

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th February, 1963.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Esq. Q.C. (Speaker); Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD (Minister of Development, Trade, Industry, Labour and Tourism); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. E. ST. A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Communications, Works and Housing); Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P. (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; 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. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of 5th February have been circulated, and if there is no objection, they will be confirmed.

Hearing no objection, I declare them confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados, and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 30th June, 1962 in respect of schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

On my own behalf, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Employment Exchanges (Registration and Recruitment of Workers) Regulations, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to place the sum of \$56,688 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1962-63, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1962-63, No. 38, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Resolution to place the sums of \$154,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1962-63, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1962-63, No. 39, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

Resolution to approve of the lease by the Executive Committee of two parcels of land at the Deep Water Harbour (and described in the First Schedule thereto), to the Barbados Development Board.

A Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905.

I should like to give notice, Sir, of my intention to ask for leave later today to deal with this Bill in all its stages. It is imperative that the Bill should become law before 23rd February of this year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are copies available?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am instructed that copies will be circulated to members.

QUESTIONS

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware of the additional expenses that peasants of canes in the parish of St. Thomas will have to undergo during this coming crop in harvesting their canes, due to lack of proper entrances to their fields?

2. Would Government issue a directive to have tracks cut so as to permit lorries to drive nearer the fields in order to load the said canes?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill further to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905, be read a first time.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Are there any Replies to be laid?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 79/1962 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael on 9th October, 1962, is ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Michael is not in his place, and I will allow the question to stand over until the next meeting.
2.45 p.m.

There are no more Oral Replies ready to Questions and we will now proceed to Private Members' Business.

The First Order is to resume debate on the passing of a Resolution *re* Farm Labour Programme in the U. S. A..

At the last meeting of the House, on the motion of the Hon. Leader of the House, seconded by the hon. senior member for Christ Church, further consideration was postponed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is not in his place at the moment, and I do not think we should proceed further with this matter today.

With the permission of the House, I would like to move that further consideration of this matter be again postponed in consequence of the absence of the hon. senior member for St. Peter who tabled this motion.

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

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

RESOLUTION *re* REDUCTION OF CONSUMPTION DUTY ON BEER

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of Private Members' Business is to resume debate on a Resolution *re* the Hon. Premier's statement laid on 27th November, 1962 *re* the reduction of consumption duty on beer.

At our latest meeting when this matter was under discussion, the Hon. Minister of Education was addressing the Chamber. I observe that he is not now in his place. Is there any other hon. member who wants to contribute to the debate before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition makes his reply? (*A Pause*)

I should like to remind hon. members that the House is not in recess.

On 11th December last, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition moved the passing of the Resolution and it was seconded by the hon. junior member for Christ Church. Then the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke.

On 15th January, this year, the hon. member for St. Peter concluded his speech. Then the hon. junior member for St. Joseph spoke. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew and the Hon. Premier also spoke.

On the 5th February, the hon. senior member for St. Michael spoke followed by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. Peter. The Hon.

Minister of Education was addressing the Chamber when Private Members' Business came to an end.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I just crave a little indulgence. I am sure the hon. senior member for St. Joseph contributed to this debate but I cannot anywhere in the Official Report find the remarks which he made. Just give me a minute. (*A Pause*) I have it.

The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is reported as having said "since this Resolution was tabled I have been told....."

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Leader of the House has got up in his place and is quoting from a debate of this Session. Have the Rules of this Chamber been changed to allow that?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the Hon. Leader of the House was merely looking at a report of a speech which was made last Tuesday, but not that he was reading from it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I heard the Hon. Leader of the House begin to read from a debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood him to say that "the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is reported to have said" which is a different thing altogether.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The Hon. Leader of the House said that and in addition began to read from the report. I saw.

Mr. SPEAKER: From my position I am not able to see if what is before the Hon. Minister is something from which he is reading.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I think I know when I am wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member still on a point of order?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, of course, to explain what I have pointed out. I am absolutely certain and I believe the Reporter began to take down what the Hon. Leader of the House was reading as a quotation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point of order has been made. Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to discover why the hon. junior member for St. Peter was so anxious to test Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I object to that most strenuously. If the Hon. Leader of the House wants to say something, let him say it without attaching any blame to my being discourteous to the Chair.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member knows what I am saying. The position is this. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph said that since this Resolution was tabled — referring presumably to the Resolution under discussion — by the hon. senior member for the City, there has been a reduction in the price of chicken parts. I do not know where on earth did the hon. senior member for St. Joseph get that information from.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think if the Hon. Leader of the House read correctly, he would see that I have said that I have been told that since this Resolution had been tabled... If the hon. member looks again, he would see that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I do not know the difference between what the hon. member said and what I said. I said that I do not know where he got his information from. Obviously, if he did not get the information he could not be told, therefore, the interruption by the hon. member is not only unnecessary, but uncalled for.
2.55 p.m.

I repeat, I do not know where he could have got the information from because it is absolutely inaccurate. The hon. senior member for the City tabled the Resolution, as you will see from the records of this House, on 20th November, 1962, and the Price Control Order affecting the price of chicken parts was gazetted on 29th October, 1962 — almost a month before the hon. senior member for the City tabled his Resolution. Therefore, the Control Order affecting the price of chicken parts was in no way motivated by, did not spring from or was not as a result of, the Resolution tabled by the hon. senior member for the City. The other remarks of the hon. member in this connection also make it necessary for me to correct what appears to be a very popular misapprehension as regards the control price of chicken parts. The Order tabled on 28th October, 1962, reduced the price of chicken parts from what they were to a new lower level. Backs which used to be sold at between 38 cents and 42 cents per pound were reduced to 36 cents per pound. Backs and necks which were sold at between 40 cents and 42 cents per pound were reduced to 36 cents per pound. Wings which, in some cases, went as high as 78 cents, and also breasts which were sold at 65 cents per pound, were reduced to 60 cents per pound. Legs which went from \$1.27 per pound to \$1.30 were reduced to \$1.20. Legs and thighs were reduced from \$1.32 per pound to \$1.10 per pound. Breasts which went from \$1.30 to \$2.50 per pound were reduced to \$1.30 and thighs which, in some cases, were sold at \$1.63 per pound were controlled at the price of \$1.30 per pound. Contrary to what is popularly believed and popularly repeated in this House, there had been no amendment to the prices of these chicken parts since that original Order was published on 29th October, with the exception of an amendment which permitted chicken parts in cartons, packed in boxes or cartons not exceeding 2 1/2 lbs. and bearing a brand name, to be exempted from control. In other words, special types of chicken parts imported mainly by the wealthy hotels in packages and cartons bearing a specific brand name and not sold normally to the masses of the people — those boxes were exempted from price control. All the other controls were effective.

Mr. Speaker, I merely rose to draw attention to this public misconception and to make the position as clear as I possibly could.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any other hon. member wish to contribute to this debate before the hon. introducer of the Resolution replies finally? (*After a pause.*) Apparently no other hon. member desires to speak on this Resolution, and therefore I should ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition if he desires to exercise his right of final reply.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I really did not expect that it would have become necessary for me to exercise any right of reply on so popular a Resolution as this of which I gave notice in connection with this very important matter; but I have been harangued, if I may use that term, I have been criticised, which I always welcome, from all sides, because I exercised my right and discharged what I have done for nearly a quarter of a century in public life, that is, to call a spade a spade and to express my view on any matter. I think that this is a very magnanimous act by a Government exercised on the floor of this House, and every hon. member quite appreciates the decision of the Leader of the Government to make this reduction on the consumption duty on beer. There are those of us who feel just as I feel, but they are not courageous enough to say so; but some people for personal criticism and others for personal dislike, would offer criticism of what I have said. I am absolutely certain that every hon. member of this Chamber who has any sense of responsibility — and I take it that every hon. member of this House should have a sense of responsibility — appreciates what has been done, and therefore there was no point in playing ostrich and putting your head in the sand and not seeing these things. There are responsible people outside who, because I have had the courage to say what I said, think that there was no opposition on my part and that I had joined forces with the Government because one paid tribute to somebody. In relation to all the hon. members on my immediate left who threw those criticisms at me, I would ask them how often it was that I have paid tribute to the last Government for doing something when they deserved tribute being paid to them.

Mr. Speaker, when I moved the passing of this Resolution, I felt that it was a good thing for Barbados. I felt that if nothing had been done, and persons could have pointed their hands at the Government and said that as a result of so-and-so which was done by the Legislature — it would not have been done only by the Government but by all of us, and we might have had to carry and share the blame if the beer factory in this island has been shut down. I have a broad view and I say that when the man who has the power and responsibility in his hand comes back here and does something which is in the interest of this country, I cannot see that there is anything wrong in saying that we all appreciate that.
3.05 p.m.

Every living member in this House appreciates what I have in this Resolution. Only members with dead souls and dead minds could say that they do not appreciate this, and I am sure that they would get behind closed doors and express the opinion that they agree with it. You are the oldest member in this Chamber, Sir, and you have seen on several occasions matters passing this Chamber and going to the Other Place then to be discovered that they were wrong by the Learned Attorney General who was in charge; but there were men in charge of Government matters who would butt their heads against a brick wall when they were told on several occasions by the legal luminaries and professional men in education, and people whether in business or otherwise, that something was totally inadequate and wrong, and would refuse to do anything.

I do not care if you call this paying tribute. I am not any Uncle Tom; I do not ask the Premier of this country any favours. I am a man who next week would get up and tell him or anybody else that he is wrong. A man who has never made a mistake has never done anything in this world, and therefore if a mistake or an error of judgment was made and has been remedied, what is wrong in coming on the floor of this House and saying that I appreciate what has been done since it has been done in the interest of Barbados? The other part of the Resolution reads in such a way that I believe the average man would understand it, because I have asked the Government to consider the removal of the increased duty on other essential commodities. There were certain essential commodities on which, as I said in my speech in reply to the Hon. Premier's Budget Speech, I would not have increased the tax, and I have expressed that view; but apparently there are some people, especially some of those who contribute to the newspaper, who make what I call mountains out of mole-heaps. They have never been able to remove me from the eyes of the public for doing what I consider a job in the interest of people, and therefore when they attempt to say that there is no Opposition, I think I made it quite clear that I never asked anybody for the position, because I do not work for a living by coming to this House. I was working for a living before I came here, and will continue to do so as long as God gives me breath. I asked nobody to make me Leader of the Opposition because it carries a few more paltry dollars; but if it was decided from a constitutional point of view that there were four people around me and the other people could not decide what they should do, I have accepted this role. I have made it clear that I was not asking anybody to become Leader of the Opposition. I may say, Sir, that this is not the first occasion I had an opportunity of becoming Leader of the Opposition. Many years ago when the hon. junior member for Christ Church was called to be Leader of the Opposition, the letter from His Excellency was put in my hands, and there is no secret about this. I was told that I had the experience of carrying the Party and that I should be the Leader of the Opposition, but I declined because it was not for the Governor to say, as the then Governor had said to the member for Christ Church, that I should carry the Party. We look at Party politics as a matter of discipline, and I declined to take the leadership.

Mr. Speaker, those who contribute under these *nom-de-plumes* in the Press and say that there is no Opposition, and are looking for me to tell somebody who was his mother and father to go into the genealogical background of a person or curse somebody, should look for somebody else to put in my place, because the people in Bridgetown did not send me here for that. If something is right, I will say it is

right. On several occasions when I was on the other side with the present members of the Government, I rose to support members of the Government. There were certain members in the Government then to whom, even if they were right, you would rather not say anything because of the nasty, uncalled-for and unwarranted attacks that were lodged upon people. This took away from the sanity and smooth running of the Legislature. Some of the people who make contributions to the Press have been holding on to the coat-tails of the Labour Party for all the years and have got nothing, and they attack me all the time because they want me to attack somebody in here. I really smile. I have never been about waiting for a job yet; I have always held my head above the water. I was here before there was adult suffrage, and I refused at the time to join with the then Government, because you know, Sir, that on no occasion did I bow to Caesar, and I have no intention of doing it now. If this Government is right on something, why should I not say they are right?

If I had occasion to disagree with the Minister of Social Services or any other Minister, I can still walk out of this House and talk to him as one man to the other and as friends, though not of the same political philosophy. A few days ago I said on the floor of this House to the Minister of Communications and Works that I did not agree with something which was brought to the House. That did not cause us not to be friendly; he did not tell me that my mother was a cook or that I went to Dodds. Those are the things one could not get along with the other Government for; but thank God we have a Government who can appreciate criticism and we can still agree and thus raise the standard of the debates in this House. I hope I have said enough on this matter to convince my detractors that when something is right, I am going to say it is right.

Mr. Speaker, my Resolution further says "And be it further resolved that this House urge the Government to consider the immediate removal of the increased duty on other essential commodities, especially rum and chicken parts." Now, which backbencher and which Government would want an essential commodity to bear hard on the people of a country? You can call me a Tory or anything you like, but I must have an interest in human needs if I am a humanitarian. Despite the way in which the Press reports people in this House of Assembly, and looking at some of the headlines which they print about planting trees in Broad Street when inside the paper they mean planting shrubs, I want to make it clear that I feel the tax should not have been put on because it would have to be borne by the consumer. I have made my suggestion, and it is for the Government working from the statistical point of view to see whether what I have said is right, and if it is, to do something about tax. Some people seem not to follow the English manner of democracy. It was a wonderful thing to read that the Labour Party in England as such was opposed to Britain joining the Common Market, but when MacMillan lost his bid, they did not say: "Down with the Government!" But rather they offered sympathy in the matter, because it was then a matter of the British people.

When it comes to the running of this country, there are certain things which are in the hands of the Government, and if I disagree with them, I say so, as I have often done in the past. I remember my last colleague on the floor of this House, Mr. Tommy Miller - used to tell me that the reason why he could not talk to me when he was going out of the door was because the Ministers would point out to the then Premier that he was fraternizing with Mottley. You dared not speak to people in those days.
3.15 p.m.

I look across the Table at the hon. junior member for St. Peter who, I know, does not think that sort of way because to those of us who know one another for years, it makes no difference. We disagree when it comes to politics, but we speak to each other.

There are some people who think because you pay tribute to something or somebody that you agree with that person. I know now, Mr. Speaker, that there are still people who by political persuasion - some of whom are of my political persuasion - think that the Government should

be criticised for doing what they did and then coming back and doing this. That is a stupid way of approaching the matter.

I exercise my conscience. I feel that I was right in moving this Resolution. Sir, I do not think we should waste any more time on it. Some hon. members on my immediate left said that they agreed with this Resolution. One hon. member said that I was very mild. Sometimes, soft answers turn away wrath. Let me repeat this. A man who has never made a mistake is one who has never done anything in his life.

Mr. Speaker, you have been practising at your profession for nearly a quarter of a century. How often you have looked back and said: "If I had done so-and-so, my client would be out;" or "If I had done so-and-so, my client would not have gone to prison." I am not casting aspersions.

Sir, I think it is time that I ask leave to withdraw this motion because my moving it has given every hon. member the opportunity to discuss this matter: and as Leader of the Opposition, I thought that I should bring in a Resolution of some sort so that hon. members would be able to discuss this matter because we could not discuss the Statement as it was laid. The way in which the Hon. Premier read the Statement and made the proposals did not permit anybody the opportunity to discuss it. As I look across the Table at the backbenchers and other hon. members, I can see that they would not attempt to vote against this Resolution which seeks to reduce the cost of living. However, Sir, this was done in this way because Your Honour directed me that it was the only way in which I could have replied to the Hon. Premier on what he said in that Statement on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask leave that this Resolution be withdrawn.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg now that the Resolution be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Accordingly this Resolution is withdrawn.

Mr. HUSBANDS RAISES QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES

Mr. HUSBANDS: Before Your Honour proceeds with any other business, I would like to draw to the attention of the House a matter of great importance to this House. I am therefore asking leave to speak on a matter of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member proposing a motion of privilege?

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am just pointing out what I consider to be a breach of privilege of the rights of members of this House in relation to a matter which is the property of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Standing Order 68, Privilege (1), it is stated:-

"A motion directly concerning the privileges of the House shall take precedence of all other public business."

Is the hon. member making a motion directly towards a matter of privilege of this House?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Further, at (2), it is stated:-

"If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises which appears to involve the privilege of the House and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House, the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of a division, by a motion based on such matter."

It is a question whether the motion should take precedence. At the present time we are now dealing with Private Members' Business and as the hon. member knows, Private Members' time is very limited, and I am loth to deprive hon. members of Private Members' time.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, it is a matter of right and a matter of necessity. If Private Members' Business is considered during Private Members' time, and it is considered that an hon. member may not raise a matter of privilege during this time, I am going to bow to that ruling; but I think that I would prefer to withhold matters in order that Your Honour might have the necessary time to do some research in the matter. I do wish to raise the matter today because it may arise at some other time. I do not think it is absolutely clear that I should be precluded from raising a matter of privilege at this particular time. However, if Your Honour insists, I will sit.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a matter under Standing Order 68 which purely states:

"If during the sitting of the House a matter suddenly arises which appears to involve the privileges of the House and which calls for the immediate intervention of the House, the proceedings may be interrupted, save during the progress of a division, by a motion based on such matter."

At the present moment, I am not going to admit what the hon. member is making as a motion of privilege, unless he assures me that it is a matter which has suddenly arisen such as the matter which suddenly arose last Tuesday and which was drawn to my attention about something which appeared in the *Official Gazette*. Unless it is a matter which suddenly arose, I will not hold that it is a matter which should be dealt with during Private Members' Time.

Mr. HUSBANDS: This matter has not arisen today suddenly, nor is it a question brought to your attention such as the one which was brought last Tuesday; but there is a lot in what the matter is all about. However, if Your Honour rules that I may not take advantage as a matter of privilege at this particular time I would bow to your ruling. I will explain that it is a matter which has not suddenly arisen today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nor has it arisen during the sitting of this House?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Quite frankly, Sir, it has not arisen during today's sitting of the House. Perhaps, I can bring the matter to the attention of the House later during today's sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: No member would be precluded from doing anything in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Well then, I will not be allowed to raise it now.
3.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 68 (1) of the Standing Orders of this House dealing with the question of privilege is as follows:-

"A motion directly concerning the privileges of this House shall take precedence of all other public business."

This is a matter which may take precedence of all public business but we have not yet come to deal with public business.

THE TRUSTEES FOR ROMAN CATHOLIC PURPOSES REGISTERED (INCORPORATION IN BARBADOS) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. James:- To move the second reading of a Bill to incorporate the "Trustees for Roman Catholic Purposes" as a Trust Corporation.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to enable the Roman Catholic Church which has been carrying on the Society of Jesus and which has been actively engaged in carrying out its objects and purposes which are religious, charitable and public in this island, to be authorised to buy land in the name of a Corporate Body known as the "Trustees for Roman Catholic Purposes" incorporated under the Charitable Trustees Incorporation Act, 1872, of Great Britain, for the use of the said Roman Catholic Church or for the use of the Society of Jesus or any other of its societies, branches or other organizations. The object of this Bill is nothing more than to enable such a Body to continue more effectively the work which it has been carrying on in this island for some time. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. In doing so, I should like to say that in this country we believe in freedom of worship and freedom of religion, and I do not think that any of us could do better than give this Bill its second reading. This Bill seeks to do nothing more than what the hon. introducer has said, that is, to allow the people of the Roman Catholic Church to continue to carry on in this country the functions which they have been carrying on for some time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is usual for such a Bill to be referred to a Select Committee. I shall therefore ask the following members to serve on such Select Committee:-

The hon. senior member for St. James, (Mr. Carmichael); the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Mottley); the hon. junior member for Christ Church, (Mr. Goddard); the Hon. Minister of Social Services, (Hon. A. DaC. Edwards); the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, (Mr. Coward); and the hon. junior member for St. George, (Mr. Miller).

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, I would suggest that Your Honour be also a member of this Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am willing to be associated with this Committee. It has been pointed out to me that this is a matter which comes within the province of the Hon. Minister of Education, who is presently out of the island, rather than the Hon. Minister of Social Services; therefore, with the leave of the House I am asking that the name of the Hon. Minister of Education be substituted for that of the Hon. Minister of Social Services. If there is no objection, that substitution will be made. *(After a pause.)* That substitution is now deemed to have been made.

RESOLUTION re RESHAPING OF ROADS FOR THE COMING CROP SEASON

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph:- To move the passing of a Resolution re the reshaping of roads and tracks throughout the island in preparation for the coming crop season.

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

WHEREAS the small cane growers of the Island are sustaining heavy losses on the reaping of their canes yearly, due mainly to the absence of properly shaped roads and tracks where the lorries can drive and stop along the side of their land to take the canes to the Factory.

AND WHEREAS the increased cost of labour has made it more difficult for them to head the canes long distances to reach the lorries.

BE IT RESOLVED that this House call on Government to assist these small cane growers of the Island, by instructing the Honourable Minister of Communications, Works and Housing to request the services of the Director of Highways and Transport to have these roads and tracks

reshaped immediately with tractors and bulldozers, giving priority to St. Joseph, St. Andrew and the neighbouring parishes of St. Thomas and St. John.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution explains itself fully, and I do not think that I would have to say much more on it. Sir, there was a time when we had the majority of horse-drawn carts to take the canes to the various mills, as we used to call them at that time. Now we have factories established in the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew, there are quite a number of roads which have become impassable due to the erosion of the soil, and most of the people work too near to these roads and make them too narrow for the lorries to pass through them. In some cases, the land is subject to slipping, and after the land has slipped, the roads slip away and the peasants are not in a position to pay the expenses of reshaping those roads. In other words, you may have one person who is willing to do this work, but the others will not or are not able to do it. They have to head these canes over long distances so as to reach the motor lorries. As you know, Sir, the cost of labour, freight, fertilisers and things of that sort has made it difficult for these people to make a profit from the growing of their canes.

3.35 p.m.

It is very easy, Sir, for a bulldozer to go and reshape these tracks. It will not cost the Government large sums of money, because as you know, these bulldozers can reshape miles of road in one day, especially if the soil is favourable to the working of these bulldozers. It only has to go and push the land aside on both sides so that a lorry can pass. I am not asking the Government to put stones on these roads at the moment, because some of these roads are only for reaping purposes, and I may be told that during the crop season you do not get people blasting stones or lorries drawing stones, and therefore you would not be able to sheet these roads with stones. But you would certainly be able to reshape them by a bulldozer so that a lorry can go right in the fields. There was an instance in St. Joseph where the people asked for a particular road to be reshaped so that they could get the canes out, and they were assured that a bulldozer would be sent. They went ahead and dropped the canes beneath the road and the bulldozer came at the same time and reshaped the road, and as soon as that was completed, the lorries came in and took out the canes. The people took the risk of dropping the canes even before the road was reshaped; so that will show that it can be done in those parishes where people have to head canes for far distances. The price paid for canes at the factories is the same as that paid to other land owners, but the factories do not have to pay for heading canes since the land is by the side of the road, and in some cases the lorries can go into the fields and take the canes out. When you pay "A" who does not have to pay for extra labour, you can see clearly that these people.....

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph mention distinctly the roads to which he is referring in St. Joseph and in St. Andrew and who are the owners of them?

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot regard that as a point of order, but I understand why the hon. member rose.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you are always willing and ready to help hon. members when they want to make a mountain out of a mole-hill. If the Hon. Minister had read the Resolution, he would not have asked me to state the owners of these roads in the parishes, because I do not know the owners of the roads in St. Thomas, St. John or in St. Andrew, and I do not know all of the owners of the roads in St. Joseph? Why ask such a silly question?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we would keep tempers much more, even if the hon. member said "Why ask such a question".

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir, I agree with you. As I said in my opening remarks, these roads were there already, but from time to time they have been closed and have become impassable by a lorry though a horse-cart would be able to

get in; but it would not pay anyone to use a horse, mule or donkey to draw canes today as was done years ago when they were all we had to rely upon. Lorries have now displaced them, and I hope the Hon. Minister will give the reply to his colleague who has also asked a question today about reshaping these roads. One of his Party mates has seen the wisdom in trying to help these people get out their canes because it is too costly now, and it does not pay them to grow canes under such conditions. When a person grows a ton of canes, several people get benefits from it. There is the lorry-owner, the lorry hands and other people who have to do with it; and if everybody says he is not planting any more canes, then he would be contributing to the unemployment of this country. I am asking for these roads to help people; I am not asking for myself. At the moment my land is by the side of the road; so I can tell the Minister that I do not need such assistance. As a matter of fact, the highway passes through my land, because I have land on both sides of the road. I am making this request for the people of this country, because I know it better than the Minister as he lives in Bridgetown where you do not have this difficulty, while in the country you have these uphill and downhill, ditches, gullies and long distances to travel, and people plant canes in places where I am sure the Minister would not go walking even if you paid him. I am sure he would not go in these places because he is not accustomed to them. He may go down a straight man, but come back up a bandy one. It is for the Government to reshape these roads. The plantations have to reshape their roads every year or every two years, because some of the land slips and the plantation owners do not spend large sums of money in making permanent roads; they only shape them as soon as they are ready to reap the canes, and they do it when the sun is shining.

I am therefore asking the Government to do likewise for these peasants who are not in a position to hire a bulldozer, because I understand that in some cases — I do not know if it is true because I never had to hire a bulldozer — you have to pay at the rate of \$100 a day. For \$100 a day a bulldozer can do a lot of work, but these people are not in a position to hire a bulldozer.

3.45 p.m.

The Government will have to help them because these peasants are paying taxes to this country to do everything; and I am sure that the Government would not be losing anything.

I know that two of these roads were done by the last Government, and the peasants in these parishes were promised that more of these roads would be done; but fortunately or unfortunately for them, they are outside; and since the broom has swept in another Government, I am asking this Government to take up from where that last Government has left and carry on this programme of works.

Sir, you can arrange it in such a way for the Director to go around, and when he has gone into the district and seen what the conditions are he would be able to reshape all of these roads. There are people who are asking me about this and I will not doubt that they are also asking my colleague too; but I am not so selfish as to bring this Resolution asking for help for the people of St. Joseph only. I am asking the Government to help the peasants in all the parishes where the roads are in the same condition. I know that there is the same class of roads in St. Andrew; may be, they are in a worse condition than those of St. Joseph. St. Andrew and St. Joseph adjoin each other and a lot of help can be given to the people by re-shaping these roads.

Of course, the Director of Highways and Transport would know more than I know; but if he feels that these roads should be also sheeted with stones and put on List "A", well then, he can do so. I know that some cannot take sheeting with stones: so if you do so you will be only losing money.

It is the peasants whom we have to think of, and we should do all in our power to help them to reap their canes, especially during this reaping season when they will have to

pay much more for reaping. As I have said on the floor of this House already, for peasants to get their canes reaped in some areas, they have to pay a lot more than what others pay, and it costs them a lot more per ton than what it would cost a plantation owner. Along with what they have to pay, they also have to give something else, such as something to the labourers to drink. The places where their canes are grown are very difficult to get to and in consequence you have to work much harder climbing those hills, especially when the sun is warm and it does not encourage every worker to do that sort of work. As you know, Sir, in some areas labourers can load the lorries right on the spot because those lorries can drive right in; but in these other areas which I am speaking about, the labourers have to be always heading canes right out to the road because the lorries cannot come in, and when they get them out to the lorries, they then have to load the lorries.

I know that help can be given to the people. And it can be given to meet this crop season. It is a true saying that the wheels of government grind very slowly, and it may be that by the time that the Director of Highways gets the go-ahead the crop season may be finished.

I am asking the Hon. Minister of Communications to speed up and help these peasants. From next week a bulldozer can be put on the job. It is not a question of getting the money, because last week we passed a Resolution so that money could be spent from one Head for a purpose other than what was set out. It would not therefore be a question of the money.

It may be said, or your Director may say, that there is no money for the re-shaping of these roads and that we will have to wait until the Estimates. The money can be found. If we have to wait until such time, the crop will be finished. We gave Government approval last week to spend money from a Head for 'other development purposes'. They can use this money in the development of other areas and this can be one matter which can come under that Development plan. We will not, therefore, have to wait for a Resolution to come to the House to do this. I do not think from last Tuesday until today that that money has been spent and this particular project should have propriety because we will be developing an area and it would be, as a matter of fact, helping to reduce the unemployment conditions in a certain way because there are some of the workers who do not work during the crop season. When you start work on the re-shaping of these roads, you will be helping those people.

Sir, I will not say anything further because I would like this Resolution to be passed today. I see from the expressions on hon. members' faces that they are willing to pass this Resolution because no doubt it is a deserving one.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure if you were on the floor of the House and not in that honourable Chair, you would have spoken in favour of this Resolution. I think that every hon. member who represents a country area would want to say something on this motion because everyone of them knows the difficulty and costs which peasants encounter in the reaping of their canes and every hon. member would want to make the lot of these peasants easier.

Sir, a peasant never tells you anything of the time and labour he spends working the land, putting it into preparation or in caring the canes. He does not look at that expense; he only cries about the reaping costs, although in my opinion the time and labour which he spends in the other directions may cost him more. Anyhow, he never tells you anything about that. Of course, there are some of them who work the land and do everything themselves; but when it comes to the reaping, they cannot do that themselves, and therefore the blow is very hard there. However, we as a Socialist Government can undertake to relieve them.

With those remarks I respectfully move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, I have no timidity in rising to my feet to support this Resolution moved by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. It is common knowledge that the reaping of canes in parishes like St. Joseph

and St. Andrew is much more difficult than in other parishes.

Mr. Speaker, I have no grudge against labourers for the increase in labour costs which they are entitled to, but as a small land proprietor myself, I have always been concerned with the plight of the small land proprietors, and I say without fear of contradiction that the time is fast approaching when if nothing is done to help the small land proprietors, they will be forced to stop working the land. 3.55 p.m.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that some of these complaints which have been made to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, my colleague, have also been made to me. I can speak from first-hand knowledge that there are some people who pay nearly all of what they receive from the factory only for heading canes. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this Government should do something to help these poor people by giving them roads. The hon. introducer of this Resolution has asked only for the reshaping of these roads and tracks which could be used by horse-drawn carts and so on, but we cannot expect a man to carry his lorry along such roads, because the parts for these vehicles are expensive and you cannot blame a man if he refuses to carry his lorry along such roads. It is for the Government to come to the rescue of these poor people. I think that the Government itself should take a look at Psalm 41: and they will see that this is stated: "Blessed is he that considereth the poor." Mr. Speaker, if the poor have elected the Government here and they are considering the poor, I feel sure that they will have a number of years to run this country; on the other hand, if they turn their backs and they give deaf ears to the poor, then deaf ears will be given to them from above. When you are on the side of the poor, you are on the side of God and you know that everything comes to you when God is on your side.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember the days when God was on Daniel's side, and although he was cast into the den of lions when the King went next morning to see him, Daniel said, "Oh, King! Live forever." If this Government will work on the side of the poor, then they will live forever.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who has brought forward such a Resolution before this House today. I am quite certain that he will consider me when from 1959 I brought forward such a Resolution and question in this House asking for help for the poor people in the conveying of their canes out of these difficult places. From 1959 I have been asking this question and the then Minister of Communications, Works and Housing has left this House and he has not answered my question yet. He told me in the Dining Room of this House that if he gave me these roads, then the people will give me the honour. I told him: "If you do not give me the roads, you will get the licks". And I am sure that he got the licks (Laughter). The then Minister of Communications and Works answered divers questions but he has not answered that question. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that a Resolution of this sort has come before this House because I am sure that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph now knows the meaning of a grievance; I am in sympathy with him in his grievance now.

Mr. Speaker, there are roads which the Government have on their list as tenantry roads and there are other roads too. I am sure that the Government does not know about these other roads. It is we who represent the people in the various districts, who will have to mention these other roads to the Government. The poor people have their canes to reap from the various districts; lorries cannot get in or out of those districts and we now have an opportunity to ask the Government to assist these poor people. The Hon. Minister does not know the grievance of the people as we, who are their representatives, would know them. When we bring such grievances before the Government I do not think that this Government will pay a deaf ear to the grievances of the people. This Government is willing to do things, but it will take time to do them. We cannot build roads overnight. Since this Government came into power they have done many things and they are willing to do more. The people in

St. Andrew and St. Joseph suffer more than any others because our land as a whole is hilly and mountainous and we have to make preparation in order to relieve the situation in these parishes.

Mr. Speaker, I have approached the Director of Highways and Transport; I have also approached the Minister of Communications and Works and they have surveyed these roads and they are working on them; they are willing to help those who bring their grievances to them, I belong to this Government; and any day when I see that they are working contrary to what is right, I will criticise them here and anywhere else. I am sure that the Government is willing to do these things, but it will take time to do them. This Government will reshape these roads in order to relieve these people. I am sure that the Minister of Communications, whom I have taken to see these other roads, will call upon the Director of Highways and Transport to survey these roads in St. Joseph and see what can be done, because the sugar crop is the upkeep of this island, and if we neglect it, then we are neglecting our life-blood. I have seen the preparations which are being made. The more roads we establish in St. Andrew and St. Joseph, the more the people down there will be given encouragement to plant more canes, and the island as a whole will benefit from that. I am sure that this Government will take that into consideration. I will stick behind this Government until they do the things which I want them to do.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the burden and lamentation of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph in respect of his request being put to this Government by way of this Resolution.
4.05 p.m.

Now, Sir, it is true that the implementation of such a Resolution by the Government would in some way facilitate the small cane-farmer. My prime concern, Sir, was to find out what sort of roads or by-ways are being referred to. I am given to understand that these roads are really on parts of land owned by the small cane-farmers, and that would obviate the difficulty which sometimes presents itself when the residents of an area want roads that are usually known as tenantry roads made. Very often it is discovered that a few of the owners of land running along the road to be made object to giving some small portion of their land to Government in order to make a road possible. I understand that in this case no such difficulty will present itself since the very people that are to be helped are all owners of the land on which some rough roadway is proposed to be made. I understand, Sir, that it is not a question of providing a macadamised surface for these roads. All that is desired is that a rough path be cut out, but there is no question of surfacing.

One thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the proposals are rather bold here. They seem to want the Government to give priority to certain parishes; the parishes of St. Joseph, St. Andrew, St. Thomas and St. John. I do not know if they themselves have already made a survey and they already know that cane farmers in the parishes not mentioned could not do well with such a service. I believe, Sir, this would call for a sort of survey on the part of Government officers to find out the general needs of the entire Island, because such complaints may not be confined to the parishes mentioned in this Resolution. I think the Resolution is commendable, Sir, and since it does not envisage a tremendous expense - the sort of expense that would be entailed if the roads were required to be surfaced - I think it is practical and to some extent not very expensive. It would not cost a lot of money if all that is to be done is to get bulldozers to make the tracks level and wide enough to accommodate the modern transportation of canes. Obviously in those days when these tracks provided ways of transportation, those were the mule, horse and pony cart-ways. Now we have transportation by way of lorries, and if the lorries themselves cannot go up these narrow tracks, obviously they remain at the side of the main road, and some expense is entailed in having to get the canes to the roadside.

If all that is needed is a level roadway, Sir, I think it is a practical suggestion and not very expensive. I join in sup-

port of this Resolution. I believe it is a practical one, but one thing I do not entirely approve of is confining such a service to the parishes mentioned in this Resolution. I have not made an island-wide survey in this matter, nor do I think I will be asked to; but I daresay in the parish which I have the honour to represent, that of St. Peter, there may exist in the hilly parts tracks like these that are lending the same difficulty of transporting canes from the fields to the factory. I have had the assurance of one hon. member who is closely associated with this Resolution, and he has told me that the lands on which these roads pass are owned by the very cane farmers who need to be serviced. That is getting one difficulty out of the way, a difficulty I know about when it comes to tenantry roads. I have known tenantry roads that I have been trying very hard to have built in St. Peter. Sometimes a single objector throws the whole scheme up. I understand this would not obtain in this case, and therefore I think the hon. member who proposed this Resolution has got great hope in that it might be found easily possible to effect the implementation of this Resolution.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, like the last hon. member, I think it is correct to say that in every parish where canes are grown, it is the peasant farmers who grow them, and one suggestion I will make is that the service be made not only to those mentioned by the hon. member but throughout the Island. Although most people might regard St. James as the highway from Bridgetown to Speightstown, it is just a question of going into the back. I may mention that it is not likely for a Minister or one who does not live in a particular parish to be fully aware of the inconvenience that would be suffered by planters, and therefore it is commendable that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should bring these grievances to the attention of Government. I myself am aware of the need for such a service in St. James, and like the hon. junior member for St. Peter, I have no doubt that if a survey or some examination is made of all the parishes where this help is needed, that it will be found out in due course.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, when one reads the Resolution, one is prone to associate oneself with it; but I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is a technical Resolution in that sometime last year about this same time, I made mention about a similar request and the Department of Highways and Transport sent around one of their supervisors to investigate the situation. I would like to tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that the snag in a Resolution of this nature is that Government has a very difficult job in getting all of the peasants to give up the number of feet on either side of the land to cause such a road to be implemented.
4.15 p.m.

In St. Thomas, there was a small snag because three peasants agreed to the construction of the road and one objected to it, and I am afraid that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would experience a similar fate by this Resolution.

Sir, when one reads the Resolution, one will agree that it has a taste of attraction and serves a useful purpose by relieving the financial burden which is mostly on those peasants; but one must realise that all of these peasants are not co-operative and some would not give up their land. It must also be borne in mind that provision is not always made for the giving up of a few feet of land, and that is the snag which I feel this Government would be subjected to. I am not against the principle of the Resolution, but the technical part of it is something to which you must give concern. I am waiting to see if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will agree with me that some of these peasants are unwilling to release some of their land so that Government can construct a road or even cut a suitable track. I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will agree that that is the snag because I have had a similar experience in St. Thomas.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which one may say relates to roads in particular, but it so happens that it affects agricultural land, especially land in the growing of canes, and in particular to that land in the Scotland area. Hon. members who have spoken will

realise that it is closely associated with my portfolio; therefore, if I may appear that I am assisting or co-operating with the Hon. Minister of Communications, it is because I am concerned with agriculture, and it is land in the growing of canes to which reference has been made and land which is in the Scotland area.

At the very outset I should like to tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that the Government is in entire sympathy with the case which he has purported to put forward on behalf of small holders in the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph and certain parts of St. James and St. Thomas. The Government is in entire sympathy with the plight of the small holders in particular, and also with the owners of land generally in that area, irrespective of whether they be small holders or large land owners. However, the hon. member having served for many years as a member of the Vestry of the parish which he represents and also as a member of this Chamber, one would have expected that he would have put his case in a more forceful and responsible manner. In the first instance, the hon. member would know, having been a legislator for seventeen years, although he is not a lawyer, that the roads in question are roads which are not public highways or tenantry roads or even other roads as such which have been handed over to the public. The hon. member is in reality talking of tracks or rights of way which lie between cane fields, and he is asking the Government to give assistance to peasants who are not able to put such roads in order. The hon. member has been in here for a long time; so he should know that if the Government has to take over or repair a road or put it in good condition and that road is between private people's lands, this is generally done by a solicitor or it may be done by the signatures of the adjoining owners of the land.

You cannot send the entire staff of inspectors of the Highways Department island wide on a wild goose chase to find out where these roads are to be put in order. If the hon. member was handling his Resolution in such a manner as we know that he can handle it, he would have taken time and gone out to the various areas and found out the specific roads which should be put in order. The Government cannot send out inspectors to look for every little road between every cane field in the Island which can be put in order; but if the hon. member comes and specified this road or that road or six or seven different roads in his parish which Government should put in order, then the Hon. Minister of Communications and myself, if he needs any assistance from me, would look into the matter and see that assistance is given.

Therefore, Sir, I am hoping that the hon. member would be able, if not now, at some future meeting, to supply the House with the necessary information because he must be able to specify to what roads he is alluding. The Government is not a mind reader. You cannot expect us to just listen to the hon. member's speech and conclude what roads he has in mind or what roads he would like to have repaired. In this case, there are existing roads and some are just rights of way between cane fields, roads of suffrance, or just tracks.

In so far as the point raised about the Development Plan and the money available, let me tell the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that what he is talking about cannot be regarded as a development plan. His is a question of construction of roads and you could not allot the money which was voted last week for that purpose. Of course, I am not raising the question of whether this money can be found or cannot be found. If the hon. member would examine further, he would also see that many of the roads to which he is alluding may be only eight feet wide. Many are not of the approved width; therefore, those which are wide enough should be attended to by him, when brought in, favourable consideration would be granted. I will also say now that any of those roads which lie in the Soil Conservation area, the Soil Conservation team would give attention to them.

I would like the hon. member to give me a list of the roads which he has in mind, and I would also say the same thing to all those hon. members who represent constituencies in the rural areas, and where you find the terrain of

the land is such that small holders in particular suffer great hardship at this time of the year which prevents them from making their full contribution to the economy of this Island.
4.25 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I should like to say that I have made several trips with the Director of Highways and Transport to St. Andrew and certain other districts in the island.....

Mr. SMITH: I am not hearing the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member may change his microphone.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I have made several trips with the Director of Highways and Transport to St. Andrew and other districts in the island and it is difficult for peasants to get out their canes. The contour of the land in St. Joseph is responsible very much for the inconvenience of the slipping position and narrow tracks. On several occasions.....

At this stage, it being now 4.30 p.m. of the clock,

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that it is now 4.30 p.m., of the clock when the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business automatically expires.

PRIVILEGE re THE MACE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the matter which I raised this morning, I am enquiring as to whether I can now raise that matter of privilege:

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Peter is seeking to make a motion which directly concerns the privileges of the House. Am I correct about that?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the matter with which I want to engage the attention of this House is one which I deem to be a very important matter in relation to the dignity of this House. It concerns the Mace which is a symbol of Your Honour's authority and a symbol of the authority of this House. I understand, Sir, that on Sunday, 27th January, of this year, as a result of a private invitation sent out by a certain Minister of Government, many hon. members of this House responded to that invitation. I am not in any way criticising their response; not at all, Sir. Hon. members attended a Service at St. Mary's Church, and they had every right to do so; but the House of Assembly, this House, could not and did not attend as a House. The Mace is not, in my opinion, to be regarded in any light manner. I recall on one occasion that I demonstrated to the House what respect I had for the Speaker's authority when the Mace is in its right place. Sir, I view it as a very serious thing, and I should not like what I am complaining about ever to be repeated as far as the Mace being outside of the precincts of this House is concerned, and not attendant upon Your Honour in your official capacity as the presiding Officer of this House. On the occasion like the one to which I have made reference, that service at St. Mary's Church was a very worthy event, but it was not an occasion of State. The Mace has left the precincts of this House before. I remember that, as presiding Officer of this House, on the occasion of National Mourning, hon. members were apprised of the death of a member of the Royal Family and the House as a House met, adjourned as a House and proceeded to the St. Michael's Cathedral.

On such an occasion — I daresay there have been other such occasions in the past before my time — the House is able to leave as a House, headed by the Speaker with the Mace borne by the Marshal in front of the Speaker. The House leaves here as a House and comes back as a House. There are many other occasions when members of the House of Assembly and His Honour the Speaker are all

invited, on occasions of State too, when the Mace is not used. At the annual ceremonial parade on the occasion of the Queen's Birthday, the Speaker is invited to attend and members of the House are also invited; but there is no Mace. The House does not leave here as a House and therefore the Mace has no right there. At the Annual Remembrance Day which is held at the Cenotaph, His Honour the Speaker and Members of the House as dignitaries of this island respond to an invitation and they attend that Service; but even then there is no Mace. I received an invitation to attend that service just as any other member of this House, not from Your Honour, but from a Minister of the Government. A Minister of the Government cannot summon the House as a House, thank God, not yet. On that occasion I understand that the Mace was in a very exalted position; I understand that during the service the Mace of this House was put in a position in front of His Excellency the Governor, who is the Queen's representative. Mr. Speaker, that sounds funny. I am very sure that every hon. member who views seriously the office of Speaker of this Assembly and all that goes to show his position as the presiding Officer of this Chamber, will view this matter in the same light as that in which I am viewing it. That should never happen again. What has happened is a precedent and a bad one, that the Mace of the ancient and Honourable Chamber should leave this House unless it is a matter in which the House as a House is accompanying the Speaker. The Mace should only leave this House when the House as a House is accompanying the Speaker, but not as individuals attending a Divine Service.

4.35 p.m.

There is absolutely no precedent for it. As I said, in my time when I had the honour to preside over this Chamber, members of this House whom I can look around and see, and I think Your Honour too, will remember that we met here and then we adjourned. There is a particular procedure that applies to members as they leave this Chamber as a House. They leave in order of seniority, and not in a hodge-podge manner. I understand that you could not see members of the House, and they cannot complain about it, Sir. It does not matter what happened. Whatever, if any, inconveniences they had to put up with, they dare not make any complaint in this Chamber, because they did not leave as a House; they left their homes as individuals in response to an invitation by a Government Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Mace is a symbol of the Speaker's authority and of the authority of this House, and it should not be taken down Broad Street or any other part of this country just like that at the whims or fancy of any member of this House or of any officer of this House. I think it is most regrettable and some members do not realise it, but they will today. We do not know who has been taking it as a laughing matter; I wish I knew. Only as a House, with Your Honour preceding, attended by the Marshal who bears the Mace is the Mace in place; otherwise it is completely and absolutely out of place, and there is no hon. member in this House who can dare gainsay that. When I was told about this, I could not believe it. Hon. members had no status there as a House. Anything could have happened. When I was told that the Mace was exalted to a position in front of His Excellency the Governor, I asked "what next?" How do we look in the eyes of people? I see hon. members smiling; let them smile. It shows that they have lost a complete sense of the dignity of this Chamber if they can smile at that. I could not dream to smile at a thing like that.

Mr. Speaker, we have been degraded as a House. As individual members, nothing matters. Any Hon. Minister of Government can invite hon. members of this House as individuals, but an invitation to this House as a House can only come through Your Honour on a Message. Your Honour is well aware of that, and mark you, hon. members whom I look around and see smiling know it too; but it is a sign of the times. More will happen if we stand for it, and if I stand alone, I am going to contend that it never should have happened and this Mace should never have left the precincts of this House, save that it was borne in front of Your Honour by the Marshal of this House on an occasion of State if a Message came to you, Sir, and those of us who cared to follow you in orderly manner and with dignity to whatever the appointed place was. I am sure, Sir, that no Message

came through Your Honour, but a private invitation came from a Minister to me. Mark you, Sir, I am in no way degrading the importance of that service at all. I want that to be clearly understood and I do not want to be misunderstood by anybody who writes or says anything after me.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain emblems. The Church has hers. The Bishop has the crozier, but he does not go for a walk with it. Only on certain important occasions when he is carrying on his duties as Chief Pastor of his religious flock is the crozier in its place. The Speaker as such was not representing anything on that occasion as far as the House is concerned; otherwise Your Honour would have had a Message and hon. members would have been apprised of that Message and would not just be getting private invitations from a particular Minister, who of course, did nothing wrong. Hon. members who attend did nothing wrong in accepting and responding to the invitation, but I want especially the young members of this House to realise it could never happen in any other place; it has not happened yet; and we pride ourselves as a Parliament of 300 years old, one of the oldest in the British Commonwealth. That should not happen in 1963.

Sir, I view the situation seriously as a breach of the privileges of this House when the Mace could leave these precincts in that manner. I believe in ceremony; I appreciate ceremony, but ceremony with a meaning and ceremony carried out in a dignified manner. I believe in those things, and I will always champion those things. Some people try to whitewash those things, but I have never been in that frame of mind. But how can this action be defended? There are two occasions on which hon. members can look back: one is the Queen's Ceremonial Parade when private invitations come from His Excellency the Governor or from some other Government official or from the Premier's Office. We do not attend as a House. Does the Mace go there? One of these days will I see the Mace up there too? Probably. When we go to the Cenotaph on Remembrance Day, will I see the Mace there too? Maybe. It would have as much right in St. Michael's Cathedral as it could have at this Service at the Cenotaph. As a matter of fact, it would be more than a precedent.

4.45 p.m.

I have brought this to the attention of the House, Sir, in order that whatever remains — and I hope that a modicum remains of dignity and observance of real ceremony and that it would be preserved in the name of this good old House that has been going on for 300 years.

Sir, it does not matter to me what records are looked up and if there is any record that can be read to hon. members to try to convince them that the Mace has left in here under such conditions. You may agree to it, I do not know what next there would be to it. Certain things are never permissible, so to speak. You do not compromise them. Do not forget that in Barbados there are still many people who respect certain institutions which have certain significance pertaining to certain things. Do not let us forget the idea of the Divine Service to which hon. members responded to private invitation but to tell me that the Mace should be there is telling me what I would never agree to. Comparisons are odious and for many reasons I would not say more.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I must speak out if I am the only voice to speak out, and I have spoken out. I know the occasions well, and I have reminded hon. members of them for the benefit of hon. members who were not in this House then. If these things pass unnoticed, if nobody raises a voice against them, such actions will be repeated and then, what next? I did not attend the service, but I had nothing against it. Now, that I know what happened, maybe, it was good that I did not attend. That does not mean that I would have caused a scene, but one never knows. Maybe, it would have affected me in such a manner that I do not know what thoughts would have gone through my mind. However, I believe when this is brought to the attention of this honourable and ancient Chamber — and I would not impute this to hon. members — it would be only through sheer callousness that such a thing would happen again.

Sir, I know hon. members of my experience would well understand and appreciate normally the pertinence of my remarks. Other hon. members with less experience - not necessarily all - would say that what I have said, I have said in good faith and will not misconstrue it. I have not attempted, you will notice, Mr. Speaker, to mention the office of Speaker in any derogatory sense. I am able to contain myself, but I know what I have said would not be lost on your ear. I am perfectly sure because if I am not here, somebody would be here to make that sort of objection.

Sir, I am on the defence here today: I am not on the attack. I am in stubborn, dour defence of the rights and privileges, dignity and usages of this House. If any hon. member dares after I sit down to misconstrue what I have said as an attack on anybody or any hon. member, I say now in anticipation to him that he is being dishonourable and I know that any responsible sort of member, if he cares to, can conscientiously speak in the same vein as I am speaking and for the benefit, mark you, Sir, of this historic Chamber.

The privileges that you claim - and when I say you, I mean, Mr. Speaker - of the Queen's Representative when the office of Speakership is taken up - those privileges, Sir, are very dear. Those privileges are claimed in the name of the House, not in the name of the Speaker. A Speaker is the Speaker of the House. He is almost the House's property if you can put it that way. He can do nothing but that the House bids. In his robes, he is the Speaker of the House, not the Speaker of himself; and all these emblems and symbols of the authority of the House are the property of the House and they must be associated with what has been handed down of the dignity of this place.

Sir, I say absolutely nothing against the intent or purpose of that Divine Service held in St. Mary's Church about two weeks ago. It was an occasion in which West Indians who are interested in education should be happy about. I did not attend that service, but I was sent an invitation, which invitation I respected, and hon. members who responded did so out of courtesy and interest in West Indian education. As Your Honour knows, Barbados has been always very proud of its educational institutions and Barbados still thinks that she takes pride of place among the sister colonies. Much as we respect education, and bearing in mind that a reasonable percentage of the Island's revenue is spent on education, yet that very thought of education which we boast about should be the sort of education which makes us appreciate just the sort of thing which we are talking about today.
4.55 p.m.

I am talking about the symbol of authority of this House. I want hon. members to understand me clearly; I am talking about the symbol of authority of this House and no other House. Therefore, I am absolutely against a repetition of what has happened a few Sundays ago. I am up in arms, and I hope that that will not be construed as being offensive; but many a man gets up in arms on the defensive. You can be up in arms on the attack, but you can also be up in arms on the defensive.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it takes anything more to convince hon. members of the proprieties which we hold dear and which we should always hold dear. I do not think I should have to add anything more to that, but I am very concerned that no semblance of a repetition of a few Sundays ago will ever take place. I have referred to occasions of State when the Mace has left the precincts of this House, when there was national mourning and on occasions when the House attends State functions when we do not leave here as a House. There is a manner in which we must leave; there is the matter of seniority in this House and it is not a Minister who sits in the Chair but the Speaker. The House is our House; it is not the Government's House. It is our House; it is the people's House; and, as representatives of the people, we must ever be jealous guardians of our heritage. I thank you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: As no other hon. member has given any indication of his desire to speak, I will just make this remark in respect of what has been said by the hon. junior

member for St. Peter. The occasion of the 27th of January this year when hon. members including myself, at the request of the Hon. Minister of Education, attended a public Thanksgiving Service held at St. Mary's Church on the occasion of the celebration of the Independence of the University of the West Indies, was an unprecedented occasion, and it is in respect of such an occasion, if there is no precedent, then precedent is made. Of that there can be no doubt whatsoever. A good precedent is a precedent to be followed, and on an occasion such as this - a unique auspicious and unprecedented occasion - to me it seemed entirely appropriate to comply with the request of the Hon. Minister of Education that that tremendously important symbol, the Mace of this House, be present as well as myself in the Robes of Office. Standing Order 66 provides that the Mace shall be, and remain, in the hands and keeping of the Speaker.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter says that the Mace is not to be regarded in any light manner, and that is exactly why the Mace was taken on this unique, solemn and unprecedented occasion. None of us may ever live in this island, to have the privilege of being in the island and to attend a service such as that representing such an occasion, and it was heartening to observe that members of each and every political Party in this island, not to speak of Independents, were able to be present and were physically present in the island, attended and participated in that service and expressed their appreciation of being invited to appear in their capacity as Members of this House. There is no reason whatsoever not to establish a precedent; as a matter of fact, the first precedent had to be established, and whenever occasions warrant the establishment of further good precedents, as long as I am in the Chair, such precedents will be established.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Committee of Supply

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: - To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the Service of the Colony.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1962-63 No. 34

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the first Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$266,364 under three Heads of the Estimates which will be taken separately as usual.

HEAD 10 - ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Head 10 - Accountant General - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 10 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head 10 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 11 - PENSIONS

Head 11 - Pensions - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that Head 11 stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that Head 11 stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 5.05 p.m.

HEAD 12 - CHARGES OF DEBT

Head 12 - Charges of Debt - was called.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 12 - Charges of Debt, stand part.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, the Resolution for \$266,364 was passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63 No. 36

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal with the Resolution for the sum of \$54,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1962-63, Part II - Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1962-63 No. 36 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Addendum to this Resolution says that 'it was necessary for advances to be made from the Crown Agents' Joint Consolidated Fund pending the raising of loan funds. Loans were raised later than anticipated, and as a result the amount of advances during the year was greater than estimated. It is therefore necessary to increase the provision by \$54,000 to meet interest on these advances.'

Now, Sir, if this Addendum is right, the statement that I heard the Hon. Premier make at a public meeting in the market square is wrong, and if what he says is right, then this is wrong. I am not in a position to quote the exact words, but I understood him to say that the last Premier did not know the approach for these loans. (Hon. E. W. BARROW: What loans are you talking about?) I read here that these are Capitalisation Charges and you are borrowing money or have borrowed money for this. You said that the last Premier did not know that the money was there ready to be borrowed or to be raised in London and it was only for Barbados to say that she wanted it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it is obvious that the hon. member is confused and does not understand the first thing about loan-raising or finance, but that is not really his fault. If he had an enlightened Government in his day, he would be more up-to-date on these matters, but I am not going to sit here and allow him to attribute remarks to me which I did not make. I am not going to repeat what I said in the Market square, because we are in the House of Assembly. If he wants to find out what the \$54,000 are about, let him ask a straightforward question and I will explain to him in words of one syllable.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the \$54,000 are to meet interest on loans, and the Premier said that the loan was there ready, but he did not want to take it at the time.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, what I think is wrong in this House, Mr. Chairman, is that you cannot permit a member to get up and quote something that has taken place outside of the House of Assembly. I do not want to enter the controversy, but this has nothing to do with what the Hon. Premier said on a platform. In this case, he has not spoken on this debate at all today; so you should tell the hon. member so.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would not take an ordinary member on a public platform seriously; but when you hear the Premier of a country talking to the people of the country, you are to take him seriously. If it is that I cannot take that into consideration on the floor of this House, I will go no further with that. It seems to me however, that you can say anything to the people of this House. When I heard that the money was there already only to be called for, and now you are asking for \$54,000 because the loans were not forthcoming at the time, why should you have to come for money to pay interest? The Hon. Premier, Mr. Chairman, got up and moved the Resolution without enlightening us one way or another on it. He has moved it and has left it for us to ramble and wander on, because he knows everything about it. The Resolution only tells us that 'it was necessary for advances to be made from the Crown Agents' Joint Consolidated Fund pending the raising of loan funds.' Loans were raised later than anticipated and hence we need \$54,000 to pay the interest. He did not let us know what time the application for the loan was made or what time it was granted. We should know all these things because you are asking for money to pay interest, and I am asking the Premier now to let us know what time the application was made for the loan and what date it was granted.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, part of what the hon. member has asked would make sense, and though I am not speaking for the Government - the Government should speak for itself - I would say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was a little mixed up in this, because this only deals with a normal and regular routine matter in so far as borrowing money pending the raising of loans is concerned. That is something the House has already agreed to. As you will see, we have already voted \$35,000 towards this thing; so there is nothing new. I am not dealing with the statement that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph made concerning when we could get the loan, but the Addendum merely states that it was necessary for advances to be made from the Crown Agents' Joint Consolidated Fund pending the raising of loans and that the loans were raised later than was anticipated.
5.15 p.m.

I think what should be explained is, if the interest that we have to pay on the raising of the loan is less than what you would have done, had you raised the money at the time. I know the raising of the money on the London Market depends on your waiting to see how the market is. I hope the people of Barbados would take note of this. The Government has landed us in a fixed percentage of an amount of money borrowed. People took pride when the interest went up to 7%. Now that it has come down, I have not heard them saying anything about it. The local money lenders took advantage of the raise in interest, although there is no local stock market and I think it is a bit of financial ignorance when the people here tried to equate the interest rate here with the interest rate of the Bank of England.

I would like the Hon. Premier to say if it is so advantageous. That is the one statement which can be given. It never dropped, but you still have to borrow the money. I would say in this case that the Government has fallen into the same error as the last Government. I think the Hon. Premier, in putting his fingers on a thing like this, should make his Ministry proffer him some sort of progress report as regards the type of capitalisation which you require for the loans which you have taken up. Tell us: what do you have in mind to do with the money which you have raised? How do you propose utilising that money? Can some progress report be given? The Hon. Premier in preparing this Resolution to bring to the House should have before him what is the sort of capital works which

we are doing and what progress we have made with them. He should also tell us how much more loans he thinks we would have to acquire. Do you think that you require all the loans that you have anticipated? Of course, you can take it in two ways: you can say that you can get that information during the Budget Speech.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should explain the mechanics and backgrounds of this Resolution to hon. members. It is simple finance. The Crown Agents for Overseas Territories have deposits in London from territories all over the world for whom they deal, and without necessarily seeking the permission of any territory they use those reserves to do shorter financing for Governments who have bills to be met in the United Kingdom or on the continent of Europe from month to month. As long as a Government has good credit, the Crown Agents would borrow money from what I know as the Joint Colonial Fund, but what is called in this Resolution the Joint Consolidated Fund — which I do not think is the correct nomenclature for that Fund. They make advances to meet the requirements of Governments from time to time without sending out to the territories and calling on them for the money.

We try to keep the Joint Colonial Fund in a financial state so that the Crown Agents can make advances on behalf of the Government of Barbados; but, as you know, Sir — and I have said this many times before — when this Government came into power, far from having reserves in the Treasury here or in the Crown Agents for Overseas Territories which used to be the Crown Agents for the Colonies, this Government was faced with a deficit on both accounts. We received authority from this House some time last year to go ahead with the Development Plan and that Plan is the authority for raising Loan Funds. We repealed or laid aside the previous authority for the raising of loans and there was an outstanding loan from 1959 which up to last year was not raised by the Government. We had plenty of authority for the loan which we raised last year. In December, we went on the London Market and we raised \$6 1/2 million in five minutes and this was the first loan which was granted to any colonial territory apart from the Government of Australia which has been successfully negotiated on the London Market for nearly three years.

Obviously, if you have advances made against the credit of Barbados, you have to pay it back and when you have paid it back, you have to pay interest. The difference of interest which we are using now is 6 3/4% with a discount and it works out to 7.2%.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to inform hon. members of this House that for the second time this year the Barbados Government had a loan which was issued this morning at 9.00 o'clock and it was over-subscribed on the local market within five minutes. I am sorry that I have to bring it to the attention of this House in this indirect way, but I was not here at the opening to make a direct statement. One supporter of one of the parties opposite remarked to me that we were very lucky. It is not a question of good luck; it is a question of timing and good management because if you mismanage, you have to wait for another three years. These things are done by good management, and, if necessary, getting advice from the Bank of England and sometimes from the Treasury.

In so far as timing and the amount of the local loan, that is entirely a matter for us, but within a matter of six weeks we were able to raise another loan. Mr. Chairman, you will remember that we raised one in January and by so doing we are preventing any export of capital. This, Sir, is a healthy sign because it discloses that there is a certain amount of thrift by the people of Barbados and no desire to send money abroad, but that they are prepared to help the industrial promotion in this country. Of course, that is only by the way.
5.25 p.m.

Whether you borrow money from the Joint Colonial Bank Fund or the London Money Market or locally, you have to pay interest. This \$54,000 does not represent any loss of revenue to this island; it actually represents a

saving. As to this six and a quarter million dollars which we raised in December on the London Money Market, we put up the debentures for subscriptions in instalments and by the end of this month as far as I remember, I calculate that we will have sufficient to cover the \$2.3 million which we had to borrow from the Crown Agents to pay for goods which we had ordered under the Development Programme. If we did not order them under the Development Programme, whether it be concrete mixers or whatever it may be, it would mean that the Development Programme would have been pushed back much further. We paid back this \$2.3 million out of the \$6 1/4 million which we successfully raised in December within a matter of five minutes. Mr. Chairman, the record of this Government is that any loan for which it has gone to the public, whether it is in the United Kingdom, Canada or the United States of America, has not gone as long as five minutes, in order to get all the money that we require.

Mr. Chairman, some loans have gone on for two or three days, but in the case of this Government, it is a matter of raising a loan within five minutes. The rate of interest, speaking under correction, is now about one half per cent above the bank rate. The rate fixed by the Bank of England is 4% which is the lowest that it has been since the time of Dr. Dalton in the late forties, and certainly the lowest in the past five years. The Joint Colonial Fund rate is usually at the rate of 4 1/2%, whereas our long-term rate of interest is 6 1/4, but when one works out the yield of the investment, it works at 7.26% or 7.24%. The short-term rate of interest which the Crown Agents charge the Government is approximately 4.5%. In other words, we have effected a saving by being able to borrow from the Joint Colonial Fund. If we had not borrowed the money from the Joint Colonial Fund, we would have had to raise the money a little earlier than we actually raised it and probably we would have to pay 8% instead of 7.5%. We have borrowed strictly on the basis of 4 1/2% and you cannot get it from any Bank in Barbados like that.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph was referring to a statement which I made in connection with the Exchequer Loan of half a million pounds which is a special sum which is channelled directly from....

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier objected to my saying anything about what happened outside of this House. He said that it was not in order; well, I do not think what he would be saying out of this House would be in order. Mr. Chairman, you should not take any notice of what has happened outside of this House. I stopped when the hon. member raised his objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think that the Hon. Premier is supplying the hon. member with information pertaining to the question which he has posed.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I objected to being misquoted. It was the hon. senior member for St. Peter who said that the House is not concerned with what anybody has said on a platform, but only with what is said in here. I not only did not say that I objected to his speaking on it, but I promised that I would enlighten the hon. member in words of one syllable. I was saying that any statement I made was in relation to Exchequer Loans which we have never raised in Barbados but which we would borrow directly under the Act of 1957 in England. We raised this loan first because the Imperial Act says that you must get this as a loan as the last resort. The Prime Minister of Jamaica and the Prime Minister of Trinidad were also promised Exchequer loans shortly after I elicited this undertaking from the British Treasury. I have always been an advocate of direct loans from the British Government because I do not think the Government could compete with big undertakings like L.C.I. and other undertakings of that kind which are able to offer a lot of inducements when overseas Governments may not be in a position to do so. We still have this 7.2 million dollars available when we are ready for it, but it was a condition that the Barbados Government could raise this £1 1/4 million which we have raised in December. We want to

keep our interest payments in the country and to be able to go periodically to the investors in Barbados and get local loans under the Inscribed Stock Act instead of using overseas loans.

Mr. Chairman, the position is that in this Resolution you will find that the amount which is asked for represents some kind of saving to the Barbados Government. The reason why we did not go on the London Market before was because I did not think that the conditions were favourable earlier this year. I predicted that the Bank rate would have to be reduced due to the general economic atmosphere prevailing in Great Britain. The bank rate did not come down and the interest which one would have to offer to investors should show some relation to the bank interest. Mr. Chairman, I have sent to get some information as to the present state of loans with the Crown Agents and I have been informed that the daily balance is now $5\frac{1}{4}\%$. At the time when we borrowed this money it was something like $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ and the interest which the Crown Agents charge on short term advances depends on the daily balance of their accounts.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear this last statement made by the Hon. Premier because I was a little worried when he said that the Crown Agents' Joint Consolidated Fund is one half per cent above the current bank rate. I was under the impression that the Fund was a Fund for Governments to use. When we have these sudden fluctuations beyond the Money Market you can hold down their loans from them, and they will give you — not at the rate at which you will be forced to borrow, because if you do that, you will see that although it is a short-term rate, you will pay the same interest as if you had it on the Money Market.
5.35 p.m.

I quite agree with the Hon. Premier that no sensible businessman or Leader of Government would have done that, and we warned the last Government that the Bank Rate in England could not remain at *7% ad infinitum*. People lend money on mortgage loans to build houses, and Barbadians have the idea that that is the sort of financial arrangement that exists in England, not knowing that there are mortgage rates in England above what the bank rate is; but the bank rate is a monetary arrangement which the Government of Great Britain uses for its own fiscal and economic policy. We do not have a fiscal and economic policy like them, but we follow them. I am glad to see that it was at $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ and not 5% , because that is the information I wanted, and I think it would help the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to understand that you can borrow money at short term at a low interest and hope to get the bulk, and the interest would be lower because something would be there to pay on the money.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1962-63, No. 37

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is for the sum of \$368, and from the Addendum to the Resolution it is made clear that this money is to supplement the vote under Head 36 — Ministry of Education (1) General Administration, and the item under reference is the Mobile Cinema.

The sum of \$368 is needed to meet the increases in salaries of temporary staff of the Visual Aids Officer, Clerk/Typist and Driver consequent on the revision of salaries by Mr. Jacobs.

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

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

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

On the motion of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN, reported the

passing of three Resolutions in Committee, and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

HOUSE RESUMES DEBATE ON EAST CARIBBEAN FEDERATION CONFERENCE 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Order No. 2: to resume debate on a Resolution relative to the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference, 1962. When this Resolution was previously debated, further consideration was postponed on the motion of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, which motion was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew. Does the hon. senior member for St. Thomas desire to resume his speech?

Mr. BATSON: No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. junior member for St. Andrew propose to continue?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who desires to speak before the Hon. Premier replies.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would be failing in my duty if I did not contribute something to this debate. First I must commend the Government for the stand which they have taken in publicising this debate, because when this debate was first introduced in this Honourable Chamber, most of the people living in this Island were very much concerned over whether or not Barbados should enter this Federation. Today through the Government's stand in publicising this debate, we can actually see that without a referendum Barbadians would be unanimous in their decision to go into this Federation.

If one reflects on this flowing river of civilisation, Mr. Speaker, one would see that the smaller territories are trying to unite in order that their presence may be felt in this world. If we quote Africa for example, we will find that while we were enjoying the early dawn of civilisation, that continent was still in dense darkness.

Today, Africa is leaps and bounds ahead of us: and although most of their federations have been marred with bloodshed, yet they are still willing to unite and to hold their place in this world.

We, in the West Indies have an example before us and that is cricket. We can say today that we have a federated West Indies in cricket because if Barbados had to play cricket against Australia or against England, we could hardly ever expect to draw a game, far more to win one. If Trinidad or even Jamaica had to play against England or Australia, they could hardly expect to win a game: but today there is a federated West Indies in cricket, and playing as a West Indian team we can beat the world.

That is sufficient to show every West Indian why we should federate.

How did the Barbadian view the short-lived Federation? We must come to the understanding that Barbados has plenty to be blamed for on the death of the West Indian Federation. If it was not for the democracy which my Party practises and preaches, I would urge this Honourable Chamber to make it illegal for any of the murderers of the last Federation to take part in this proposed Federation because they through shame have tried to retard the progress which the Hon. Premier and the Chief Ministers of the other territories have so ably prepared for this Federation. In electing men for this Federation, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the people will see fit to elect men who would not go to the Federation and serve their people at least for three or four years for a pension, but that we send men who would

put God before all, others before self and success before pennies, in order to build a strong nation.

Mr. Speaker, Federation of the West Indies is the dream of all young progressive-minded West Indians, whether he or she may be a Barbadian, a Trinidadian or a Jamaican. We say that the young progressive-minded West Indians are willing to federate and in this year of grace, 1963, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that representatives of this Honourable Chamber willingly agree to federate.

Like all federations, we know that some problems must confront us, such as lack of funds, industrial development and miles of separation by water; but, nevertheless, these problems confronted America when they wanted to federate, and it has been proved that the older a federation, as long as it has been founded and put on its right footing and if the leaders are willing to make sure that the people are represented rather than trying to fill their own pockets with wealth, the older the Federation grows, the more the problems reduce. For example today, any New Yorker is proud to say "I am an American". Therefore, we are hoping in the near future that Barbadians, Trinidadians, Jamaicans, Vincentians or whoever he or she may be would be proud to say "I am a West Indian".

Sir, you have heard plenty about the European Economic Market. That in itself is a Federation.

When I read the records of things agreed upon, no doubt everyone of us can say that this proposed Federation is being put on its right footing, and therefore I prophesy that sooner or later Trinidad and Tobago or even British Guiana will join us.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by quoting: "Behold, how good and pleasant it is to dwell in unity together."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in a debate last year.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. James caught my eye first.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I saw no other hon. member rise and I wish to say that this debate has been going on since June 1962. There is a procedure in the House for the conduct of debates and I intend to observe it.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is for members even backbenchers to intimate what line of action ought to be taken, and if the Hon. Premier wants to preclude me from contributing to this debate, however small it may be, I see no reason why. I intimated to Your Honour the Speaker, and I asked the question if the Hon. Leader of the House was closing debate on this matter today. Of course, if the Hon. Premier wants to continue, he may; but I just mentioned that.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: As far as I am concerned, I am concluding debate on this matter today. No such intimation was given to the Leader of the House. He warned all hon. members that the time table which we set and had given to Her Majesty the Queen for the conclusion of this debate had run out. We still like to observe our agreements.

As far as the Government is concerned, ample opportunity has been given to all sections and all parties in this House for the past seven or eight months to express their views on this matter.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have to remind the Hon. Premier that when this debate was started, I had the honour to be deputising for Your Honour and there has been only one occasion on which this debate continued when I was in my seat. I do not want to draw swords with the Hon. Premier, not in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is being very silly now.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I object to the Hon. Premier saying that I am being silly. When he gets home with his children he can say that, but he cannot tell an hon. member of this House that he is being silly.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member does not attend the debates of this House and therefore.....

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I object to that remark, Mr. Speaker. I would like the Hon. Premier to bring out his record or register and confirm that now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is only making an exhibition of himself.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The hon. member is being dishonest and bare-faced in saying that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "dishonest".

Mr. CARMICHAEL: He is not acting honestly then.

Mr. SPEAKER: The words "not acting honestly" are the same as the word "dishonest".

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would like the Hon. Premier to bring his register and confirm what he has said. When the hon. member makes the indictment that I do not attend the debates of this House, I challenge him to confirm that now. When he says that hon. members had the opportunity of contributing to this debate, I must remind him that there was only one occasion on which I was in this seat and was not deputising for Your Honour. I want to say that contribution to the debate is not snatching at a fruit like children. No sooner than the hon. member who was speaking took his seat, the Hon. Premier got up, although he saw that there had not been any pause. He can preclude me from speaking in this House, but he cannot preclude me from coming into this House. I give him that challenge tonight.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. member who should know better has finished fulminating against himself, as far as I can see, I want to say that today Your Honour considered the length of time given to hon. members to speak. I am not giving the impression as to whether the hon. member is honest or dishonest, loyal or disloyal. It is a matter for the hon. member. We cannot afford to allow people to stay away from the debates of the Legislature and then come in without notifying the person who is in charge of organizing the debates in this House, the Hon. Leader of the House, or even getting up when he has an opportunity to speak when a reply is given by a Minister. I want to make it abundantly clear that whatever the newspapers in this country may think, whatever friends people may have within this Chamber, as far as this Chamber is concerned there is one Government Party and not two or three. The Hon. Leader of the House and myself have adjourned this debate on numerous occasions — and I will itemise them — and the purpose of adjourning the debate, much against our better judgement, was to get all the different opinions in the House, not necessarily the opinion of every single member of the House although we did not want to deny hon. members the opportunity of allowing their views to be heard by their constituents and by the hon. members of this House. I did not know the hon. member belonged to a different Party from the one to which I have the honour to belong.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I will not allow the hon. member to say these things and get away with them. He has said that he did not know that I belonged to another Party or words to that effect. He must say what he means.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that I did not know that the hon. member belonged to another Party different from the one which I have the honour to lead. Does the hon. member understand that now?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I belong to the people.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, he can vote with the people, whoever he belongs to. We all know this history anyhow. On the 12th June, 1962, the Resolution was introduced. On the 20th June I moved the passing of the Resolution and the hon. senior member for St. Peter seconded the motion and spoke. On the motion of the hon. senior member for the City, seconded by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the debate was postponed. On 31st July, 1962, the hon. senior member for the City continued to speak. On the 7th August, that hon. member concluded his speech and proposed certain amendments with which I intend to deal tonight. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Hon. Minister of Education, was speaking on that date, which is the 7th August, when the debate was postponed. On the 14th August, the hon. member, whom I have just mentioned, concluded his speech. On the 9th October, the hon. senior member for St. Michael spoke and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph spoke. The hon. junior member for St. Andrew spoke and the Leader of the Minority Opposition Party in this House, the hon. junior member for St. George, spoke and moved that the debate be postponed. The hon. junior member for St. Peter seconded that motion. Then the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter and I, myself, spoke on the motion for postponement and the hon. junior member for St. George with leave withdrew the motion for postponement.

I may mention that the debate was not proceeded with on that day. On the 29th January, 1963 the Minority Opposition Party ventilated its views through the person of the hon. junior member for St. George. The hon. junior member for St. Peter spoke and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, who is also a member of the Minority Opposition Party and one of its elder spokesmen on matters of foreign policy, also spoke and the hon. senior member for St. George spoke. The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown spoke and seconded the amendments proposed by the hon. senior member for the City, who is the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition in this House.
6.05 p.m.

On that same day, 29th January, 1963, the hon. senior member for St. Thomas spoke, and on his motion seconded by the Hon. Minister of Social Services, further consideration of the debate was postponed. Mr. Speaker, if you consult the records of this House of the meeting of 5th February, 1963, you will discover there that the Hon. Leader of the House speaking on the motion for the Adjournment, pointed out to hon. members that this debate had dragged on for a considerable period of time, and it had been expected that we would have continued on 5th February. We were already behind our time table and he then said that it appeared to him that all those persons who desired or had desired any contribution to the debate had not only been given an opportunity to speak on the motion, but in his opinion had actually spoken. I am therefore rather surprised that a member of a Government Party — and we do have some kind of procedure in this Party — should get up after a Minister has got up to reply and be guilty of the kind of exhibition which we have witnessed here today. I hope that I do not have to say anything more about this, but I should like to make it clear.....

Mr. CARMICHAEL: On a point of order, if I am guilty of something, let the hon. member say what it is. If he is on his feet and says that I am guilty of some kind of misbehaviour, let him say what kind of misbehaviour I am guilty of.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It is a good thing that not only do we not live in a totalitarian state, but that the Government and people of this country have been saved from any drift towards totalitarianism by the result of the elections in December, 1961. Mr. Speaker, may I continue?

During the course of this debate, Sir, the most significant contribution which has been made has not been necessarily in quantity or in quality the amendments which have been proposed by the Official Opposition Party. The Resolution which was moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Minister of Education, was to the effect that

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

Members of the Government have spoken on the proposals and the amendments which have been moved by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. I would say that they are amendments which tend to substantially detract from the main Resolution which was proposed on 12th June last year. The provisos and reservations which have been advanced by the Official Opposition are three in number, and these amendments are as follows: the Leader of the Opposition stated that in his opinion the House ought to approve of the principle of the Conference provided that this House reserve the right to reconsider the position of Barbados in a Federation of the Eastern Caribbean if the Fiscal Commission reveals that the cost of such a Federation will involve further financial burdens on the island of Barbados to the detriment of the present standards of living of the inhabitants of this Island.

Provided further that steps are taken to ensure that Britain's entry into the European Common Market will in no way affect the guarantees of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement thereby endangering the economic position of Barbados and undermining the financial capabilities of Barbados to contribute to such an Eastern Caribbean Federation.

Provided further that Paragraph 13 of Chapter 4 of the Report is amended to provide for dual membership of the Legislatures of a Unit and of the Federation on condition that only one Ministry be held by any one representative and only one salary paid to each representative.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now, Mr. Speaker, I could continue this debate a lot more easily if I did not have five or six people walking around behind me and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown apart from other people interrupting all the time. It does not give a good impression.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I just wanted to draw to the Hon. Premier's attention that there was a further amendment made by my colleague, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown. It is not a question of interrupting. I am only saying there is a further amendment which was adopted, and if the hon. member has not seen it, I am drawing it to his attention. I am only drawing to his attention that there was a further amendment which I am accepting; so he should not say I am interrupting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment moved by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown was not seconded, but I also gather that it was accepted by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, and if it was not clear before, I understand now from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he has accepted the amendment by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But it is not on the paper in front of the Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I think I have a right to marshal my arguments in the way that I think best, and not in a way dictated by the Opposition or any other person sitting around this Table. It is rather unfortunate that we must have this kind of interruption. I was dealing with the amendments which were advanced by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and those are the ones that I choose to deal with at this juncture and no other. If he now tells me that he has accepted an amendment put by one of his colleagues, there does not appear to be that measure of previous consultation between members of the same Party in this House that is so desirable for the successful functioning of Parliament. I will deal with that amendment at a later stage, but I should very much appreciate hon. members allowing me, since I have given them eight months, to finish and round up this debate in a reasonable time.
6.15 p.m.

These, Sir, are the three amendments which were put forward by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Hon. Minister of Education has to some degree — I should say in a very satisfactory way — dealt with the amendments which have been put forward. The whole purpose of this exercise — the debate upon which we are now engaged — is to give members of the Opposition parties particularly, the opportunity of putting forward amendments which in their opinion may be necessary for the successful working of the Federation. I did not challenge the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, for his right to put forward these amendments. In truth and in fact, I support and endorse his right to put forward amendments of this kind, but I think it would be necessary for us to make a very brief examination of the implications of the amendments which have been put forward.

As I said at the beginning, and as I would say at the end, the *rationale* of a Federation is that there are territories which have a desire to be associated together, whether it be as in the case of the American Federation in the late eighteenth century in order to ensure domestic tranquility and provide for the common defence, or whether it be in the case of Great Britain in the mid-twentieth century a desire to strengthen her economic position in relation to other exporting countries in the world. The *rationale* of the Federal exercise is that countries do not want to become completely submerged in their identities in the form of a unitary state; but they do want to associate and give up some of their powers to achieve their objectives, and while associating for the better government and advancement of their peoples, they want to maintain certain powers for themselves.

It is absolutely necessary that we should not go into a Federation in an atmosphere of suspicion. On this side of the House, our approach to any problem whether it is the problem of Federation or any other problem in the art of Government is: "What do you want to do? What do you want to go to the House of Assembly for? Do you want to go to the House of Assembly to get a salary or the title of 'M.C.P.' behind your name or do you want to go to the House of Assembly to do something for the people?" The second question which you ask yourself where you are standing as a candidate for elections is, if you want to do something for the people of the country and you are sincere in your anxiety to do those things, what is the best way to do them. If we ask ourselves those two questions and if you accept that the purpose and functions of any democratic Government such as ours in coming into this Assembly is to raise the living standards of the people over whose fortunes and misfortunes we have the good luck and the honour to preside, you will see that the federal exercise, Mr. Speaker, is only a further step of achieving your original goal in coming to this Chamber. I will demonstrate this to you, I hope, Sir, to your satisfaction.

When you come to this Chamber you are confronted with a situation which is largely financial, lack of productivity, lack of resources and in some instances even a lack of enterprise and lack of the will to do something for yourself; but the major limitation which is imposed on a democratic Government or any democratic Government is that of material resources and that of proper use of those material resources, whether they be in the form of mineral wealth or human ability that we may have at our disposal. There comes a time in the life of every nation especially those which have not rapidly approached the stage that the resources of the country, both from the point of view of labour factors and mineral resources, have not been properly manipulated, where the road for expansion of the economy must necessarily proceed at an ever diminishing pace. You come to a further point where the economy ceases to expand, and then you come to a stage where the economy far from expanding goes on to contract, may be at an ever increasing pace.

It is difficult for me to say at which one of these stages the economy of the Island of Barbados had arrived that is to say, which of the last two stages, because two years before we came into office we witnessed an exodus

of 25,000 people in a four-year period out of this country and a contraction of the gross domestic product and the output of goods from this country. The gross national income declined three years ago and remained at a static level of \$100 million despite the fact that our population tended to show a slight increase, migration notwithstanding.

It may be not inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, to guess that the economy of Barbados was rapidly approaching Stage Three at which you begin to contract rather than to expand. We had certainly reached Stage Two by 1961 and the figures are there to show for it.

The people of Barbados are gifted with a tremendous desire of good sense and a tremendous reserve of energy which by merely putting it into the right kind of productivity efforts can be of great gain; but there is no point in expanding over any task unless the end product of your labour is going to be absorbed into the community, or any community for that matter. This is almost axiomatic in the theorem of relations. The Government of Great Britain realised this since 1960 and that is why they are making these friendly efforts to get into the European Economic Community which is so often mis-described as the European Common Market. There is no European Common Market at present; that is an objective to which those countries are moving and hope to reach by 1965 when there would be free international trade and a common external tariff.

Therefore, if the United Kingdom which has a much higher standard of living, a much greater income per capita than the Island of Barbados, has come to the conclusion or has been forced to the conclusion and has accepted that conclusion, though rather reluctantly, that modern-day economics of international trade demand that one should seek closer ties with one's immediate neighbours if a nation should survive with a country like Barbados which has not achieved the high standards that the industrial countries have acquired, it is all the more forceful for us to examine the proposals for association with the other territories so that the energies of our people can be properly directed and usefully employed.

6.25 p.m.

We are very fortunate now in our associates; we are very fortunate in having around us a group of islands which have a history similar to our own but whose present economic position is not exactly similar to that which we enjoy in this country; and by that I do not mean that we are better off and they are worse off. By that I mean that, whereas in Barbados we have come to the extent of our agricultural resources — and I go so far as to say that we have also come to the intensive part of our agriculture as well, and the only advance remaining to us is by way of our diversification rather than extension or intensification. We have come to that point where we have developed our agricultural resources; we have neither mines nor minerals, but we have material we can work on in this country and our human material at that. In the six or seven islands of Windwards, both Windward and Leeward Islands, but they are all of Windward, we will find that much land is lying fallow, that the countries are sparsely populated, they have resources which have not been tapped and they have an abundance of room, not only physical room but room in the economic sense for expansion and intensification of the resources which we find in these countries.

Mr. Speaker, we are very fortunate in having a neighbour in the Dominion of Canada whose economy is complementary rather than supplementary to our own, and we will have to look in future to increased trade in both directions with that country and with our neighbours in the Eastern Caribbean. I need not remind hon. members that as recently as May, 1962, I believe, the British Commonwealth Immigration Act virtually shut the doors against our people who have been going up to the United Kingdom in their thousands looking for remunerative employment. It means that we, in Barbados, more than in any other country in the Caribbean outside of Jamaica, will have to seek avenues of employment not only for the thousands whom we know to be unemployed, but we will have to seek avenues of employment for those who normally would have emigrated but

are now precluded from doing so by the British Commonwealth Immigration Act which is now law in the United Kingdom. There are people of goodwill particularly outside of this territory — I am not saying that there are no people of goodwill within the territory because you must be aware that for the second time in this new year we have successfully raised a loan within five minutes on the Local Market of half a million dollars; but there are investors outside of the area who are sitting down and spending time waiting to see whether the Eastern Caribbean Territories will have the good sense to get together. If they do get together — I can almost give you an undertaking that with the wider markets which will be created, with Custom Union and Freedom of Movement, I doubt very much whether we will have to go to the British Government asking for loans, because the upsurge of capital which is willing to come into this area for a multiplicity of reasons will preclude us from going to any country to ask for loans. We have been grateful for assistance which we have had by way of loans by Governments, but we are told — hon. members will be able to verify that the United Kingdom was not in a position to provide any investment capital for these territories and that we should look to the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada for assistance when the time came. We did not need to be told that by any Secretary of State for the Colonies; these things we hold to be self-evident. Anyone who has made a brief study of the promotion of industrialisation in the Eastern Caribbean will come to the conclusion that no matter how many trade missions may be sent out here from time to time, fundamentally the British industrialist is not interested in setting up industries in the West Indies. I think that that is a conclusion to which all of us have come a long time ago. Therefore if we have other people who do not have the philosophy of mercantilism, the philosophy which says that you must sell goods to the undeveloped countries and take their raw material for processing in the metropolitan countries and send the goods back to the undeveloped territories, if we have people who are not imbued with that kind of philosophy from other countries which are willing to stimulate the economies of these territories, if and when we get together and we say to ourselves that our aim and object in Government is not to put somebody out of office merely to put influential people out of office, our aim is certainly not merely to put ourselves in office but to raise the standard of living of the people who have put their trust in us. If we believe that people who are willing to do that on one condition only, that we get together and have a common market and have wider markets, then we need have no fear of investors and industrialists and it would be extremely churlish of us on our part if we say that we do not want to get together with other people in order to improve our living standards.

6.35 p.m.

This may appear to be an over-simplification, but I assure you, Sir, that it is not an over-simplification; it is a statement of the stark, economic facts which confront us today in our conditions in the West Indies.

To come back to the amendments which have been proposed, Sir, I am asking members of the House to support the Resolution as presented by the Hon. Minister of Education. We cannot go into this exercise with so many provisos and "ifs" and "buts", because when we closely examine the implications of these provisos, they may be putting us in such a position that the other people with whom we are supposed to be associating begin to look askance at our motives, and begin to question whether we seriously want a Federation and understand what a Federation really is.

There is nothing that you do in this world today, Sir, which is going to be of benefit to you that you can get for nothing. The days when you could get things for nothing have passed. The first proviso of the Leader of the Opposition states that this House reserve the right to reconsider the position of Barbados in a Federation of the Eastern Caribbean if the Fiscal Commission reveals that the cost of such a Federation would involve further financial burdens on the Island of Barbados to the detriment of the present standards of living of the inhabitants of this Island. I said before, Sir, that we are going into a Federation to improve

the living standards of all, and so a Federation is going to cost us money; and I do not think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying — the way the amendment is worded it could mean anything; it could mean everything and it could mean anything — that we are not going into a Federation if it is going to cost us money and reduce our living standards.

As I said before, the whole object of the exercise is to improve and not reduce the living standards. It is going to cost us money, because under Paragraph 38 of the Marlborough House Conference Report you will see that the Federal Government is going to derive its income from about four main sources, and those sources are import duties, postal services, Court fees and currency profits. Right now, Sir, we in Barbados get our import duties, our revenue from the Post Offices, our Court fees and our currency profits from time to time, but we are going to give those up to the Federal Government, and according to Paragraph 38, the surplus accruing from the revenue from these four sources should be returned to the units on a derivation basis, that is, on the proportionate basis of the contribution which was subscribed by the contributing territories, if you can call it a contribution. Some people argue that you must have a strong Federal Government, a strong Central Government. That is a phrase which has been bandied about here from time to time, that you must have a strong Federal Government, and at the same time those people say that we do not want a strong Central Government if it is going to cost Barbados too much money. It is going to cost money.

Mr. Speaker, I have done some rough calculation, and the Federal Government is going to spend something like \$12 million a year in the first instance by my calculation, which is an excess of the total mandatory levies which the former Federal Government got from ten territories. These seven or eight little islands will be spending \$12 million for the Federal Government alone, and I can see that some people now may be ready to throw up their hands in horror at the thought of Barbados giving up \$6 million of its revenue out of a total budget of \$30 million or 20% when its mandatory levy was only 8.7% or 8.8% before. When you look at the opposite side of the picture, you will see that the Federal Government is also taking over from the Government of Barbados the entire Customs Department, the Currency Board, the entire Post Offices — and all the postmen and everybody else employed therein will be Federal Civil Servants — taking over all the Magistrates' Courts, all the clerks of the Magistrates' Courts, all the writ servers, the whole of the Police Force practically, and will be paying out those salaries on the other side of the Balance Sheet; so when you look at absolute figures, they do not really indicate what the true picture is.

It is by giving the Federal Government those powers that we have made the Federal Government strong, because the Federal Government does not have to send every three months to the Unit Governments and ask the Unit Governments to send their contribution so that the Civil Servants in the Federal Government will be paid. The last Federal Government had no control over Customs, Police, Magistrates' Courts, Superior Courts, Post Offices or Currency, because the Eastern Caribbean Currency Board was a separate and distinct body and had nothing to do with the Federal Government. They had no control over anything that I can see which was of any benefit that could promote anything on behalf of the people of these islands. They had absolutely no power, and they had a big lot of money — \$9 million — to support an Army in Jamaica and various establishments abroad, embassies and matters of that kind which they were then branching into. They were living in a kind of fool's paradise. But what we have done at Marlborough House is to sit down and make a sober appraisal of the aims and objects of Government, what a Government is to do, and then we have devised a Federal Association, and we have devised two Legislative lists, an exclusive Federal list and a concurrent list which will be common both to the Federal Government and territorial Governments in order to achieve this objective.

People in Barbados should realise that economic prosperity depends upon the degree to which you can specialise, and specialisation itself depends on the extent

of the markets which you have at your disposal. You can only specialise if you have a very large market. It would only pay a man to come into Barbados as a psychiatrist if there were a lot of lunatics; but if there were two mad people, it would not pay him to set up in a private practice. Unfortunately it could be a very thriving concern in this country right now. It would only pay a man to be a welder if there are 500 or 600 or 5,000 or 6,000 motor vehicles or ten or twelve factories in the Island; but if there was only one bicycle in the Island, there would be no point in a highly trained welder coming to Barbados to set up a welding concern in a community like this. As you get larger markets, you necessarily must get a higher degree of specialisation; and when you get specialisation, you tend to get a certain amount of economic prosperity in a country, because by specialisation we can increase the productivity of the individual worker.

6.45 p.m.

It may appear to those listening to me around this Table that I am very cynical about my approach to this Federation. It is that I am practicable. If it is nothing, this Government would not be interested. We can dwell together in perfect unity with people living in Japan without ever seeing them; and if you want perfect unity, you have that down Westbury Road better than anywhere else I know of. Do not let anyone go away feeling that there is not any purpose but that we can send a cricket team to Lords which is truly a West Indian team. We are approaching this whole exercise from a practical position. Our approach even to the Federation itself is severely pragmatic; and if any hon. member has some kind of fear that it is going to cost the people of this country some kind of money to go into Federation with the other sister colonies, I would say "yes". I will not prejudge the Fiscal Commissioner's Report or any other expert report which we are awaiting; but I will only say that on the balance sheet we do not come off badly at all because we are relieved of the necessity of running certain departments which are not now running as efficiently as they could be.

The idea that the Islands of the Eastern Caribbean Federation are impoverished territories who would expect Barbados to support them is also nonsensical.

Right now, we are importing St. Lucians to help us to get crops out of the ground, particularly our cane crops. We are importing these people to do this although we have unemployment and it is done unofficially. Houses are being provided in this Island by plantations for people from the neighbouring islands although we have an unemployment problem. It shows the necessity for us to live closely with each other because there are times when we have to call for assistance even in the form of labour, even on the one thing which you would expect that Barbados has, which is labour. There is a severe shortage in this Island right now of skilled foremen and supervisors in construction works because we have sent most of our skilled workers to the Virgin Islands, Antigua, St. Kitts, St. Lucia and the United Kingdom. Right now we can use some of them in Barbados even in the Government so that our Development Plan can go forward with the speed and energy which we would like.

There is nothing static about human affairs. We may be in the depth of depression today, and tomorrow we may have a shortage of labour and we may have more money than we can wisely spend. Let no one be depressed by the fact that the West Indies have been a blind area for a considerable length of time. Our expenditure has doubled in the past six years, which is a remarkable rate. It levelled off in 1961. From 1948 to 1962 the Government's revenue has certainly gone up by 20% in this territory alone. In the neighbouring territory of Antigua the investment in hotel building in the past eighteen months has been of the order of about \$30 million U.S. I was rather surprised when I read an article in one of the local daily newspapers challenging the right of the Antigua Government to encourage a \$26 million investment in an oil refinery, and in its editorial they expressed the attitude of "How dare Antigua to put down an oil refinery!" Could they be serious about

a Federation? People who argue that way cannot see that the more capital investments you have in an island like Antigua and those islands which they say are impoverished, Sir, the less burden will be on the Barbadian taxpayer; and when the Government of Antigua is able to persuade an oil refinery to spend \$26 million in that territory, it is bound to be to the credit of the whole area because some Barbadians will be able to work in Antigua. Therefore let us not go into an association grudging what the other fellow may have.

I know right now that there are some people in the other territories who are saying that Barbados is going to get all the industries. The location of an industry is a matter for the industrialist. The man who is spending the money decides that because nobody can tell a man to come and put his industry in St. Michael if he prefers to go to St. Lucy; and if you tell him that you are not going to let him put it in St. Lucy he would tell you "Well, I will not spend my money at all because I do not think it should be placed in St. Michael."

Therefore, let us not get embroiled into any argument about who is going to have the industries because if one territory has all or if each has an equal number, it is not going to matter because we are going to have entrenched into the Constitution freedom of movement, and we are also having a common tariff and free trade throughout the area. If that were not so, there might be some validity in the argument about who is going to have the industry and that would be a matter which should not be decided by the unit Governments but one which comes under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. I see no reason with these three safeguards why anyone should argue that the Federal Government should have federal jurisdiction over the location of industries. As a matter of fact, I do not care if you give it to the local Government or the Federal Government because the man who is putting up the capital may have his own peculiar ideas of where he should put it and very often, it is not decided on the profit and loss account either. Very often, he may put it in a particular Island because his wife finds in that Island that she has three persons with whom she can play bridge.

6.55 p.m.

There are human factors at work in an exercise like this which no one can make any precise calculation for, and therefore I do not think we need get unduly worried about that aspect of the matter. The second amendment proposed by the hon. senior member for the City reads as follows:-

"Provided further that steps are taken to ensure that Britain's entry into the European Common Market will in no way affect the guarantees of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, thereby endangering the economic position of Barbados and undermining the financial capabilities of Barbados to contribute to such an Eastern Caribbean Federation."

Well, Sir, we all know that on the 28th January, 1963, some two weeks ago, Britain's attempt to enter the European Common Market was met with a rebuff; but even if that had not been so, I would like to look very closely at a proposal of this kind, at a proviso such as the one which has been advanced by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, because it appears to make our desire to establish a Federation contingent upon guarantees, which, up to now, we have not been able to elicit from Her Majesty's Government in Great Britain on the future of the Sugar Agreement. Again, I say that it is fortunate that human affairs are not static because right now we have witnessed a remarkable rise in the world price for sugar, greater in excess of the price which we are getting from the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I beg to move that further....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member already has a motion before the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not understand that I had a motion before the House; that motion was in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. In any case, perhaps, the Hon. Leader of the House can make the motion for the postponement.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 5 for the remainder of this Session.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that Standing Order....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what you are up to or what hon. members are up to. You cannot have any motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders now. What sort of business is this we are going on with? Are we making the Rules of the House a whole nonsense? You are postponing the debate on the basis that it is now 7 o'clock but you have to postpone this debate automatically. It is not now a question of Your Honour accepting any motion like this; I am saying that people must get down to their business. It is now 7 p.m. of the clock, the debate has to be automatically postponed and therefore Your Honour will have to suspend the sitting of this House for the next three-quarters of an hour.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: If the motion for the suspension of the Standing Order had been passed before 7 p.m. of the clock, it would have been in order. The motion for the suspension of the Standing Order has not been passed before 7 o'clock and it is obvious to me that this debate cannot be concluded by 7.10 p.m. of the clock. In the circumstances, this sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. of the clock.

This sitting is now suspended.

7.00 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When this Sitting was suspended, there was a motion that further consideration be postponed. We were then on Item No. 2 debating the Resolution relative to the Report of the East Caribbean Federation Conference.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the suspension of the sitting, I was dealing with the reservations of the Opposition on the motion for the adoption of the Report of the Eastern Caribbean Federation Conference which had been made by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the Hon. Minister of Education. The second amendment to the Resolution which had been advanced by the other side was that there should be a proviso that further steps should be taken to ensure that Britain's entry into the European Common Market would in no way affect the guarantees of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement thereby endangering the economic position of Barbados and undermining the financial capabilities of Barbados to contribute to such an Eastern Caribbean Federation.

Although I do not feel that the proviso which has been advanced in the form of an amendment to the Resolution and the Resolution itself are mutually exclusive, I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that a proviso such as this is one which would unnecessarily inhibit the decision of this House to adopt in principle the proposals which have been put forward in the form of the White Paper published in June, 1962. I do not see that this House will have much control over the British Government if the British Government itself eventually succeeds in acceding to the European Economic Community. As far as the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement is concerned, we do have at the present moment an undertaking from Her Majesty's Government for the provisions of that Agreement until the year 1970. If I have had any occasion to worry over the economic future of the sugar producing countries in the Commonwealth, and particularly in Barbados, it is because I take a very long term view of the economic progress in these Islands and in Barbados in particular, and I must view with some concern what the position of Barbados will be after 1970, and I hope that all of us will be alive at that date when the present protective tariff against sugar imports into the community from

countries who are outside of the European Economic Community is to the order of 80% of the commodity which we produce in this country, namely sugar. I do not think, therefore, that we should regard a guarantee which has been very slow in forthcoming from the British Government as to the future of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement as in any way impinging upon our right to support the principles of the Eastern Caribbean Federation.

The third amendment advanced by the Opposition related to the provision in paragraph 13 of Chapter 4 of the White Paper which prevented members of the Federal Parliament from sitting in the Unit Legislature, and the amendment reads as follows:-

"Provided further that Paragraph 13 of Chapter 4 of the Report is amended to provide for dual membership of the Legislature of a Unit and of the Federation on condition that only one Ministry be held by any one representative and only one salary paid to each representative."

My personal view of the amendment, Sir, is that we have to examine very closely our conditions in the Eastern Caribbean. There is a reluctance on the part of men of goodwill to come forward to represent their people in the political field. I happen to know that at the London Conference, the representatives from the territories of Antigua and Dominica both voted in favour of having dual membership. I think that we ought to keep our minds open on this reservation, but I should not like the House to vote specifically for such a proviso. I think that we ought to leave it open to see what the general feeling at the Conference in June which is projected in the Statement issued by the Secretary of State will be, because there is some kind of case for dual membership. But I do think that if we are going to support the idea of dual membership — there are many arguments against the idea of dual membership and there may be some arguments in favour of it — we should definitely set some outside limitation on the period during which such a condition will persist. We do not have any definite views on this question of dual membership. From the pure theory of a Federation, it is not a good idea to have dual membership for all time, but I do think that perhaps if it is a question of compromise, and if it is a question of getting together on a realistic basis, that there is some room for accommodation from the point of view that there may be dual membership, provided that that condition persists for a limited period, and a limited period only.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to protract this debate much longer. I have dealt with most of the points which have been raised by members on the other side, but there is one reservation which many people in this community appear to entertain on the question of the super-abundance of Governmental Offices and Institutions which we allegedly have in the area. I should like to say this, Sir, and I think I have said it before; the success or failure of the Federation is not going to depend on how few Ministers you have in Barbados, Antigua, St. Kitts, St. Lucia, St. Vincent or any of the other territories. There is a fallacy being mooted abroad that the maintenance of a Cabinet system of Government in each and every individual territory is somehow or the other inimical to the best interest of the Federation; but the fundamental question, Mr. Speaker, still remains whether we are having a Federation or whether we are having a Unitary State. If you are having a Federation, you must have a Federation of territories which have full internal self-Government and which have a system of responsible and representative Government.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, in June, 1961, Her Majesty's Government advocated that each and every territory in the Eastern Caribbean should have full internal self-Government with a full Cabinet system, with a Governor, not even an Administrator, in each of the ten territories, and no objection was raised at that time in June, 1961, to the idea, which was not only supported, but actually promoted by Her Majesty's Government at that time. What then has taken place between June, 1961 and June 1962? I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that nothing has taken place which would vitiate the principle that if you are to have an independent territory in a Federal system of Government,

each individual Unit in that Federation should not be inferior to any other Unit in the Federation. You will have to have a Federation of people who have equal status. You cannot have a Federation of people who have or enjoy unequal systems of Government, and therefore as far as I am concerned — and I think I have a fairly intimate knowledge of what has taken place in the Eastern Caribbean in the form of economic and constitutional progress during at least the past twelve years — you will find, Sir, that in these territories under a system of Ministerial Government, the progress which has been made under the Ministerial system, no matter how unqualified or inept we may consider the Ministers whether in Barbados or in any territory to have been at the inception of that status, far transcends the progress which had been made under the Colonial system for the previous fifty or sixty years.

8.00 p.m.

There is no doubt in my mind on that at all. One only has to examine, if one is unacquainted with the actual geography of the territories and first-hand knowledge and the evidence which one can see before one's eyes of the progress which has been made, the national income and Government's income over the period of twelve years to appreciate the validity of what I am saying; and I do not agree, neither does this Government agree, that the success of the Federation would depend on the reducing of Ministers in Antigua, St. Lucia, St. Kitts, Montserrat, Dominica, St. Vincent or the other Islands from the present average of four or five to two or three Ministers.

The Government's revenue of Antigua is some \$11 million or \$12 million. The Ministerial system costs them \$25,000. They have four Ministers of Government and I personally would not entertain the idea of suggesting to the Chief Minister of Antigua that the success of the Federation is going to depend on his throwing two or three of his Ministers to the wolves and sacrificing them on the altar of arithmetical equation. I do not think that has anything to do with the functioning and art of government at all. It is all very well for people in Barbados or in London to sit down and say: "Imagine the British people with a population of 50 million having just 30 Ministers and the Federation would have 58 Ministers for the population of 750,000!"

The stark facts demand that there should be full control over the daily affairs of the people of these territories by the elected representatives of the people. If you do not have Ministers, you may have Local Government or Civil Servants or Heads of Departments who have no responsibility to the people of the area saying that such-and-such a programme should be carried out in the interest of the people. To me that is the antithesis to democracy and the democratic idea.

I do have this in favour of my argument of the retention of Ministers that the British Government in 1961, when it started the idea of full internal self-government and set the date for independence of the Eastern Caribbean, made an Order as regards the number of Ministers which the territories should have in each. In truth and in fact, the British Government was promoting the idea of Ministerial responsibility and I do not accept the theory, neither does this Government accept the theory, that the success of this somewhat truncated association is less qualified to have a system of Cabinet Government in each territory than the old Federation which had no powers at all.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with the amendments which have been advanced by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown made a further amendment to the three amendments which I have already mentioned, and this amendment proposes that paragraph 15 (b) of Chapter four of the Report should be amended to provide for a unit of population by 30,000. Paragraph 15 (b) of the White Paper provides that the unit of population should be 50,000. That is the unit of population of membership of the House of Representatives. It says: that there should be one representative for every 50,000 people.

As I understand the argument under the present system, the system which is proposed in the White Paper, Barbados should normally have five members; that is the original member plus one additional member for each complete unit of population; and as our population is somewhere in the vicinity of 240,000, it means that we will be entitled to four plus one. If you make it 30,000, then Barbados quota would go up from five to probably eight plus one the original number, but so will the quota of the other territories go up.

The idea that the other territories would be able to outvote Barbados if we only have five out of eighteen is something that we should not be very much concerned about. Quite honestly, we have to decide whether we are going into a Federation or whether we are not going into a Federation. It is not a question of arithmetic of Barbados against the rest of the Caribbean territories. It may be a question of political view-point as against another political view point. In the last Federation we had members from nearly every territory represented in the Government's Party, and then you had an opposition party which was comprised of members from nearly every unit of the Federation. It is not a question of Barbados going into the Federation to fight for Barbados; it is a question of people with similar ideas trying to push forward their view-point of what best would be for the Eastern Caribbean territories as against people who have a restrictive view-point. It may be that the people with the restrictive view-point comprise the Government party and the people with the other view-point are in the Opposition. We should not worry as long as we have our view-point represented, and we should be able to find people of like mind in the other territories who will come together with the people of Barbados and share this view-point with them.

Therefore, much as I admire the efforts made by the Official Opposition to safeguard the image and the integrity of Barbados, I do not think that it is really in keeping with the principle of this Federal exercise that we should approach it from this angle. To sum up the position, I would say that when we examine the amendments which have been put forward by the Opposition, there is one amendment, perhaps, on which we can have an open mind and that is the question of dual membership, provided that the dual membership is for a limited period. As far as the other amendments are concerned, I think that these amendments may be putting the people of Barbados in such an unfavourable light in relation to the other people in the Eastern Caribbean that they should not be proposed or supported by the Government in the moving of this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we hope very soon, certainly by the month of May, to have all the reports from the Fiscal Commissioner, the Civil Service Commissioner and the Commissioner who is examining the Customs Department of the Island, to have all these before this House. The picture financially would be a lot clearer than that it is at the present moment. What we are doing when we move the passing of this Resolution is to give our support to the idea of a Federal system of Government as against a Unitary State of the Eastern Caribbean which has never been permitted amongst the signatories to this White Paper or as against the idea of Barbados continuing in isolation by itself, no matter what may happen in the outside world. That is what we are doing when we are supporting this Resolution. We are saying along with the former Secretary of State for the Colonies that a Federal system of Government appears to offer the best solution to the economic ills from which we are suffering at the present moment. I have said before, and I can repeat it, I hope, with impunity, that the whole purpose and rationale of this exercise is to improve the living standards of the people of the whole area in the first instance, and the people of Barbados in the last analysis. There is no sentiment in this matter; sentiment can come after, when we have received our National Anthem, our National Flag and our Independence. No one of us can help feeling a sense of pride when we are able to salute our own flag and sing our own National Anthem; but if I may quote the present Prime Minister of Jamaica when he was attacked some years ago on a political platform in the United Kingdom and gave pre-

ference to an agriculturist over a doctor of philosophy. He said that philosophy did not plant yams and sentiment did not feed the people in the West Indies. I say that sentiment will not create employment for the people in Barbados. There are things spiritual and temporal; there are things spiritual without which the nation cannot hope to attain to the comity of nations unless they have this spiritual attribute, this sense of wellbeing, this sense of self-respect and matters of that kind. But before the people in the West Indies can achieve this self-respect without having to use the economic tools which are at their disposal — and those tools can only achieve employment, and that is known to people who are more skilled in this exercise than I am — we can only achieve these things if we can come together in order to forge our problems and enter the nation as a result of our effort.

Mr. Speaker, nobody can superimpose Federation on us. We have to produce ourselves not only the instruments whereby we can make these advancements, but we have to produce in this island people of the right calibre, people of goodwill who will see the development of the West Indies and the Eastern Caribbean as a national image, as a means to an end and not an end in itself. To have an independent nation is a very laudable objective, but there is no point in having an independent nation of serfs, an independent nation of people living at low standards or an independent nation of unemployed people. It is far better for us to have a Federal state with full employment than to have an independent island of Barbados with 26,000 unemployed people. When we examine the two Lists, the two Legislative Lists over which the Federal Government and the unit Governments can exercise control, we do hear some strictures that the Federal Government will be just as weak as the last Federal Government; but we have not heard in what direction it is being suggested that the Federal Government will be weak just as the last Federal Government's statesmen. When we examine the Constitution of the last Federal Government and we look at the proposed Constitution for the new Federal Government, we will find that the tools which will be placed in the hands of the Federal Government will be independent and strong. You must not look at the Legislative Lists — both the Concurrent and Exclusive Federal List — as some kind of shopping list that you go to the market with; whatever you write in a Constitution, whatever powers you allocate to the Central Government and whatever powers you take away from the territorial Governments, the success of the Federation is not going to depend merely on the drawing up of the two Lists; it will depend upon the kind of people, upon the kind of good will which you can foster and generate in the Government. Mr. Speaker, it is going to depend upon the co-operation of the unit Legislatures and the Federal Legislature; it is going to depend upon the realisation of the fact that we can only succeed if we decide to co-operate and not regard the Federal Government as some kind of foreign country beyond the sea bringing in returns. We have to regard the Federal Government as part and parcel of the national economy and not merely a constitutional body; and if we adopt this approach towards this exercise, I have absolutely no doubt or fear that we can succeed. There is a time in the life of every man and nation when we have to make a decision; the decision which this Government is seriously asking members of this Legislature to endorse is the decision that we approve of the White Paper, the Report of the Conference of the Eastern Caribbean Federation which took place at Marlborough House in London in May, 1962. We are endorsing the decision that this White Paper sets out the principles along which we wish to proceed in order to develop the economy of these islands. 8.20 p.m.

I regret that I have had to mention the economic aspects so often, but the Opposition has raised quite a lot of points about the economic viability.

In conclusion, Sir, I must debunk the idea that we cannot proceed towards independence unless we are able to have battle ships of our own and atomic warheads and matters of that kind. We know by reading the events in Europe for the past six or eight weeks that even the mighty European industrial nations themselves do not have this absolute supremacy either in weapons or in military or-

ganisation. Your ability to defend yourself in these days in the 20th Century depends not upon the atomic warheads which you have at your disposal, but the kind of alliances which you are prepared to make. There is no nation on earth including the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that is able to defend itself unless it can grapple to its bosom with hooks of steel the kind of friends who are able to assist it in varying degrees in protecting itself against threatened aggression. Your ability to defend yourself, in short, Sir, does not depend upon the amount of money that you have in the Treasury, but on strategic alliances and outposts, and the mighty federation of the United States of America depends very heavily on these small territories out here in the Eastern Caribbean for the integrity of their national frontiers. Let no one have any illusions about that. Sometimes the smallest territories can be more pivotal in the defence of a big country than the vast expanses of the Sahara Desert and the Arabian Desert. Your ability does not depend on how many horsemen, archers or how many musketeers you have, but on what kind of friends you have and where those friends are. We in the Eastern Caribbean are in no less favourable position than the people in the United States or the people in Great Britain to foster the kind of relationships with the right kind of friends in order to ensure that our own national integrity is preserved for all time.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot look too far into the future, but we do know that there are people today who recognise that the people of the Eastern Caribbean have something to contribute to the progress of mankind, not only in the realm of strategic defences, but certainly in the realm of the cultural and humanistic contribution which those islands who have suffered so long can make to the progress of the human race.

I beg therefore to move that this Resolution which has been moved by my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Education, do now pass.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how this debate is going, but I understand that an amendment was moved to the main motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment will be put first under Standing Order No. 23.

Mr. WALCOTT: This amendment was moved subsequent to the main motion, and I want to speak on it because I do not agree with it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, the hon. member is quite right. I had already moved the passing of the Resolution and subsequent to that, an amendment was put and hon. members will be entitled to speak on the amendment. My making the motion again was merely redundant.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Deputy Speaker is willing to speak on this motion, he may do so because I had spoken on the main motion; but I am speaking on the amendment because I am opposed to it. I am going to be very brief, and although I did not see the amendment, I will ask the Clerk to furnish me with a copy so that I will have it clear in my mind what I am speaking on.

I would like to say quite briefly and categorically that I am diametrically opposed to any question whatsoever at any time of dual membership of a Federation and of a unit Government. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Government agree with that, and they feel they speak for the country, they can agree; but if the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier are going to say that they have been possessed with so much power and knowledge that only they alone seem in this year of grace to be possessed with the power to be legislators, and they should both be in the unit Government and the Federal Government — I do not mean this in a personal sense.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, I am glad that the hon. member said he is not dealing with this in a personal sense, because he was not here to hear the arguments

which I used, as there was nothing in my arguments which could indicate that any member of my Party or myself was possessed with any such power. I am only making this explanation since the hon. member was not here to hear the reasons. From my experience at Marlborough House, it struck me that in order to have some sort of success, an opportunity should be given to some of the best men to serve for a given period of five years. I do not know if that was mentioned, but I never intimated that I was possessed with so much power and ability or that I was thinking of myself at all. I was thinking on a national level of the West Indies.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to give the impression, as I said, that I was speaking about it in a personal way. I am a member of this Chamber and any of us who happen to be members of this Chamber should not give the impression to others outside that if there is a Federation, the members of the Federation should also be members of the Unit Governments for five years. I do not agree with it even for one year. Let us get some examples. How long have the members of the present Government been running the Government? Since the last election. The Minister of Agriculture is the only member who had been a member of a former Government. This idea that you must have dual membership pre-supposes that there are not enough people within the community capable of taking leadership in public affairs. The Premier has said something which is true.
8.30 p.m.

There are some people in these small communities — and the Hon. Premier must realise this — who regard themselves as responsible people, but they do not take any active interest in public affairs. Some say that they have good reasons for not doing so. Some say that the political assassination which takes place on public platforms prevents them from doing so because people get on public platforms and speak about your relatives and they even go to the lowest depths. That has kept some people out of public life. I do not accept that as a real excuse because if people are intelligent enough to realise that they have a community to live in, you have to live in all sorts of communities. You have to live with reptiles, birds, good and bad people and the pleasant and unpleasant; therefore, I do not subscribe to that idea.

Moreover, the Hon. Premier has confirmation about members at the London Conference. I have seen something going on in the West Indies for many years to which I do not agree. Some of the leaders of the Windward and Leeward Islands believe that God has endowed them with so much sense and power that they want to be in complete control of everything. We have a classic example of this monkey business which we have in the West Indies that you can get this type of political buffoonery that you get the Prime Minister of Jamaica who normally is the President of a Trade Union and getting the bogus idea that the Prime Minister's Trade Union can call a strike and that matter goes to the same Prime Minister's Cabinet to hear what and what should be done about it. I do not believe in that kind of thing. In Antigua you have Mr. Bird and in St. Kitts you have Mr. Bradshaw and they are Chief Ministers of their respective countries and also the Presidents of Trade Unions. Well, if that suits them, it suits them; but I am saying as a Trade Unionist that I do not want to be the President of a Trade Union and at the same time running the affairs of Government because I am conscious of the normal conflicts which are bound to arise between the two.

I am afraid of the issues and the close inroads to dictatorship in these small territories by allowing a man to be a member of the Unit Government and to be a member holding power in the Federal Government. You have not evolved anything in which a man can be in two places at the same time. You get a little hosh-posh Federation and a little hosh-posh Unit Government, one holding a meeting today to accommodate you and tomorrow the other holding a meeting for you to attend; but you will never get these two places meeting at the same time when they of necessity are dealing with two different issues. What the Hon. Premier enumerated today is irreconcilable. It is irreconcilable that you enumerate the things for

Federal Government and the things for the Unit Governments and think you have super-headed Ministers to take care of both of these things. In a Federation like ours you should give others the opportunity to serve and make a mistake. You have this idea, like a dog which tastes blood, that as soon as you get one man in the Unit Government and another in the Federal Government that it would not work. Absolute power corrupts. I am afraid of West Indians in what I would regard as this interim stage of independence. You have young leaders and, as you know, Sir, young leaders are rapacious and intolerant; therefore, too much power in their hands can plunge us in a situation like the African states. When there are no barriers to check the intolerant, everything goes wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am satisfied that it is now after 8.30 o'clock when the moment of interruption arises. Can the hon. member say whether this matter continues to be controversial?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am opposed to this amendment: so I regard that in itself as controversial.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is too late for the Standing Order to be invoked, therefore I will ask the Hon. Leader of the House if there is another matter which is non-controversial with which we can proceed between now and 9.00 o'clock.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Order No. 6.

THE BANK HOLIDAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House: Third reading of a Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905.

Is the hon. member asking leave to take this Order?

Mr. WALCOTT: Is the Hon. Minister aware that this is something which has been submitted to a Select Committee?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Oh no; this is something which has been circulated today.

Mr. WALCOTT: I now see what it is all about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister asking for leave now to take this Bill of which he gave notice today?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Minister regularise the position?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to proceed with this Bill now in all its stages, as I intimated when I gave notice of it earlier.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am also asking the Hon. Minister to move the suspension of the Standing Order which states that no Bill shall be read a second time until it has been printed and circulated to members and has appeared in the *Official Gazette*.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On Your Honour's suggestion, I move the suspension of Standing Order No. 40.

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

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, the 23rd February, known as 'Federation Day' was made a Bank Holiday for the purpose of the Federation of the West Indies. The Federation as everyone knows came to an untimely end, and therefore in the Government's opinion, there is no justification at all for perpetuating this day as a public holiday now that Federation of the West Indies no longer exists.

It is therefore necessary to amend the Bank Holidays Act of 1905 to such an extent as is necessary to prevent the observance of this day known as "Federation Day" in future as a Bank Holiday.
8.40 p.m.

It is for that reason that the present Bill is now before the House. What the Bill will do is to amend the Schedule to the Act to delete the date 23rd February. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this Bill at all because I feel it is absolutely necessary as there is now no Federation Day. However, what I want to suggest to the hon. member is that he should postpone the consideration of this Bill for the simple reason that you are amending this Act just about ten days before the whole island has made arrangements for having this day as a Bank Holiday. All plans have been made for excursions and so on. While I am not opposed to this amendment — and no sane person would be opposed to it — I would suggest to the hon. member that he postpone the consideration of this amendment and allow this Bank Holiday to take place and after 23rd February this year then he can bring forward this amendment. As I have said, people usually plan for these Bank Holidays more than a week or two beforehand. I am therefore suggesting that the Government postpone the consideration of this Bill until after the 23rd February, this year. In my own experience, I think of Queen's Park and places in which I have some concern, having been already booked for affairs on this day. We very well support the idea of amending the Act but not at this stage, it being just eleven days before the 23rd February this year. Mr. Speaker, that is my view of this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this idea; I am not even opposed to the idea of passing this amendment now. What I am opposed to is this; last year the Government said that in this year they were going to bring forward a Bill so that last year would see the last of such a Bank Holiday as this. How is it then that you are running a Government and you state that you are going to stop this Bank Holiday on the 23rd February, you have allowed a whole year to pass and now you have brought down this Bill just ten days before the date? I am opposed to the idea that you were to send down this Bill a year ago and now you come down with the Bill today and ask us to pass it when you had the whole year to do it. Mr. Speaker, there can be no justification for the perpetuation of this Bank Holiday even with ten days' notice; hon. members must remember that when you create a Bank Holiday sometimes you only allow two days' notice. I have been in this House and we have passed a Bill making a Bank Holiday of a day when we only had ten days beforehand, but there is a difference in giving something and when you are taking it away. My opposition is in relation to the method adopted by the Government. The Government has allowed this Bill to wait until ten days before the day when they said last year that this Bank Holiday on 23rd February would be the last one. What are the Permanent Secretaries and the Civil Servants doing? I am opposed to the idea of taking the House of Assembly and the public and using them just like a rubber stamp. I do not like a Bank Holiday occurring during the crop; it dislocates certain things; but I am not even thinking in those terms because if it were a national day everybody would abide by it. However, this state of affairs creates a very unpleasant feeling in my mind and I am saying that Government efficiency must be better than this. With due respect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would agree to the passing of this Bill and putting this Bank Holiday to an end. A Bank Holiday can come and go as the Government pleases, but, in this case, we would like a longer notice to be given of this Bill. It may be, Sir, that the Ministers are extremely busy and things like a Bank Holiday are not important enough to be given their attention, but I say that you are paying Permanent Secretaries and Civil Servants to do these things. I do not think that the Government can come here at this stage and ask us to accommodate them in this manner.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not against the non-observance of this day, 23rd February, as a Bank Holiday, but I do say that the time is too short. The hon. senior member for the City has mentioned that that date is ten days off, but I am saying that it is only four days off because this Bill, even if we passed it here today, cannot be passed by the Other Place before this day week, which will be the 19th February, and therefore you will only have four days left. Sir, people have made arrangements for this Bank Holiday; the bus concessionaries and the taxi owners have received money in relation to this Bank Holiday. It is only today that I took in a taxi to be overhauled and the taxi owner warned me that if I could not give him back the taxi in time for the Bank Holiday then I could not take it. It is a serious thing for a man who has received a piece of money in his hands and then he has to give it back just because the Government can prevent this day from being a Bank Holiday.
8.50 p.m.

This day was a Bank Holiday ever since, and now the Government can declare it not to be a Bank Holiday any more. I do not understand why the Government should wait until the last moment to bring down certain Bills and Resolutions, introduce them and want them passed the same day. I would have to say that this is a habit of theirs, because it is not the first time. There is some smartness in bringing things down the same day they are introduced and wanting them passed. Imagine I will have to vote "Aye" to a Bill of this sort when I know there are people who are going to suffer from it. I know some of the same Ministers would be glad for this Bank Holiday, because I meet them on Bank Holidays with their shirt-tails out, and the Clerks, — I do not mean the Clerks of the House although I meet them too — the people in the stores and commercial houses in Bridgetown are only too glad for this break and are sorry there cannot be more Bank Holidays for them to get a little more recreation. I am not against this Bill because this is in connection with Federation Day and we do not have any Federation; but the present Government should allow it to remain and let it be a day of mourning for the death of the last Federation. I am therefore appealing to the Introducer to let us leave it for now because you will be putting out several people. Taxi owners have already received money for that day as well as bus concessionaries, and people have booked dance halls and things of that nature for which they have paid money in advance. It is possible, therefore, that these people may lose some or all of their money, and that is why I am saying that you would be upsetting the apple cart of these people.

Mr. Speaker, giving back money is not a nice thing. People do not like to give you what is yours, far less. The taxi-owners and bus concessionaries are not supposed to pay back this money; so the money which has been paid out will be forfeited, and this Government will be blamed for it; so we should not do something to harm these people. It would not harm the Government or the country to let this particular day remain, and I am appealing to the Government to postpone this Bill.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Government is prepared to accept the suggestion for a postponement of further consideration of the Bill at this stage.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be now postponed.

Mr. BATSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: It is periously near the hour of 9 o'clock.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business to an end for the day.

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 19th February at 2.30 in the afternoon.

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

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

8.55 p.m.