revolution, as in the case with Castro. If a country has to revolt against a Government for interfering with its fundamental rights and liberties, it is quite in order to do so, and if there is going to be a suspension of the constitution, it should be a suspension of the constitution in those grave and exceptional circumstances.

Now who are to say that because Mr. Gairy bought a piano and because Civil Servants acted stupidly, all the people in Grenada have no right any longer of going to the polls, and that the Administrator must decide who are the people in Grenada now to preside over the destinies of Grenadians? In discussing Federation, the Colonial Office now is just like some cricket teams which start to play, but they are not playing to win; they are playing for a draw. Now the Colonial Office starts off this new Federation of the Eight, and they are playing for a draw or to come 'not out'. There was this timing to allow the Enquiry to be published when these honourable gentlemen were in London. It was not done by accident; it was done by design, in order to create such an atmosphere in London that the same delegation that is pressing for all these constitutional powers had to go easy. They had to play the keys a little softer because the music sheet wind was blowing; so you never knew what would happen. The Colonial Office has done that in order to postpone the request that West Indians would now make for greater demands in their own rights within these territories.

Now if you examine the issues involved, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will see that they are not different from the issues which were involved in other territories. Here in Barbados a Commission of Enquiry went into the conduct of a Minister and you had a whitewashing. No Minister resigned, neither was the constitution suspended. But you heard that Barbadians thought they were very smart and that everything could happen in Barbados. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you hear Barbadians talk about honesty, but I do not know why they have built a gaol in Barbados; there should be all churches and monasteries because there are no dishonest Barbadians. I am not advertising that we are more dishonest than anybody else, but we have all the same idiosyncracies and failures. Barbadians do not like to investigate themselves, but only like to have scapegoats and use them for these things. Mr. Gairy in Grenada is being used as a scapegoat, not against Grenada only, but against the West Indies as a whole. Every time some frivolous nonsense occurs in the West Indies, you get the Colonial Office pouncing on these Governments and suspending their constitutions. When was the last time they suspended a constitution in Africa? Far from that, you had Nkrumah coming out of gaol and leading the country into independence. You had Dr. Banda coming out of gaol and leading his country into independence.

4.40 p.m.

You had Jomo Kenyatta coming out of gaol to lead the colony of Kenya to independence. They had a strike in Nairobi three weeks ago. Let me tell the hon. senior member for the City that it is not unusual to have a strike in Kenya. Even Tom Mboya had his first baptism as Minister of Labour when he had to receive a delegation of strikers from the Kenya Federation of Labour of which he was the former General Secretary.

When last have they suspended the constitution in Singapore? Mr. David Marshall was Premier of Singapore and the British people told him something which he did not like and he resigned. They have this idea of suspending a constitution as if you were taking off the head of a woman and taking away the constitutional rights of the citizens and

saying that we are not allowing them about after six o'clock at night.

A Minister does something wrong. He squanders money, and you say: 'take away the constitution of the colony because the Minister squandered money.' The reason why they are doing that is because they are afraid of the popularity of the Minister. If he were a person whom they felt they could punish and put on a desert island, they would do so.

The British people have the art of making martyrs. Archbishop Makarios is the first President of the Republic of Cyprus and they had banished him to the Seychelles. A lot of our money was spent in Cyprus. They said: 'Look at how much money the Russians spent in Kiev', yet they have done this same thing in Kenya as the Russians did in Kiev. Lots of lives of the Kenya population were taken - not in fighting.

Sir, I am in wholehearted agreement with this Resolution because I do not see any excuse whatsoever for suspending the constitution of Grenada on the report of the Commission of Enquiry. What the Hon. Premier pointed out is true. I was at pains to remember, myself, and I cannot remember of any case, as he has said, in which you set up a Commission of Enquiry to find out the issues involved and as a result of the recommendations, you had to suspend the constitution of the country. You had the Belgian case in England because corruption was going on. Do not believe that you get shocking things happening in these parts but you do not get them happening in England. It was proved that it was corruption going on and more money than the Barbados Treasury possessed was spent, but nobody suspended the constitution nor did the Queen recall Parliament. If the Prime Minister or a Minister is involved in corruption or bringing down the good name of the country, he will resign and let somebody else take over. You get this colonial imperialistic attitude, and it seems as if the West Indies form the last vestige of British imperial power and it seems as if they treat us more ruthlessly now than they did before. They came down with crushing power over every little territory of the West Indies because many of the territories of the West Indies themselves do not see it fit to stand up to these things.

I am very pleased that the Hon. Premier has taken up this matter today. My organisation says that this matter is not going to end here. We are going to send a telegram to the Secretary of State for the Colonies letting him know that we protest against it. I am of the considered opinion that the West Indian Leaders should be protesting to the Secretary of State jointly demanding him to receive a delegation of them with a view to the re-institution of the constitution of the people of Grenada. There should not be any cap passing. We have had Heads of Departments and Heads of Administration making strong statements about our political leaders when they have not been equal to it and the most that the British people did was to promote the Head of the Department or the Head of the Administration by sending him to another colony in a higher job and therefore, that official was better off financially.

This is why I say that the Hon. Premier and I are like twin brothers. It is the first time since the opening of the Session that the Hon. Premier and the Cabinet are progressive on what I regard as a national issue. This is not a party issue or anything which affects the Barbados public as such, but it affects the Barbados public in so far as it deals with an issue which affects those who have strong socialist views of which they are not ashamed. On this point, I would like to agree with the Hon. Premier. There are those with this same West Indian spirit whom you will find telling you to go slow on this West Indian unity and give them time to fail - not to pass. I have often said in here that a boy failed his examination and when he went home and his mother asked him why he had failed, he said that just as he was going to pass they stopped work.

The average Barbadian wants a lot of time to fail. You have all of this procrastination and their saying: 'Give us a little more time.' They have had seventeen years to make

up their minds as to what they know on Federation. All the 'time' which they want now is what they can get in the Fairchild Street Market or that one in Cheapside; that is, broad-leaf 'thyme' or parsley. If you were to ask them a fundamental question, I do not think that they would know anything. Ask them what are the issues on the European Common Market and the only thing on the Common Market which they know anything about is the market in Fairchild Street or the one at Eagle Hall.

On this important question, the constitution of Grenada was suspended as from today. Which newspaper in the West Indies in its editorial has written anything on it? If it were something coming from the proletariat, it would be a different thing. We are living in an age in which the people who represent the proletariat have to get up because there is the subtle attempt by others to believe that we have no right to be in power and to rule. I was in Grenada in 1951 and I know the society of Grenada well. What the Hon. Premier said is still true. There are some middle-class people in these West Indian territories who want to sit back in their cloistered atmosphere and speak on terms such as this: "What is wrong with these domestic servants now?" They say so as if God made some domestic servant for them. They want somebody to bring a glass of water for them. They do not think that they should fetch a glass of water for themselves and they want an army of the unemployed available to them at all times so that they can get cheap labour. They lie down in their couch and with some name as Whittaker, Brancker, Jones, they say: "Bring me something." That is the sort of atmosphere which the middle-class want to find themselves in. They want to find themselves in the position of the old planters and so those people who represent the proletariat should get up and help the people to think for themselves.
4.50 p.m.

They must call Jones, Brancker and Sobers and they think these servants come in at any time so that they cannot get the breakfast. But how long was the cooking of breakfast an art that you cannot do it for yourself? They want to know who was Mr. Gairy's grandfather or who was his mother. They want to discuss when are they going to get a nice "fridge" or a nice Baby Grand Piano. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you put these people in the same position, they would want to have the same piano, too. I do not subscribe to the idea of some of these people. Those are the conditions which the middle-class people have created. They will say in relation to this House of Assembly: "Whom have you got in the House of Assembly now?" When the hon. senior member for the City was going to be the Mayor of Bridgetown, a half riot took place in Barbados. The people said: "Look who will be the first Mayor of Bridgetown - Ernest Mottley." They said that as if the Mayor was a cow and not a human being, and you were going to put a chain on him. The middle classes are withdrawing from society; they say that I must do all the rough work and they should sit down. They want to create two worlds, they being in the upper world and the other people being in the lower world. The average middle-class man finds himself out of step with the proletariat, and when the proletariat reject them and take their leaders, they want to sit back now. They want to reduce the power of the masses for the masses to reduce them in the eyes of their own people. That is what the West Indian Islands are being subjected to.

I have no praise for anyone in public life who is going to misuse the solemn position of power for his own benefit. I know Mr. Gairy fairly well. I was in Grenada in 1951 when Mr. Gairy was under pressure from the Bourbons from Grenada. The Grenada people felt that there was a difference between them and the people of other West Indian Islands. It was a society of the remnant of slaves; it is not a society of the sharp plurality of races which we have in Barbados which would create a problem. It is one of those homogeneous societies in which people can live quite easily but it is a closed society that does not believe in percolation. They want to be in water-tight compartments for which people were not prepared in Grenada. That was the Gairy difficulty in 1951, but he had the masses behind him. He was banished to Carriacou and he was re-enfranchised and re-elected: and you have this unnecessary stupid persecution which is being perpetrated by the Colonial

Office of reducing the quality of your leadership; but it makes people have less confidence in those who are presiding over you as leaders. As soon as you attack the leaders too much - you hear that Mr. So-and-So is a dishonest man and the answer is: "He is a dishonest man like you." They will say: "he will give us some of the money, but you will not give us any." Every time you have these inroads or every time you have these Ministers with these motor cars in Trinidad, did you have any suspension of the constitution? I share the view of the Hon. Premier and I am very pleased to see that the Cabinet as a whole agrees with this Resolution. We do not need to amend this Resolution although I would like to see some stronger language used. I not only protest against the action of the Government of the United Kingdom in suspending the constitution of Grenada and in dissolving the Legislative and Executive Councils of that Island, but I condemn such action. A protest is one thing, but a condemnation is another.

I feel that the Governments should call upon the Secretary of State for the Colonies to receive a delegation of elected Ministers. I feel that this is a challenge to the elected Ministers because when they bring out the Colonial Office Civil Servants who get drunk and who carry away the money, they do not suspend the constitution. When Administrators get drunk and they do as they like, no constitution is suspended. In those days the Colonial Office people were ruling the masses; now there is a subtle attempt made to make the reactionary forces feel satisfied that you can intercept the will of the people by this process. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has passed through a process like this in Barbados, not at the hands of the Colonial Office but at the hands of some people. But the majority of the people were backing him up. It was the same type of action which the people wanted to adopt.
5.00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether or not hon. members like Mr. Gairy, as the Hon. Premier has said, the matter at stake is not Mr. Gairy. The matter at stake is of a higher nature than that. As people who have been elected by the people of these territories, and who are emerging to self-government, we must make the Colonial Office understand that unless it is something that interferes with the fundamental rights of the people and their freedom, we are not supporting the suspension of a constitution which deprives people of their power. If you want to remove the Ministers, you can remove them, but let the people remove them. As the Hon. Premier has asked what is the price of democracy? In democracy you allow the people to vote; it is not an examination. You do not vote by examination to see who comes first. You do not ask the men to write an essay; you ask them to vote; so you would not have the ignorance of people saying that the ones who lost the Government got the most votes. For instance, if a man ran against two of their candidates, they would count the votes of their two candidates and say that they got more votes than the man who won the seat. You get the ignorance of a man getting 3,000 votes, while the second man gets 2,000 votes and the third gets 1,500 votes, and they add the votes of the second and third man and say that they got more than the first man. They want to prove that more people voted for them than for this Government, and yet they could not win.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the sort of exercise you get coming from an electoral office, and the ignorance that comes from newspapers, and that is why I do not agree that we should postpone this and wait until reports appear in the newspaper. Imagine a man who had been to school sitting down in a newspaper office and coming out with the biggest arithmetical conundrum which you have ever heard, that the men who lost in a double-member constituency where you are sharing votes got more votes than the man who won. They added the votes of the honourable senior member for the City, the hon. junior member for the City, and said that all the men who lost got more votes than they did. Secondly, they say that the people who stood home and did not vote are more than your votes, because they are negative and you lost them.

I feel that in Barbados we have to expose some of these things. The reason why I say that is because the Premier said something at the beginning about having to wait; but I

will say that it is the business of the Legislators to start a discussion on any matter, and then for the public to be able to decide on it. As soon as you pussyfoot and wait on somebody who has no known idea of what he intends to debate, you will be waiting until Doomsday. We here in the Legislature have to initiate debates on fundamental issues. We cannot take the lead from the people outside because they are not in a position to do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have the greatest pleasure in supporting this Resolution. I think it is going to go a long way in galvanising the position of West Indies Governments, and it is going to give Barbados or put Barbados in a position in which it has the right to be, in taking the lead in these important constitutional matters, and not allow our colleagues in the other colonies to feel that because Barbados might be in a constitutional position that is somewhat higher than theirs, we feel that we are so better off that it is not our duty to help them. I support this Resolution in my own name; I support it in the name of all the Trade Unions in our Organisation in the Caribbean, the Congress of Labour, and I have the greatest pleasure in seconding the passing of this Resolution. *(Cheers)*

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, hon. members who intend to speak after me need not have any serious state of worry, because I am not usually a long-winded speaker. Like any other Barbadian or West Indian, I am particularly interested in this Resolution, and I would not let it go by without voicing my opinion as to what is taking place affecting the constitution of our neighbouring colony of Grenada. It was only last night just as I was about to leave home that I heard a part of the B.B.C. news wherein it was mentioned - I just caught the end of it - that something was taking place in Grenada which I knew would affect the people of Grenada adversely.

Now, Sir, this Resolution as it has been presented by the Hon. Premier reads:-

'RESOLVED that this House strongly protests against the action taken under the authority of the West Indies Act, 1962 by the Government of the United Kingdom in suspending the Constitution of Grenada and in dissolving the Legislative and Executive Councils of that Island.'

Sir, it seems to me rather peculiar that at this time in the development of the West Indies politically, that this West Indies Act, which we have heard so little about, has the authority to grant Orders-in-Council which affect the constitution of these Islands. I listened to the Hon. Premier most carefully, and I do appreciate the position that the Barbados delegation found themselves in when they were recently in England having talks about a new constitution for the eight territories that intend to form a new Federation. I think that what has always been affecting West Indian progress as far as any form of Federation is concerned, is that there has always been a great measure of internal jealousy and inter-Island jealousy between the peoples of the various Islands.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when something is done that affects one particular territory, particularly if that something relates to the constitutional status of that Island and the constitutional rights of the inhabitants of the Island, I think it is full time that every other British West Indies colony should sit up and learn and act.
5.10 p.m.

I think the Hon. Premier is very, very right and I was listening most carefully to the manner in which he presented what he said in backing up this Resolution. Somehow or other, it is difficult not to see some taint, nor to see some relationship between what has previously taken place and the report of what the administration of that Island of Grenada wants to reveal. One is bound to think that somewhere this most recent action has stemmed or is in some way associated with the recent report which has been published concerning the mal-administration of public funds in Grenada. As I have said, I had to listen very carefully to the Hon. Premier and I was very much relieved when he told the House that he in no way associated this Resolution with the report. I was very glad when he was at pains to

point out the purpose of the Commission of Enquiry and said that it would be somewhat unfair for a public prosecution to stem from what was reported from the Commission of Enquiry, knowing full well that after such a matter has been given so much ventilation, a public prosecution proceeding from that enquiry would be such that the people's minds would be biased as far as giving a sound decision. Therefore, I am very glad to see the way in which the Government is looking at it and that there is no question of our wanting to condone the actions of Mr. Gairy. It is no business of ours and we should not put ourselves in such a high and pre-eminent position that we remain on a high pedestal and do not care what happens to Grenada. I feel that we should feel as if we had been affected and it is no good consolation to us that assurance has been given that similar Orders-in-Council would not affect Barbados.

I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that there should be joint action by West Indian legislators on an occasion such as this. Why at this particular time, when the old Federation had been broken up and we hope to form ourselves for a new Federation, why should these retrograde and backward steps be taking place? It seems to be rather clumsy procedure on the part of the Colonial Office. Surely, some other remedy can be found. If that enquiry in Grenada has revealed that there should be certain safety measures to safeguard and protect public funds, surely, it does not take so much ingenuity for the lawyers of the Colonial Office to give that sort of advice to stop what has been taking place in the past; but to introduce a measure like this which affects every citizen in Grenada in my view, is proceeding in a very awkward and clumsy fashion in the middle of the twentieth century. That is why we cannot afford to take this thing lying down, and as Barbados is a Colony where we have a good measure of internal self-government, I think it is more incumbent on us, being the sort of elderly sister, to act, and to act promptly and to protect and condemn the most unaccountable action of the Colonial Office.

This may not be the end, I do not know, Sir, but you always have to look for a background: and believe me I have been searching my mind to find out what is the real purpose of it all. I never like - it was never a habit of mine - to attach blame on somebody else. I cannot give an explanation and I do not think the Hon. Premier himself can give an explanation of it; and that is where I think we all are in some measure of doubt as to what permitted this 1962 West Indian Act and the new Order-in-Council to affect the other Islands of the Caribbean, while we were given the assurance that we are exempted. I do not feel very much assured myself and this is bound to act adversely on the getting together of these eight islands. They have not yet met and adopted the report. They are about to do it now and it seems to me that just as we are about to think more and more about Federation and commit ourselves to something tangible, it seems as if we are being frustrated in witnessing a temporary emasculation, speaking from a constitutional point of view, of the constitution of one of our sister colonies.

Sir, I heartily commend the Hon. Premier and his Government for taking this swift action. I heard a bit of it on the B.B.C. last night and I saw a little something about it in this morning's newspaper, but I think West Indian leaders have got to be more probing as to why at this particular time this new Act and this Order-in-Council are made. We have to protest as citizens of the West Indies. We have to steel our backs and make up our minds and be more and more determined and united and willing to rescue one of our sister colonies from this action of the British Government. Although this seems to be a temporary measure, it is going to have very serious effect. Without doubt, before any new elections can take place in Grenada, there may be a changed constitution. Nobody knows what that change will be. We have got to be on guard and what really matters is the timing, that at this particular time in our constitutional development, this issue has taken place and that is why we have to be worried about this.

Sir, I feel so worried that I could not hope to be lengthy in my speech on this matter. I give this Resolution my hearty support and I have no doubt that every hon. member

of this House and every right thinking citizen would welcome this Resolution today and hope that it would be as effective as it should be.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I too would like to say something on this matter which is contained in the Resolution before this House. I say this with rather deep feelings; history, particularly English History, is nauseating as it represents itself in acts of this kind perpetuated by the British Government, more particularly the Colonial Office. Not so long ago, Mr. Lennox Boyd was removed from office because he failed in Africa with British Colonial policy.
5.20 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution does not go far enough. It is not positive; what is more, I would like to say that it would be impossible for me to contend as to the question of squandermania in Grenada as reported by the Commission of Enquiry in that country. I have my own feelings about this matter. I am not in any position to defend and I do not want to defend anybody; I do not know that the gentleman would want our defence in this matter. If the case is in the Courts, I would say that you should send him to prison for ever; but what is important is the effect which this action is bound to have on the people of the West Indies. We know only too well what is meant by this. Today we have heard what the Hon. Premier has said and I understand he said that Sir Grantley Adams has caused the Federation to be broken up. We have heard that, but we can pass over it.

You will hear the question raised as to whether independence should be given to British Guiana. I say that history will repeat itself and it is unceasing. If you were to think of two thousand years, this will continue to re-appear in the history of a country which is trying to find a place under the sun. We were invited to discuss the question of a nation in the making and what would be more important to West Indians as citizens of the World? You have Nkrumah who was released from prison and he became Prime Minister of Ghana. Even at this distance I can hear the clank of the cell door when Nkrumah was released from prison, elected by his people to be Prime Minister of Ghana, and less than a year after he was invited to share a room on the second floor of Buckingham Palace with the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh. We cannot say all that can be said about Jomo Kenyatta. It makes you tremble and you feel as if you were in some camp where you would be perspiring. For nearly two hundred years you have been pondering and wondering if you really mean to have independence. We know what is taking place; we know the Colonial type of officials who will feel that you may crawl away to the top of the ladder but something must happen, as if it were a sudden slip, and then you come down to the last rung of independence. The moment that a child is born you have to buy your food and you become a citizen.

The human rights of the people of Grenada would have to be shattered in a moment and there you have a helpless and defenceless people. When you think of independence for an area, do you think you must assume superiority? And if you think of this Resolution I say that the Leaders of the West Indies should be arriving in England to protest against this action which has been taken by the United Kingdom Government. The country probably reeks with the odour and filth because of the poverty of an island which had a grant-in-aid from the British Government.

This Resolution is but a first-class joke. Since yesterday the Leaders of the West Indies knew of what had taken place and some of these Leaders should be in London now. If this is something for which Mr. Gairy should be sent to prison, well, send him there and I will be there to welcome him. (Laughter). Because of his vanity, he probably bought two pianos and he probably had fourteen suits; but I say that if anything is wrong you should send him to prison; you do not crush the constitution of the Island. Do you know the scar which will remain on a helpless and defenceless people? And here we are, sitting down talking about imperialism and you are criticising somebody about a vote! This is the aspiration of every breathing soul in the West Indies; you are lowering human dignities. It has taken about ten

generations to remove the scars and today we are moving this little Resolution! The position is humiliating and embarrassing.

Some years ago you had somebody saying: 'Tonight is going to be a funny day', and he was sent to prison for nine months. I am saying, and I repeat, that the Leaders of the West Indies should be in London and demanding an audience with the Colonial Office. This is something which is denying one a place in the sun; this action on the part of the United Kingdom Government is denying somebody his sovereign right. Not so long ago in British Guiana when there was the wrecking of the City of Georgetown, Mr. Maudling would not dare go and upset the British Guiana constitution, but today that is what is being done in the West Indies.
5.30 p.m.

I do not want you to feel, Sir, that I am condoning his attitude, but are you going to tell me that the entire population of a country should suffer and be reduced to a state of humiliation because you believe by some Report that somebody is guilty on the grounds that he bought a Baby Grand piano? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am hoping that the Hon. Premier and the Government of this country really realise what is taking place. You have been having sweet dreams over a new Constitution, but you will remember that on the verge of nationhood of the West Indies, Jamaica was told to ask for Independence and the request would be granted. You will remember too, what was told to the Premier of Trinidad. He was told to ask for Independence, and indeed he could go to the country in an election and have it. In all the criticism and discussions which we have had, including those of the Premier, no mention was made of the Order-in-Council on the collapse of the Federation which had been elected by all the adult souls of the ten Federated territories. Nothing was said of this, Sir; but we know that Sir Stephen Luke has power through the Colonial Office to reduce the constitution in Barbados to that of a Crown Colony, though this country for 300 years has enjoyed a more advanced constitution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, sometimes we should pay silent tribute and respect to the planters and mercantile community of this country, because when we may have been forced like Grenada and the other islands into being a grant-in-aid territory, the local planters said that the British Government could give budgetary assistance by any name, Colonial Development and Welfare, Cess or whatever you call it, but remove and free our country of the embarrassment which of necessity would follow the ties of a grant-in-aid territory. We have a lot to be proud of, and I am not in doubt one minute that we have been sleeping in spite of our talk of internal control, of our own Government and our own affairs. We know that Sir Stephen Luke cannot promise anything; but if it is at all necessary you would see the application of colonial rule in Barbados, something that has never happened in 300 years. The Colonial Office is always waiting for the opportunity of a split in the community to get into the breach, and divide and rule.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe in another year or two you will have an election in Grenada, and until then there would be no attempt to discuss Federation. What are we to do with the tentative arrangements as envisaged and expected by the Pre-Federal Organisation of the eight federating units? Do you believe that because Gairy himself as Leader was accused of this irregularity in the country's finances that this has occurred? This does not only affect Grenada, but all of us as a nation. Another attempt to be nationals is going to be foiled again. That is the technique of the Colonial Office to mar our aspirations and our dreams, and it is always at the silent moment when it is too late. I have no doubt whatever that it is too trivial a matter to bring the huge and uncomfortable axe of the Colonial Office down on the constitution of Grenada. It is not meant to hurt Gairy; it is not meant to hurt the Colonial Office; but you will remember that Mr. Maudling, Secretary of State for the Colonies, wanted us to examine further the viability of the federating eight units, and these tactics have been practised and repeated through the centuries in almost every territory.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to say to the Premier that this Resolution is not good enough. Mr. Maudling would

only light another cigarette and smile at this. This is the sort of Negro tear that is not worth anything. Do you think that Negro tears by the gallon will be recognised anywhere in the Colonial Office? There is a way to handle this, and I believe that with agitation you can get the sympathy of the democratic, thinking world if you write to England and ask them to lock up Gairy forever, but to remove the humiliation of the many souls in Grenada on whom the suspension of the Constitution is bound to have its effect, and also denying us an opportunity to become a nation. They knew that if they gave Jamaica independence along with Trinidad, the eight small Islands were gone forever. Today the British find themselves looking away from the Empire or what is left of it and looking to a common association on the Continent; yet they said to Jamaica and to Trinidad that all they need to do is to ask for Independence, because they knew that by coming out of the Federation of the ten units, it would only leave the strangling Eight. That has happened only because the Eight are willing to come together. Would that something should happen to fuse them together and destroy the accident of geography which keeps us apart.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, now that we are satisfied that it is going to work, the vilest attempt is being made to bring a number of citizens to push an election off in Grenada, and then you know there will only be seven territories. I do not think the Resolution goes far enough. I feel that you should write a letter and demand a meeting with the Colonial Secretary. If you fail in that, you should fly to London and call a Board of Enquiry, lock up Gairy in England if necessary, and remove the humiliation that exists now in our only hope to have a union at least within another two decades through the formation of the association of these Eight territories. Heaven help us if a little thing like this should foil our attempt! I will tell the Hon. Premier not to let it rest on his soul and not to have it as a prick of conscience because he failed at this crucial moment to save whatever is left of this growing nation.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not be very long because the Premier has expounded on the theories of this Resolution so much, that it has left very little for me to say. But you will permit me to digress a bit in bringing this analogy to you. Let us go back to 1953. The British Guiana Constitution was suspended on the pretence that Mr. Jagan was a Communist. Mr. Jagan only became a Communist because he went to some Communist country. That, I have noticed, Sir, in the British way of ruling, always make a coloured man a Communist. Jomo Kenyatta was also a Communist because he wanted an education and got one in a Communist state; but it did not make Clement Attlee and Edith Summerskill and the bunch of them Communists. 5.40 p.m.

As soon as a coloured man sees fit to go behind the Iron Curtain, he is always branded as a Communist. As soon as a coloured man makes a statement relative to something pertinent to himself and his people, he is always branded as a Communist. Mr. Clement Attlee, who is Lord Attlee now, went to China and had the temerity to come back and tell the western world that he did not see any flies. He must have been in a glass case painted black. He was not branded as a Communist, yet he came back with a lot of ideology of what great work the Communists were doing in China.

Going back to British Guiana, the Government of British Guiana was dissolved by an Order-in-Council and I notice that none of the West Indian leaders had the temerity to tell the British Government where they were getting off. They all stayed put. They did not think that the day would come when an Order-in-Council would be also applied to the other West Indian countries. However, we have lived long enough to see it applied to Grenada yesterday.

In 1953, in England, not under the present Government which is in power but the Conservative Government under the leadership of Sir Winston Churchill, Mr. Oliver Lyttleton was appointed Secretary of State for the Colonies. Sir Winston Churchill knew as well as I did that Mr. Oliver

Lyttleton had a negro phobia. The British Commonwealth is comprised of 560 million people and of that number 80 million were white; therefore, that left 480 million coloured. Imagine that just a handful of people want to rule 480 million people and the 480 million have no say whatsoever in their destiny. They have dissolved the Grenada Government because of malspending. I am not here to castigate or condone what Mr. Gairy has done but if you want to talk of misspending, let us go back to 1956 when the British Government then misspent a lot of money in the Suez crisis. If you are going to talk of misspending, let us go back to 1939. As the Hon. Premier pointed out, there was something like £2,000 million that was misspent, yet still the people of Great Britain had to be drilling with broomsticks. They can always see something wrong as soon as one of our leaders talks of our rights. We are branded as Communists. Every time that emerging countries such as Africa and the West Indies talk about getting equal status with other people who are enjoying everything, we are branded as Communists. So long as you do not sit down on your rights and do not go to them with your hat in your hand, you are a Communist. The same British Government took up \$1 million and gave it Marshal Tito who is an arch-Communist and who will eventually fight against them.

They give Grenada a little grant-in-aid; they do not give Grenada what an ordinary worker in England would work for in a year; but imagine the British Government sending out a Governor to that country and he has the power to tell the people what he wants them to do. They say that there would have to be new elections. Mr. Gairy was elected by the people and I make bold to say that if they had an election tomorrow, Mr. Gairy would win again with a bigger majority. It is time that we in the West Indies banded ourselves together; we have been looking at things in what they call a one-way traffic line too long.

We have a tendency to be secular and we have a tendency of saying that it could not happen to us. In Africa, when they locked up Kenyatta, the other West Indian leaders did not say anything about it. It is not that if they said anything it would make the British Government release Kenyatta. I can prove that a man came and swore that he was paid to lie on Kenyatta. At the time Mr. Winston Churchill said that he could understand something like this happening in the fifteenth century, but he could not understand it happening in the twentieth century. The British Government had an election soon after that and Mr. Churchill's Government got into power. Immediately after his Government came into power, he went one step further and kidnapped the Kabaka of Buganda. They suspend what they like and keep what they like. They locked up Dr. Hastings Banda of Southern Rhodesia because he said that Africa was Africa and was for the Africans. Why did the same Order-in-Council not apply to Sir Roy Welensky? He said that if the British Government tried to interfere in their affairs, the Colony of Rhodesia would do no less than the American colonies at the time, which meant that they would take up arms against the British Government if they had interfered in their affairs.

I was appalled to hear two people the other day talking of the fairness of British justice. It is true that British justice deals fairly to everybody but there is no kind of justice which is real justice. For instance, as regards the Africans in Africa, those who have been given the right to vote have one vote, but the minority group are allowed to monopolise the votes. Any Englishman in England can only vote once but it is not so with those in somebody else's land in Africa.

I remember the Hon. Premier mentioned that in British Guiana the constitution was suspended because somebody had painted something on some statue. New Zealand has the second highest standard of living in the world. (A VOICE: Where have you got that from?) I have been there. Switzerland is first, New Zealand second and Bermuda third. Although New Zealand has the second highest standard of living in the world, you see there filth written on walls. Hon. members will remember, because this is just a few years ago, there was somebody going about

painting a Swastika on certain things. People have a tendency to do these things; therefore, I do not see that that was anything to suspend a constitution of a country for.

If I may go back to mismanagement, you will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the British Government spent \$1 million on a peanut venture in Africa and then they went digging for oil the same place after that venture was not successful. That was mismanagement because the venture was a failure. No constitution was suspended because of that. But because the hon. Mr. Gairy felt like spending money in a way which he felt, whether it was right or wrong, it is not good enough to say that you suspend a constitution because of that. I am not in favour of anybody mispending money. As the hon. junior member for St. George has said, if Mr. Gairy has been found guilty of mispending, send him to gaol; but it is not good enough to suspend the constitution of a colony and then you stay in England and dissolve something which you know nothing about.

5.50 p.m.

That is not good enough. I am sure that if you were to put the matter back to the vote you will see that Mr. Gairy would win again. Why did they not suspend the constitution in Cyprus? They did not do that because they would be dealing with people of a different colour. The English people want to tell us what we must do. As far as this Resolution is concerned, I would like to see the word "condemn" used rather than the word "protest" against the action of the Government in the United Kingdom, because it is time that we let these people know how we feel about this matter. In supporting this Resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot do anything more than hope that if a thing like this ever arises again, whether it be in the West Indies or in the African States, my Government, as well as other West Indian Governments, will see fit to pass Resolutions condemning the action of the British Government in like manner.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has now been six months since I believe that the entire island has been saying that there was no opposition in this House because there was never a discordant note sounded against the Government; but this afternoon this note will be sounded. I defy anybody in this country to accuse me of being an Uncle Tom for my political career in this country or to accuse me of being an imperial stooge or of attempting at anytime to send West Indians down the river. I make these few remarks because from the Premier's lips we heard that in the past, in the not very distant past, you have had men of learning, men of letters and in very strong opposition, men learned in the constitutional issues and in the law, men who could very well be singled out and characterised as such. This Resolution reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that this House strongly protests against the action taken under the authority of the West Indies Act, 1962, by the Government of the United Kingdom in suspending the Constitution of Grenada and in dissolving the Legislative and Executive Councils of that Island."

I do not think that the Hon. Premier would remember, but I think it was during the period when he was away from the Conference when we were discussing this Order-in-Council. Mr. Hugh Fraser pointed out that it would apply to all of the territories. I was quick enough to ask him if Barbados was included. He replied: "Yes". I had the copy of the cable in which he said that it would not apply to Barbados. I reminded him of that and he was caught in a web from which he could not extricate himself. It caused some worry on the part of the other members. I have been listening to what the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said and I do agree with him. I am not speaking against Mr. Gairy as such; I stood alone on the floor of this house and protested against a Socialist Government agreeing that Mr. Cheddi Jagan had been a Communist. I made it clear that Mr. Jagan should be allowed to land in Barbados and you could charge him if anything went wrong. We cannot do as we like because we are governed by the law. I hold in my hand now the "Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Control of public expenditure

and subsequently," published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office, and I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you will give me as much latitude as you gave the Hon. Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is just what is expected of me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As far as I am concerned, I view the matter in this way. I have heard very strong arguments advanced by the Hon. Premier and by the hon. senior member for St. Peter; but there is an old slogan which says that two wrongs do not make a right. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that similar things had been said about me, but those who go into politics and do not want things to be said about them, well, then, they had better get out of politics. What would be the result of the next Election in Grenada? If I misquote the Hon. Premier, I hope that he will correct me. What I am worried somewhat about the passing of this Resolution is this; one of the finest speeches which I consider the Premier made at the Conference was the speech in which he made it clear that we are not accustomed to certain things being done and he mentioned one of those things. He explained the procedure adopted before money could be taken out of the Treasury; that was the evening when we were having discussions at the Conference, when it was intimated that if we agreed to have inserted in the White Paper provision for an enquiry into the island at all, Grenada would pull out. I do not think that I am bringing out any secrets when I say that when that was pushed into the Premier's hands he handed it to me and it was handed all around. Grenada should be the last people, especially the Leader of the Government, to adopt such an attitude.

6.00 p.m.

It was on that occasion that I supported very strongly the idea of having provisions for an Enquiry if and when it became necessary and what action should be taken. I think we made it quite clear that there should be no idea of just taking away the Constitution. As can be seen in the White Paper, time was allowed for the unit territories to act, and if within a certain period they did not act, then the Federal Legislature could act. For some reason unknown to me, Mr. Gairy, Leader of Grenada, might be the most honest or dishonest man in the world. I am not prepared to judge. What I have in front of me is not really a Report of the Enquiry although it says so; to me it is a misnomer. It is the findings of the Enquiry without recommendations, because an Enquiry in my opinion should have some sort of evidence which people can go by.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I repeat that I am about the only person living now that caused an Enquiry to be made on an expatriate, an Englishman, in Barbados which was presided over by Mr. Hilton Vaughan. I have read this Report very carefully, and for the benefit of hon. members who have not read it, it is not only signed by Mr. F. E. Field, but by Mr. H. A. Watson, Mr. E. H. Hollis, and the Secretary Mr. E. E. Hunte. This is a Report of the Enquiry which I had in England, and I believe the Hon. Premier must have one. I remember discussing the matter with the Hon. Mr. Gairy at the time when I believe the hierarchy knew that the Report would be published, and the Grenada delegation boycotted the Conference in London. To show you that I was not taking a stand against Mr. Gairy, I had a talk with the legal luminaries concerning this gentleman — I think one of them was a Barbadian, Mr. John Husbands — and suggested that it was foolish to adopt that attitude because the Report was going to come out. I said I thought it was the time to face the issue, because we did not know what was in the Report and we were prepared to stand by him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, an Enquiry was instituted at the instance of the Administrator of Grenada, Mr. Gairy, I believe, not only had the right to defend himself at that Enquiry, but in common practice it would be his right to cross-examine those witnesses. Before this Report was issued, Mr. Gairy had an opportunity of cross-examining the witnesses. After some legal battles between the various courts, it was held that the Administrator had every right to have this enquiry. After the Report was published, Mr. Gairy was asked for his comments in view of the fact that

he did not take the opportunity of going before the Commission, putting in his own evidence and cross-examining the witnesses to see whether they were lying or telling the truth. I read in the English Press one morning that Mr. Gairy had said it was a bogus Report and a bunch of lies.

Now there is no responsible leader in any country who would say that a Report is a bogus Report when it has been compiled by responsible men taking all sorts of evidence from Civil Servants. It was very stupid of Mr. Gairy to say that. The British people have a peculiar way of doing things. I heard the Hon. Premier say that what happens in other territories could never happen in Barbados, although I heard him refer.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I would like to correct the hon. member.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not finished the point which I am making.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not going to have the hon. member telling me at what stage I must make a point of order. If you rule, Sir, I will sit down. I will not have the hon. member misquoting what I said in London or in any other place. I pointed out to the Secretary of State that there were certain safeguards written into the Barbados Constitution, and at least, they should have these safeguards.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of explanation,.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You cannot have a point of explanation on a point of order. I am asking you to rule, Sir, because there is only one procedure. This is not the Bridgetown City Council, and I am not going to have him getting up on a point of order and interrupting.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I told the hon. member that I had not finished what I was about to say.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Rule of the House which says that two members of the House should not be on their feet has not been suspended.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will hear the Hon. Premier on his point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to have the hon. member or any other hon. member misquoting what I have said, and I do not think the hon. member should take advantage of the debate to say so, because we are being more tolerant on this side and not interrupting the hon. member unduly. The hon. member is repeating that I said in London that these things never happened in Barbados. That is not what I said. I said in London that at least the safeguards written into the Barbados Constitution should be written into the Constitution of the other seven units. For me with a due sense of responsibility to say that they have never happened in Barbados, I would be the most abysmal liar under the sun, because you can make laws, but the laws are broken every day. I was insisting that these half-baked, financial provisions in the other islands should be repealed and the constitutional safeguards which are written into the Barbados Constitution should also apply to every other island. At no time did I say that there have never been breaches of these constitutional safeguards, because there are breaches of law, both constitutional, criminal and civil in Barbados all the time. I have made that abundantly clear. As a matter of fact, the hon. senior member for St. Peter has pointed out that time and time again.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member has made his point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You do not know that I have made a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When you refer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, you are going off the point of order. I will now hear the hon. senior member for the City.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Just as you say, Sir, but I would not like the hon. member to continue in that way, because I would get up and interrupt on another point of order and I would have a lot more to say, and as the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, a lot of us would go to gaol. 6.10 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would like the hon. member to know that as far as I am concerned he got up on a point of order before he allowed me to explain. I did not intend to stop there. I know that certain irregularities would happen in Barbados, but if you choose to interrupt in that way, you can. How can I prevent you?

When the Hon. Premier was in England, in one of his finest speeches he made it clear that in Barbados there were these safeguards. He did not let me go on to elaborate. What he said was that there were safeguards under which money could not be taken from the Treasury. In other words, let me put it this way. When it was brought out that the Minister of Finance in Grenada could sign a warrant to bring money out of the Government, the Hon. Premier pointed out that those things could not take place in Barbados. Am I right?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If he meant that under the Barbados constitution in contradistinction to the Grenada constitution that a Minister of Finance should not and may not sign a voucher, he is correct.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is all I want to make clear. While I was discussing this matter, a member pointed out, and this was dealt with, that there was no question on the report of Mr. Gairy. This was dealt with by the entire delegations of the eight territories. They were told that there were safeguards in Barbados under which no money could come out in this way in Barbados as it could come out in the other territories.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hope the hon. member would not say that it could not come out in other ways because several times monies were voted for one thing in Barbados and were being diverted for purposes which were completely unknown to the Legislature.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That was not the point which I was raising. You have made it clear and I have made it clear. We are not at loggerheads on this. As far as I am concerned, I have never seen two wrongs make a right. This is a question of protesting against the taking away of a constitution. Am I right? At times I am more willing to be guided by the Hon. Premier of this House than I have been during the sixteen years which I have been in here by any other lawyer in the House. Am I right in saying that there is a difference between suspension of the constitution and the taking away of the constitution? That is what I am trying to get at.

Now, if the Hon. Premier will recall this, I remember asking this question: "what next is the position?" I believe every other member of the delegation asked after that report was out: "what would be the next position in Grenada?" And I think I am correct in saying that the Hon. Premier said he could not see any prosecution being made under the circumstances. (Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that it would be up to the people.) I asked him myself; Mr. Bird asked him and all the other members of the other territories asked him. It was rumoured by the Secretary of State for the Colonies that Mr. Gairy's report would be out tomorrow and the next day when it was out, the hon. member and other members asked him: "what next?"

What I want explained by the Hon. Premier before I bring myself to support the Resolution before us is, if it is up to the people of Grenada, Mr. Gairy has been elected by the people of Grenada. This is my condemnation of the British Government in this entire matter. Whether this was against Mr. Gairy or a member of the Barbados delegation, I still have faith in British justice. But the British people went out of their way after an offence had been committed by Mr. Gairy under the Representation of the People's Act,

and for what reason we do not know, they themselves legalised the position although a Barbadian Judge gave the judgment and I have not heard one lawyer or judge say that that judgment was wrong. I have discussed this matter with lawyers even from Grenada. The all-powerful British Government decided that we would enfranchise this man again and now Mr. Gairy comes back in and this offence is committed. When we ask: "what next is the position," is it that you should go to the people?

I am the last person in this Island to associate myself with the British people using an Order-in-Council. They cannot use it against Barbados and I say it should not be used against any of the other Islands. You have given back Mr. Gairy the franchise and he has taken charge of Grenada again.

I will say this about this Report. We have made up our minds on it for the simple reason that we have not swung. I personally condemn Mr. Gairy for not taking advantage of the opportunity afforded him to make out his own case against those persons who gave evidence in order to show that they were not telling the truth; but this is the Report which the law would have power to deal with and merely to stand on one side and wait until the findings of the Enquiry had been published and then say: "Oh! this is a bogus Enquiry; all of it is a bunch of lies", anybody can say that. I ask myself this single question. Take what the Hon. Premier himself has said. The only thing which you can do after this is what? The suspending of the constitution is not an offence on Mr. Gairy but an offence on principle. How else can you go to the people of Grenada? Maybe, the Hon. Premier can answer this question. Mr. Gairy was not allowed to sit in the Legislature of Grenada for five years after he had contravened the regulations. The British Government said that he could run at the elections. He offered himself after the elections and he captured the Government. Despite all this which has written against him in this Report, I feel that he can capture the Government of Grenada again. I want to know if the only opportunity is going to the people again. I am no constitutional lawyer: I know nothing of it. I ask this simple question: can Mr. Lloyd the Administrator of Grenada call an election? That is the simple question I am asking.
6.20 p.m.

It is obvious that Mr. Gairy has a tremendous following. I do not know what the Government knows about the suspension of the constitution, but they must have had some cable from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. We heard it over the radio; it is not merely a question of the suspension of the constitution of Grenada and that is why I am more than worried. I came in here prepared to discuss the matter concerning the White Paper. They have not only suspended the constitution, but made provision for somebody to be Minister of Finance or something of the sort; that is contrary to all that we have discussed. This is a matter of suspending the constitution and going further; it is suspending the constitution and doing something which is contrary to what we agreed to in the eight territories.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking this question: we are resolving that we deprecate the action taken by the United Kingdom Government in suspending this constitution. Is that all we are deprecating? We have discussed the method by which we should form a Federation and the method by which your unit territories should operate. Nothing was said at the Conference to the effect that the British Government would have, by an Order-in-Council, to appoint any person to Grenada in relation to financial affairs.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of explanation. It is clear to me that the hon. member has not studied the West Indies Act, 1962, particularly the Clause to which I made reference, that is Clause 5. The constitution of Grenada was taken away last night. The hon. member has said that they are going further and appointing somebody to take control of the finances of the colony. That is exactly the point which I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members. When the Federal House of Representatives and the Senate in the height of their folly decided to vote large sums of money for the compensation of Minis-

ters, and incidentally, the other members of the Legislature, the Bill was introduced by the Minister of Finance; the same Section 5 of the West Indies Act was invoked by the United Kingdom Government to deprive the Minister of Finance of his portfolio and to vest the authority of the control of the finances into the hands of the Governor General of the Federation. Taking away the portfolio and giving it to somebody else is the first step we said that should have been taken before you take away the constitution from the people. It would be good to say that Mr. Gairy was incompetent as Minister of Finance. They could have said: "We will take away the control of the finances and we are giving it to the Queen's representative, Mr. Lloyd; we are putting him in charge of the finances." Is the hon. member seriously standing up there today and seriously telling us that the British Government is justified in doing what we consider as taking away the constitution of the island of Grenada? That is what he has to resolve in his mind. The hon. member is saying what the members of his Party have told him to say; he is now debating the matter with two sides of his mouth. His commonsense and knowledge of nationalism have told him that there is something inherently wrong in the action which he has taken. If anything I have said has assisted the hon. member, I will be glad that it is of assistance to him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can speak with both sides of my mouth. Let the Premier get this straight; there is no Party or anybody who can dictate to me as to how I should come in here and talk. No Party or nobody can tell me how I should talk in here. I do what I think is right in the interest of the people. I thank the Hon. Premier for his explanation, but I repeat that nobody or no Party can tell me what I should say. I have discussed the White Paper with my Party; that is a part of my duty and I think it is fair. But how can the Hon. Premier accuse me of saying what my Party has told me to say when the Clerk handed this Resolution to me when I came in here today?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not accusing the hon. member of not carrying out Party discipline.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In this respect we are not even half brothers. I do not feel that I am a whole fool. I have listened to people who use flowery words and I will say that I am tempted to be guided by the Hon. Premier on economic aspects. Probably, I will be guided by my own son if he - well I had better not say that. (Laughter) I will repeat what I have already said; nearly every member except Mr. Gairy consulted the Premier of Barbados as a lawyer as to what would be the next step. The hon. member has told us: "Go to the people". Is there any difference between suspending and taking away? You took away the constitution of Jamaica, of Trinidad and of British Guiana - all these had their constitutions taken away. Is this the method of going to the people or could Mr. Lloyd or the British Government by an Order-in-Council suspend the constitution by calling for a new election or giving Mr. Lloyd instructions to call for a new election?
6.30 p.m.

We object to the suspension of the constitution. I think you will recall, Sir, that the Report sets out that you cannot suspend a constitution, but if after about six weeks following an enquiry the particular territory did not act, then the Governor-General could call an election. Now I do not pretend to be any constitutionalist or to know any law. When the Report was published, we saw in the London Press that Mr. Gairy referred to it as being bogus and nonsense. That is not good enough. You are a lawyer and you would know that if this is nonsense, it would be libel and Mr. Gairy would have a case. I am not arguing about that now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it fell upon me in the Premier's absence to ask the Secretary of State whether this Order-in-Council applied to Barbados. He said "yes" and then caught himself and said "no", and I drew to his attention a copy of the cable which I had in my file; but I say like the hon. senior member for St. Peter if a crisis occurred, in as much as he said "no", that they would act upon it. Why are they acting upon this? We heard a few days ago since the Report has been published that Mr. Gairy had something

prepared in America, but all we did hear from him was that it was a bogus Report. If you are going to prepare something, you are going to do it for the public not only in Grenada, but in the whole of the West Indies, because you are now asking the Barbados public to judge, and back up the people in Grenada. You will see, Sir, that I am refraining from mentioning any names in this Report, because it is Mr. Gairy's right to say that it is a bogus Report, although it is not good enough to say just that.

Immediately after the Report was published, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we heard that the British Government had given instructions to withdraw the grant-in-aid. I thought myself that that was as far as the British would have gone with Grenada. What the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said is this: merely to pass this Resolution does not seem to be doing anything. We sat and discussed the entire question of Federation, and I do not know why the Hon. Premier chose to mention the Regulations or the law or whatever it is about Mr. Bradshaw as Financial Secretary, because I am not talking about that at all. What I am talking about is that the British Government has suspended the constitution and they will appoint in Grenada unlike Barbados, St. Vincent, St. Kitts or Antigua an Administrator, that is, a financial officer, to take care of finances. Now when they do that, it is as good as saying to the Minister in charge that he is only a puppet Minister.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I help the hon. member? I tried to make it clear to him just now that the Government of Barbados was not consulted, neither has any official communication been received; but according to the cables which we received from Grenada, Antigua and St. Kitts and the things which were broadcast over the British Broadcasting Corporation last night, not only has the Order-in-Council suspended the constitution of Grenada: it has also dissolved the Legislative and Executive Councils of that Island; therefore there are no Ministers. It has also appointed the Administrator Mr. James Lloyd as the sole Executive and Legislative authority in the Island. I thought the hon. member understood that from the beginning. For the hon. member to say that the same Order-in-Council applying to the Federation or words to that effect is not relevant is more than I can understand, because it is very much germane to the issue we are discussing now, because I was merely pointing out that if a single Minister was guilty of an irregularity in their opinion, all they had to do was to appoint somebody else to do his job.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member thinks I am just trying to tease or oppose. I have made it clear that I am not here to oppose for the sake of opposing. What I would like the hon. member to tell me is whether this is merely a device for the holding of an election, because the British Government could not be so stupid as to suspend the constitution, and having talked with the eight territories say that he must go permanently and therefore they are going to put somebody in Grenada to carry on its affairs until there were further talks. I should like to know for how long they have suspended the constitution. Where I agree with the hon. senior member for St. Peter is that instead of passing this Resolution, you as leaders of the Units who sat together and discussed this entire matter should approach the Secretary of State collectively and ask on what grounds he has suspended the constitution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. Is the hon. member serious that we should go cap in hand to the Secretary of State and ask him to give us the grounds on which he suspended the constitution? We are concerned about what he had done, not the motives he may have had. The members of your Party seem to enjoy the confidence of the British Government; so you can ask them to tell you. We are only concerned about the impact it has made on the West Indies to the outside world.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am going to answer you as you have answered me. You do not want any explanation; the constitution has been suspended, Mr. Lloyd is in charge and that is the end of it. You will pass this and it will go into the waste paper basket. I think it is so much waste of time. 6.40 p.m.

I do not mean that you should go hat in hand; you would be demanding. They have just sat and decided something; that is, because you have had this enquiry, and this enquiry according to their Report revealed certain things, and you yourself and the leaders of the West Indies in Parliament have never seen any evidence about it. You are saying that you have suspended the constitution. I am not asking you to go cap in hand. I am wondering whether it is good enough. The hon. member said: should we go hat in hand? Then, what next it is? The constitution of Grenada will still be suspended. After all, I sat and heard when the members of the Windwards and Leewards, although they were grant-aided people, spoke, and they spoke with greater force and authority to the Colonial Office officials than one would have expected. You should listen to a man like Mr. Bramble or Mr. Bird speaking to the Colonial Office officials. You certainly would not believe that they get grants-in-aid from the Colonial Office.

This is how I feel from my Party's point of view. I condemn Mr. Gairy for the stupid action. I am not accusing him of anything because I have not seen the evidence; but the fact was that there was an enquiry and he did not take any opportunity to defend himself which would strengthen our hands and the hands of the people of Grenada. While I can very well say that similar things can happen in Barbados, and if I may put it in this way, at the first meeting of this House, when the Government brought the Hospital Bill here, when I first read it, I saw in it a vote of \$7,000 which was spent without the knowledge of the Legislature at the time at all. That does not say that it was squandermania and that is why I am very cautious of condemning Mr. Gairy on this Report. What I condemn him for is not giving himself the opportunity to give evidence at the enquiry. When this present Government came into being, one of the first things they came here with was a Resolution for \$7,000 to be spent on the Hospital. Squandermania could be very well attached to somebody in Barbados because that money had already been spent.

What my colleagues and I want to know is whether the suspension is merely for the purpose of doing what you yourself told us who are laymen. The next step, which we pointed out today and when you were in England, was that there was no question of prosecution, or locking up or anything of the sort; it was a question of going to the people for an election. The hon. member had the opportunity of reading certain Ordinances which I have never had the opportunity of reading. Is this merely the procedure to have an election in Grenada? (A VOICE: No.) (ANOTHER VOICE: It is to suspend the constitution of Grenada and have a new one.)

Nobody can convince me that the British Government, after sitting down solemnly with the delegations of the eight territories and deciding that this is the type of constitution for Barbados, St. Kitts and all the other Islands, would say that they are suspending the constitution of Grenada to make a different one. That is the point which I want to get clear.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for the City should know that the constitution which is now suspended is the whole constitution; that means that the Legislature is dissolved and the Executive Council. I should also like to inform the hon. member that the British Government suspended the constitution of Malta and instituted a different one.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the hon. member. I am not above learning. If I want to know something, I will ask the Hon. Premier. You met quite solemnly in London for three weeks and said that you will discuss this White Paper. A constitution was made for the unit territories. My argument is this. You met solemnly and decided that this is the constitution which should be for the eight territories. When the Hon. Premier gets up to discuss the White Paper, he will have to say that Grenada was included in this. You have met and decided that the Ministers should be appointed in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief Minister of the unit and who should be appointed by the Governor-General, and so on. Then, just like a bolt from the blue, without consulting any Minister,

you have selected one unit and decided to suspend the constitution of that unit. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that they are going to suspend the constitution and make another constitution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for the City said that I said so. It is a simple matter. They met in London to deal with the proposals for which a constitution would have to be framed. Grenada already has a constitution by which it is working and that is the constitution which the Order-in-Council has suspended. It is not the proposed constitution for the "Eight".

Mr. MOTTLEY: I understand that quite clearly, what I am saying is that they met solemnly and discussed with the representatives of the people of this area the proposed constitution for the territories and then like a bolt from the blue they are saying: "This is nothing to do with what we are going to allow you to have in your constitution; we are now suspending the constitution of Grenada." 6.50 p.m.

We are now suspending and I have asked the Premier to say whether this suspension is for the purpose of what he told us when we asked him after this report was out on Mr. Gairy, "what next"? All the Premier said what he should go to the people.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said that it was a matter for the people of Grenada; it was not a matter either for the British Government or for the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I did not invite them to hold an Election on the next day. The people put the Gairy Government in power, and if they made up their bed then they must lie in it. I do not like any misinterpretation of anything I have said either in public or in private. The members of the Labour Party have said that I say one thing today and another thing tomorrow. If I attempted to correct all the misinformation which they had in the newspaper, then I would not have any time to do the people's business. If I do not correct anything, it is because I have not got the time to do it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Does the hon. member think that the newspaper would misquote him purposely? I do not think that the hon. member should worry so much about misquotations. This is a question of suspending the constitution of Grenada. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that they are suspending the constitution for a new constitution contrary to what has been agreed upon by the Ministers.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I never said that. What I want the hon. member to understand is this: I know that there was the suspension of the constitution of Malta. There was a situation where the British Government did not like the constitution and they amended that constitution, giving the elected people less power. What is inherent in this constitution is to take away the powers which a Minister had and give them to an Administrator. That matter was not discussed in London. How could we discuss that in London?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The evening on which this matter was discussed, I do not think that the Hon. Premier was there. Mr. and Mr. Southwell said that the Chief Minister of Grenada actually signs vouchers.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. That is a different matter altogether. I would not like the hon. member to say that I was absent. I believe in the six working days. They did not intend to make one single decision at that time because of adjournments and I had to tell the Secretary of State for the Colonies that I had work to do in Barbados. The point raised by the hon. member was about the Commission of Enquiry and he suggested that we set up some machinery which would give power to suspend the constitution and to give power to call an election. But if the hon. member would look at page 19 paragraph 28 of the Report of the Eastern Caribbean Conference, he would see that it was set out there. This is what that paragraph states:

"The Federal Government would have power to appoint a commission of enquiry to investigate any matters tending to undermine the financial stability and good government in any part of the Federation."

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is what I said.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I wish that the hon. member would allow me to read the other nine lines. This is what it goes on to say:-

"If such a commission submitted a report reflecting adversely upon the conduct of a Unit Government, and that report was accepted by the Federal Government, the Unit Government concerned would be given sixty days in which to take steps to rectify the position. If at the end of the period the Governor-General was not satisfied that any such steps taken were adequate, he would have power, after consultation with the Federal Prime Minister and with Unit leading Ministers - except the leading Minister of the Unit concerned - to dissolve the Unit Legislature and set dates for a general election in the Unit."

I had intended to deal with this matter during the course of my reply but the hon. member is repeating the error into which he is falling all the time, that the situation was analogous to the United Kingdom Government. I categorically state that it is not so. We said that if there is a financial mismanagement and the report of a Commission of Enquiry reflected that there was such mismanagement, then the Governor-General would call on the Government of the colony to set its house in order. If there were no steps taken to dismiss a Minister - we know that in this colony we asked the Premier to dismiss a Minister and he would not do that and we had to suffer from that. If the Premier does not dismiss a Minister, the Governor-General does not take away the constitution; he calls upon the Government to resign and he fixes a date for the Election. They have not consulted any Minister of the region in this matter; where have they given Mr. Gairy any opportunity to rectify any mistake which he has made? Where have they, in this Order-in-Council, said that elections in Grenada will be held on such and such a date? Do not let us confuse what we discussed in London with what was done by the United Kingdom Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this very section caused a long debate; this is a question of giving the power to the Governor-General to call an election.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member cannot be right. This section gives the Governor-General the power to call an election. What is the difference between what I have said and calling an election. 7.00 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is a lawyer. I am only asking him, if he does not remember, that sixty days were allowed for the Chief Minister of any Island to act following an enquiry, and that the Windward and Leeward Islands fought very strongly upon this. We told the Secretary of State that we would not meet him until 3 o'clock on that day on this matter. The matter at issue is that the constitution of Grenada is suspended, and all I am asking the Premier to say is whether this suspension is merely for the purpose of calling an election. The hon. member knows that he cannot go hat in hand with the other Ministers from the other Islands. When the British Government stopped the grant-in-Aid to Grenada, we thought they would have stopped there and seen whether they were going to put their house in order. I am asking the Premier who is a constitutional lawyer how they can call an election. Maybe the members of his Party could pull away and make the situation such that the Ministers would be unable to run the Government and they would have to have an election. I would like to know what would happen in the case of an Island where all the members were members of one Party in the Assembly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not accusing Mr. Gairy; therefore I am not accusing the British Government. Since I would not pass judgment on the British Government for suspending the constitution in order to give them another constitution as has been initiated. (A VOICE: Where was it

intimated?) The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that the constitution was being suspended for the purpose of giving them a new constitution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member must bear in mind that the constitution of Malta was suspended, but they did not get back a constitution with the original powers. When the hon. member talks about a new constitution, that presupposes that maybe they want to give an amended constitution taking away powers; so when the hon. member talks about an election, when there is an election after a suspension of the constitution, a new constitution is axiomatic; that is why I say the hon. member does not know what he is talking about. In 1953, Sir Alfred Savage had power vested in him whom to appoint as Ministers and whose Ministry to take away, just like a mother who gives her son a cap which he kicks about, and the mother says "Give me this cap off your head!"

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is your interim Government.

Mr. WALCOTT: The constitution was suspended, and therefore the British Government instituted an interim constitution. The constitution is not suspended to give Lloyd a constitution to function. You suspend a constitution with a view to amending and taking powers from it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What I am asking the hon. member is whether the suspension of the constitution is for the purpose of holding an election or for the purpose of giving a new constitution. Naturally, as soon as you take away a constitution, it is obvious that you are going to take away powers. I am not misquoting you.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, what I want the hon. member to see is that you do not have to suspend the constitution to have an election. As it now stands in Barbados, you can have an election next month without anything going wrong with the constitution, but merely by the Premier saying that he is satisfied he has some Ministers with whom he cannot work, and he goes to the Governor and says he cannot continue as a Government and ask him to dissolve Parliament and call an election the following month; but the constitution remains the same.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Imagine Mr. Gairy going to Mr. Lloyd and doing that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier must not get annoyed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I am not getting annoyed. I was telling my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, that it would be a good idea for the hon. senior member for the City to stop shadow boxing and say whether he is for or against the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member knows I do not shadow box. I have guts and courage. I box, kick, butt and bite.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the hon. member says he is not shadow boxing. Well, he is sparring for an opening.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is nice to be humorous like this in the House. We started at 2.30 p.m. and everybody is now getting peckish. I think everybody in this House knows me well enough to know that if I had guts enough to stand up in this House and say that Jagan ought to be allowed to land, there is nothing for me to be afraid of in saying that the British Government should not take away the constitution in this manner. The hon. senior member for St. Peter said that the Premier of Barbados can go to the Governor and ask him to call an election if he cannot get on with his Cabinet. Could you see Mr. Gairy asking Mr. Lloyd to call an election? I am not condemning Gairy on this Report, neither am I condemning the British Government for suspending the constitution if it is for the purpose of calling an election. I am a man of courage in my convictions. 7.10 p.m.

A VOICE: That is where we differ.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is for the purpose of holding an election.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we have had too many of these asides. I will hear whoever is on his feet.

A VOICE: Let us wind up the debate now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot talk that nonsense in here. There is no levelling with anybody when I am expressing my views. We have never had any levelling. If you are hungry, go outside and eat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. I listened for three hours to the Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have never said anything of winding up the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not mean you at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Therefore, the reply is not to me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It should only be directed to me.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I apologise most sincerely to you, I heard a member from the other side talking about winding up the debate. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas made those remarks. He is not in the Chair and therefore, he should not be using those remarks.

Sir, we cannot vote for the Resolution as it stands because we cannot say that we are dispensing with the constitution in Grenada. All I know about it is what I have heard on the radio. I do not know if the Hon. Premier said that he received certain official communications. As far as we are concerned, we know nothing about it to be able to vote for the passing of this Resolution as it stands, because we must confess that it looks to us as if you pay the piper, you can call the tune.

A VOICE: Do not say that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As enthusiastic as hon. members are, I will not condone those asides; they do not enhance the beauty of the debate.

A VOICE: That is the Conservative philosophy.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It may be, but what philosophy do you expect me to have? It is universal philosophy and Conservative philosophy that if you pay the piper, you call the tune.

I thought that, the British Government having withheld the grant-in-aid, they would have stopped there. I asked: "Why have they suspended it?" You have not told me; therefore I cannot condemn.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is talking as if I suspended the constitution and I must give him the reason.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Like him, Sir, if I were running the Government I would be raising hell about this, but in a different way. I do not like the way the Government is doing it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Where is hell?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I mean that I would be raising fire about it. The Hon. Premier is misunderstanding me. Do not think that I would take it lying down. By now, I felt that the seven territories should have sent and said: "Tell us why you suspended it. For what reason?" Then we would do something about it and given them all the trouble that they are looking for.

Sir, we cannot vote for this Resolution as it stands today. When you protest against it, it is all well and good; but they are going to take this from you, fold it up and put it somewhere. You can be stronger than this.

The Hon. Premier thinks that I am one of those people who, as he has said, is Uncle Tom and an imperial stooge. Nobody in Barbados can think that of me, not from the way I have treated imported officials and said what I think of the British Government and all that sort of thing. All I am saying is that I have not gone into it. As a matter of fact, I only got it today. When I heard it yesterday my colleagues were worried about it and we said: "I wonder what these fellows are going to do about this now." They are going to let all the Eight have a similar constitution: but now they come along and say, "We suspend the constitution of Grenada." If you suspend for a time to have an election, that will be a different thing to suspension with a view to reducing the constitution. Reduction of any kind would mean that you would give the territory a different constitution. As I look at it, Mr. Gairy would not be always alive, Mr. X would not always be alive. You do not make a constitution to suit Mr. Gairy.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I heard the hon. senior member for the City said that he does not intend to pass judgment on the British people; therefore, if I were he, I would hold my peace.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not a point of order. His latitude might be right, but his longitude is wrong. Sir, under the circumstances, we cannot vote for this Resolution as it stands.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I always remember one of the psalms which we used to sing. It is: "Lord I am not high minded: I have no proud looks; I do not exercise myself in great matters which are too high for me."

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What is the hon. member speaking on? I would like to know.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph now appears to have arisen from his slumber. I am now replying.

Mr. SMITH: I take it that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was not in the House when this debate started. I take it that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was in charge of this Resolution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: You are mistaken on that.

Mr. SMITH: If the hon. member is replying now and if he is in charge and is on his feet, this is what I want to find out.
7.20 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The position is this. The mere fact that a member has not taken the trouble to come out at the opening of the session does not absolve him from the responsibility of knowing what is taking place in his absence. The situation is quite a simple one; the hon. member cannot rise after the Minister has replied. I am surprised that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is now taking the opportunity to speak when the Leader of his Party and the Leader of the Opposition have already spoken. If the hon. member looks at the Notices on today's Order Paper, he will see that this debate is not the debate on the White Paper in relation to the Federation, but this is the debate of a Resolution of which I gave notice myself. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy did not give notice of this Resolution. I do not think that the hon. member should be under any misapprehension if he had read his Order Paper before he came in here.

Mr. SMITH: I know that this is not the debate on the White Paper which we are now discussing. Sir, the Hon. Premier is in charge of this Resolution and when an hon. member finishes his speech, the Minister in charge pauses a while in order to see if there are any more hon. members who want to speak. In this case, no sooner than the hon. senior member for the City took his seat, the Hon. Premier was up to reply.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be the last person to be accused of stifling a debate on an issue

of this kind. If the hon. member wants to ask for leave to make his contribution to the debate, whether that contribution is slender or otherwise, is immaterial; but if he wants to make some contribution to the debate, he should first ask for leave to do so.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to speak on this Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is asking for leave to speak on this Resolution. If there is no objection, the hon. member will be granted leave. (After a pause.) There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows:-

"RESOLVED that this House strongly protests against the action taken under the authority of the West Indies Act, 1962, by the Government of the United Kingdom in suspending the Constitution of Grenada and in dissolving the Legislative and Executive Councils of that Island."

Sir, I take it that we are protesting against the action taken under the authority of the West Indies Act by the British Government. I would like to point out what is the real question. The real question is this: is Mr. Gairy right or is he wrong? Was the Commission of Enquiry right or wrong or was the action taken by the Government of the United Kingdom right or wrong?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The question is not who is right or wrong. I am speaking on a point of order. We are not enquiring, at any stage, into the legality of the matters reported in the Report of the Commission of Enquiry which investigated the irregularities in the island of Grenada; we are not concerned with any of these matters because we do not feel that we are in a position to pass judgment on them. What we are doing is protesting against the action of the United Kingdom Government in suspending the constitution of the territory of Grenada and in dissolving the Legislature of that colony.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to find out from the Hon. Premier if the action of the Colonial Office in doing so is right or wrong. I understand that they have acted on the Order-in-Council and I want to know if that has been legally or illegally done. That is what I would like to find out from the Hon. Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, nobody is challenging the legality or otherwise. We are agreed that the Act, Clause 5, is a legal document. Nobody is suggesting that they should have done it in any way. We are protesting against its being done, not the authority under which it has been done at all. I am surprised at the hon. member because I thought he was in his seat and it appears that everything has flowed over his head just as water flows under the bridge.

Mr. SMITH: I agree with some of the remarks which have been made by the Hon. Premier. They could have taken away the portfolio from the present Minister if they were not in agreement with the actions of the Minister; but right away and out of the blue to suspend the constitution and dissolve the Legislature, I would say that it is not at all fair to the Leader of the Grenada Government that it should be done. The British Government has the authority to do these things. This is just like our having a Magistrate who can impose a fine of \$100 on a poor man and take away his licence. The Magistrate is not wrong in doing that, but when you take away a man's licence, you are, in effect, taking away his hoe and basket.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can you sit down there and hear an hon. member criticise the Judiciary in this manner on a Resolution dealing with the suspension of the constitution of Grenada and the dissolution of the Legislature of that Island? Your Honour has been a Magistrate sitting on the bench yourself. That is not what we are discussing; we are discussing a Resolution dealing with Grenada. I have heard the hon.

member make some censure and he told one lawyer that he sleeps either at his home or at his business.
7.30 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just want to let the Hon. Premier know that I did not come here as a Magistrate. I did not understand exactly what the hon. junior member said.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Then you must get an interpreter.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not criticising the particular Magistrate. I was only saying that the power which is given to the Magistrate to carry out his duties, is the same power which the people at the Colonial Office have, because they can suspend through an Order-in-Council. However, I am saying that they could have used their discretion. I do not have much to say on this, because I am not in agreement with the action taken by the Colonial Office relative to the suspension of the Constitution of Grenada, but I only wanted to point out that if it is law, it is law.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was not really my intention after listening to the first three speakers to make any reply, because the House appeared to be in substantial agreement with the terms of the Resolution, but as the debate wore on — and I use the word "wore" as the past tense of "wear" because the wear and tear on the patience of hon. members must have been terrific — members appeared to get more and more confused, and instead of saying whether they were for or against, particularly the last two speakers — I do not intend this as any censure against them, but as I have to make notes on the matters to which I think a reply is necessary — it appears to me that they were asking a series of questions, which questions should properly be addressed at the appropriate time to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Reginald Maudling, or the British Government itself directing the British Cabinet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think we have drifted far away from the original intention and purpose of the Resolution, and my only purpose in replying is to dispel those seeds of doubt which may have germinated in the minds of some hon. members after some of the other hon. members began to ask these questions. It was because I was of the opinion that most hon. members had fully acquainted themselves with the Report published in May, 1962, as a matter of general interest to every West Indian and to every politician in the West Indies; it was also because I thought we were fully conversant with the terms of the West Indies Act, 1962, which is a matter really of vital importance to this area and which has not been raised for the first time today in this Honourable Chamber, and it was because I thought that the hon. members being conversant with these two documents in particular, and thirdly conversant with the Report which we had originally been summoned here today to discuss, that I did not dot the "I's" and cross the "T's" when I introduced the Resolution protesting against the action of the British Government in suspending the constitution of the neighbouring colony of Grenada. I am going to be very brief, because what I want to say can be said in very few words and by quoting very briefly from the documents to which I have just alluded.

The Commission of Enquiry in Grenada was set up on 22nd January, 1962 under the provisions of the Commissions of Enquiry Ordinance, Chapter 46 of that territory, appointing three Commissioners whose terms of office were — and I quote:—

"To enquire into the control of public expenditure in the territory of Grenada during the financial year commencing 1st January, 1961, and subsequently having regard to the financial provisions in the Constitution of Grenada, the Grenada Finance and Audit Ordinance, 1961, (No. 2), Colonial Regulations, Financial Rules in force in that territory and the specific financial instructions governing the administration of grant-in-aid by the Federal Government and any matters incidental thereto: to report and to make recommendations which they may consider appropriate."

I have gone into the whole question of the reason why the machinery of a Commission of Enquiry is set in motion in preference to the purely legalistic machineries such as public prosecutions, or some other device in order to bring matters to public attention. The Commissioners published the Report and made their recommendations, and these were their recommendations. Their recommendations after arriving at their conclusions were that —

1. The Minister of Finance has disregarded and contravened the laws and regulations governing the control of expenditure;
2. Expenditure has been incurred wastefully or unnecessarily through failure by Ministers to seek or refusal to accept the advice of the Civil Servants;
3. The Executive has deliberately destroyed the morale of the Civil Service by an undesirable interference with administrative duties and by improper threats against the security of office;
4. The Civil Service has been induced by this interference and these threats to commit or condone improprieties or irregularities in the expenditure of public funds."

Those were the four findings of fact of the Commission of Enquiry, and they made their recommendations. Perhaps if hon. members would pay attention to the recommendations, they would understand why this Government is protesting so strongly against the suspension of the constitution of Grenada, because nowhere in these recommendations does the Commission recommend such drastic action as the suspension of the constitution of Grenada. As a matter of fact, Sir, and indeed, the Commission does not even recommend that the Ministers be removed or that there should be another election, or that these Ministers are incapable of understanding the constitutional niceties and obeying the constitutional proprieties. The recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry were broken down into about five different headings, and briefly, these are their recommendations:—

"We think it essential that the morale of the Civil Service should be restored and that civil servants should be permitted and encouraged to perform their proper functions without fear or favour.
7.40 p.m.

"We therefore recommend that:—

"(1) The Grenada (Constitution) Order in Council should be amended so as to provide" (and here I would like to insert my own words: "not for the suspension of the constitution" but this is what the Commissioner recommended) "for the appointment of members of the Public Service Commission by the Administrator acting in his discretion and not after consultation with the Chief Minister;

"(2) public officers should be left in no doubt that appointment, dismissal, and all disciplinary proceedings are matters for consideration by the Public Service Commission alone and are in no way the concern of the Executive Council, and that this be made clear in regulations regarding the Public Service Commission to be made under Section 54 of the Constitution;

"(3) if difficulty is experienced or anticipated in selecting from the small population of Grenada a sufficient number of Public Service Commissioners in whose impartiality public officers can feel full confidence, consideration should be given to the desirability of having a Public Service Commission in respect of senior officers which, like the Legal and Judicial Service Commission, will include persons resident outside Grenada and will have jurisdiction over Grenada and over any other territories with which Grenada is associated." (That is normally the Island of Carriacou.)

Then the Commissioner went on to recommend that gross negligence or irregularity by public officers in the collection, custody, or payment of public funds should attract pecuniary penalties and "we therefore recommend amendment of the Finance and Audit Ordinance so as to

provide: firstly, that in circumstances described in the Ordinance the Financial Secretary be required and not merely permitted to initiate proceedings" -- (I want to insert my own words, "not for the suspension of the constitution" but) "for surcharge." That is making an officer who has contravened to pay out of his own pockets.

"Secondly, that the initiation of such proceedings should not be dependent on a report made by the Principal Auditor; thirdly, that surcharge should be levied by the Financial Secretary with the right of appeal to the Public Service Commission; or alternatively that the irregularity etc. should be reported by the Financial Secretary to the Public Service Commissioners for decision by them with right of appeal to the Administrator acting in his discretion; and in any event that the proceedings and decisions are at no stage referred to the Executive Council or to any Minister; and fourthly, that if the Financial Secretary neither imposes surcharge nor reports to the Public Service Commission, as the case may be, the Principal Auditor may present the case directly to the Public Service Commissioners for consideration by them.

"In our opinion," the report went on, "surcharge is essentially a disciplinary matter and as such should not be the concern of the Executive; on the contrary, any interference by the Executive in the enforcement of discipline is an improper activity which is likely seriously to impair the efficiency of the public service."

The Commissioner then went on and recommended on Financial Rule and said:

"Certain financial irregularities have apparently been frequent for some time and we think that they denote an incomplete understanding by accounting officers of what is required of them. We therefore recommend an early revision of the Financial and Store Rules with a view to clarifying them, amending them in the light of constitutional changes, and expanding them so as to regulate procedures newly introduced. For instance, we have learned with surprise that no officer outside the Audit Department records the total amount of the expenditure authorised by special warrant in anticipation of a supplementary appropriation law, in order to ensure that it does not at any time exceed \$50,000. We also consider that the machinery of control would be more easily operated if a clear distinction were drawn between a *virement* warrant, authorising the transfer of provision within a Head of expenditure, and a special warrant which authorises expenditure in addition to that appropriated for the Head. Accounting Officers need also to be made to understand that a decision taken in Executive Council cannot in itself convey any authority whatsoever for the incurring of expenditure.

"We further recommend that consideration be given to the desirability of amending the Finance and Audit Ordinance so as to provide for giving these revised Financial Rules the force of law by some simple process such as tabling them, and any amendments to them, in the Legislative Council."

Then as regards the Method of Communication, the Commissioner recommended that:

"The need to record decisions and instructions in writing might be thought too obvious to merit attention in this report but there is no doubt that Ministers and civil servants alike have failed lamentably in this respect. It becomes all the more important that there should be some written record when there is any suggestion that officers are being instructed to act contrary to regulations or where personal relationships are strained. On many of the matters brought to our attention there has been a significant absence of anything in writing and our enquiries have been made much more difficult in consequence."

Then they went on suggesting that "a Public Accounts Committee has recently been established and we have considered whether it is likely to impose any effective check on public expenditure. We are inclined to the view that, with the present composition of the Legislative Council, its value may prove to be slight but we recom-

mend..." (here I insert my own words, "not that the constitution be suspended",) "we recommend none the less that the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Council should be amended so as to provide for its constitution and conduct."

Now, Sir, there you have in brief the recommendations made. You set up a Commission of Enquiry and you ask them to make recommendations. The whole principle of parliamentary democracy had broken down in Grenada. That is the type of recommendations which they made. They say that there is absolutely no chance under the present set-up in Grenada, no matter how we teach Civil Servants the job, how we make them aware of their duties, how we make them aware of their responsibilities as Civil Servants or no matter how the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council are amended, "we are convinced that there is no hope of parliamentary democracy in Grenada and you are going to have bloodshed" and so on if those recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry are not taken into account.

The hon. senior member for the City asked what was the reason for suspending the constitution and the answer would be simply that it was because the Commissioners of Enquiry had recommended that good government had broken down.

I see the Clerk of the House in conversation with the hon. senior member for the City at the top of his voice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Commission of Enquiry had made these recommendations. I am not concerned with the topic of conversation between the hon. senior member for the City and the Clerk no more than I am concerned with the motive behind what took place in Grenada; but if the Commission of Enquiry said that good government had broken down in Grenada and, furthermore, that the present Ministers were acting in a way which did not conform to all the canons of the principles of parliamentary democracy and, furthermore, the Civil Servants were not carrying on these rules, there would be some consultation. We were not consulted, and I am glad that we were not consulted because if the United Kingdom Government had made up their minds, they would have sheltered under the excuse that they consulted with the Ministers and this would put us in a very awkward position. But when we drew up the constitution of the projected Federation in London in May this year, which is only some four or six weeks ago, we stated that the principle which we would observe when the Federation should have been established was that the Head of State, who would be the Governor-General, would be at every stage of the proceedings not only be in consultation with the Federal Prime Minister but with the Chief Ministers of all the territories other than the territory involved before he decided on proroguing or dissolving the Legislative and fixing a date for an election. That is all.

But this constitution is still very much in the idealistic stage and, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter pointed out, Grenada has a constitution; Grenada has a legally elected Legislature with a few nominated members for good measure and nowhere has the Commission of Enquiry recommended that such harsh treatment be meted out to the people of Grenada that their constitution should be taken away from them. Because of the purpose of this Resolution, no matter what the hon. senior member for the City thinks, it cannot go in the wastepaper basket. This Resolution would be printed on fifteen million sheets of paper and there would have to be a very big wastepaper basket to hold this Resolution which would be sent to His Excellency and then sent on, and then it would be sent all over the world.

I think this Honourable House of Assembly should be proud to break the tradition which was set up by the last Government in keeping quiet on matters where they felt that they would offend their imperial masters. We are breaking that tradition tonight and there is no wastepaper basket which can hold this Resolution. Tonight, when we pass this Resolution, it is going around the world because the present Government in the United Kingdom has been so accustomed of dealing with the stooges that they really think

that they are going to get away with this, and that we were so anxious to get loans and get a Federation that we would say that Mr. Gairy really behaved badly and you have the right to take away the constitution from him. They are not taking away a constitution from Mr. Gairy; they are taking away a constitution from the whole people, as Mr. Burke said.
7.50 p.m.

I would not like any hon. member to go away from here tonight confused about this at all. I would not like it to be thought either by any one outside that we are concurring in any mismanagement or in any financial irregularities merely because Ministers happen to be the elected representatives of the people. We do not feel that the mere fact that you are elected and not nominated gives you any licence to abuse the confidence which has been reposed in you by the people. However, we do not consider it as a prerogative where you have gone through the legal technicalities so that no one can impeach your action as being done without legal authority. We do not consider that any Imperial Government has any right, after the long struggle we have had for survival, to say that they are taking away the constitution of the people of these islands under any pretext. There are so many other alternatives which are open to a country which is subsidising another country; they could withhold the subsidy, although I do not agree with withholding the subsidy, because when you withhold the subsidy, you are withholding it from the people and not from the Ministers. In that way you would be imposing a penalty on every taxpayer in Grenada.

They have taken away authority from no less a person than the Finance Minister in the Federal Cabinet. Under Section 5 of the West Indies Act, 1952, they passed an Order-in-Council wresting the control of finance from Mr. Bradshaw who was only acting on the instructions of the Federal Prime Minister. That Minister's one fault is that he is too loyal to be a politician in the 20th century. He belongs to the people like Toussaint L'Ouverture, Henri Christophe and Simon Bolivar stretching back to the 16th century. Mr. Bradshaw is too loyal and he could expose the person who gave him the authority to impose that Measure. What price did he have to pay? Mr. Bradshaw's portfolio was taken away from him and reposed in the Governor-General. It is no part of my duty to make suggestions to the British Government as to what they should have done; it is not my duty to enquire as to what is the purpose of the suspension of the constitution and the dissolution of the Legislature. We are only concerned in that what we consider to be a retrograde step has been taken in the constitutional history of the West Indies by the suspension of the constitution of Grenada and denying the people of that territory the right as to who should govern them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no other point which I should like to make in answer to the remarks of the hon. senior member for the City. He said that the British Government is paying the piper and therefore it can call the tune.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Did I say that?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, and I have it written down.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Well, you cannot write or read what you have written. I said that those who pay the piper should call the tune.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member said: "Who pays the piper call the tune." Who is that?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Who, Who?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is obviously implying that the British Government is paying the piper and therefore they should call the tune.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: But you cannot snatch the flute out of the piper's mouth. The Constitution belongs to the people of Grenada.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has stated a Conservative doctrine. You can stop the piper, but you cannot take the flute out of his mouth.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has said that he cannot support this Resolution because he has not seen the evidence in the Report. Well, I say that that is the strongest reason why we should support this Resolution. There is nothing in the evidence of the Report which justifies this action which has been taken. If the hon. member had the evidence which the Commission of Enquiry had before it, he could say that he does not agree with the findings of the Commission and that they should recommend that the constitution should be taken away. The hon. member is not in as good a position as the Judges in the first instance. They did not recommend, at any stage of their recommendations, that what they found justified the taking away of the constitution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I did not say that I cannot support the Resolution because I did not have the evidence. I said that I cannot condemn Mr. Gairy because I did not see the evidence in the Report. If the hon. member will recall, that is exactly what I said. On the recommendations of the Report I cannot see the recommendations being put into effect. I asked the Premier, with these recommendations and with Mr. Gairy still in power, to tell me how these recommendations will be passed unless you suspend or do something or other. I said that if these are the recommendations of the Committee and they are put into operation with Mr. Gairy still in power, unless you do something, you call for an election. That is what I said.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not think that anything which the hon. member has recently said clarifies his stand in this matter. He is still asking questions even after this debate has been going on for five and a half hours. I suggest that as to the trip recommended by the hon. junior member for St. George, he should be the beneficiary of the bounty of the members of the other Party who want to send him on the trip to find out what he wants to know.
8.00 p.m.

We do not have any time to waste. We do not have any questions to ask, because there are no issues politically which are so confusing for us to have to ask a lot of questions and then putting in further questions and asking for further and better particulars, which particulars are supplied already, and that kind of nonsense that goes on in the Law Courts. We are only concerned over the fact that you hear the bell tolling for 8 o'clock; do not ask for whom it is tolling; it only tolls for thee, because it may be the turn of Antigua tomorrow, of Barbados the next day and then after our turn, St. Vincent and so on *ad infinitum* until they get rid of all of us. It is a very simple issue and we are not going to have this or any United Kingdom Government thinking that the present Government in Barbados is going to fall in step with the kind of behaviour that they have come to expect from the leaders of the West Indies who are now on the way out, and the Barbadians who are on the way out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph wants to know the answer now, we say that they are wrong and we say that the test of what is right or wrong is the test of what is good for the people of Barbados and the people of the West Indies, and we say that any such step taken by them after 337 years of representative Government in Barbados must be considered a retrograde step. We in Barbados ought to be proud that we are the first people to protest as a Legislature against this very retrograde action which has been taken within the last 24 hours. Some other members have described it as scandalous. I only want to warn the hon. senior member for the City that there is no waste paper basket big enough, because this is already echoing around the world in the news from America and the United Kingdom and the Hon. Chief Minister of Antigua has just informed me over the telephone, in a message received by the Hon. Minister of Education, that Antigua has already made the strongest possible protest to the Secretary of State over the action which they have taken, if that is any consolation to those pusillanimous members of this Chamber, if there are any who seem to be living in trepidation and fear of their imperial masters, that we are

not alone when we make a protest of this kind, and that we will not be left high and dry. We have the consolation of knowing that little Antigua has already taken the first step, as a Government but not as a Legislature, to protest against the action which we are all condemning here tonight.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BATSON; Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. LOVE; Mr. YEARWOOD, Mr. BOXILL; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SMITH - 14.

NOES: Mr. SEALEY; Mr. LYNCH and Mr. MOTTLEY - 3.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that concludes Government Business for this evening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in consequence of consultation which I had earlier today with the hon. junior member for

the City representing the Opposition Party, the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for St. Peter, it has been decided to move the adjournment of the House at this stage, and so conclude today's sitting until tomorrow. This step has been taken so that members may come tomorrow with fresh minds prepared to discuss the White Paper which stands as Order No. 1, and if after discussion has been initiated it seems desirable that a postponement at a certain stage should take place, then of course that would be quite possible. But we did think that discussion should be initiated in view of the fact that maybe some hon. members might not have an opportunity to contribute to the debate after tomorrow until perhaps several weeks have elapsed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, 20th 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.

8.10 p.m.