
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th June, 1963.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P.; (*Deputy Speaker*); 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: I regret to inform the House that the Minutes of the previous meeting are not ready due principally to the much regretted indisposition of the Clerk.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, I am commanded to lay a Statement regarding proposals for establishing and operating a condensery and milk plant in Barbados.

The Statement reads as follows:-

PROPOSALS FOR ESTABLISHING AND OPERATING A CONDENSERY AND MILK PLANT IN BARBADOS

The purpose of this statement is to inform the Legislature of the action taken by the Government and the further action which it proposes to take in regard to the establishment of a condensery and milk plant in the island.

2. Since 1945 the Government has been giving consideration to the establishment of a milk processing plant with Colonial Development Welfare assistance. It was then proposed that the scheme should be operated as a cooperative.

3. In March, 1951 the Legislature approved the proposals in principle on terms agreed with representatives of the dairy industry for organising a scheme on a cooperative basis.

4. In February, 1952 the Government decided to establish and operate the plant itself and abandoned the idea of operating it as a cooperative. The milk producers were not prepared to finance the scheme and the Dairy and Stockbreeders' Association were invited to put forward proposals for the operation of the plant on the basis of a dollar for dollar contribution. Discussions with the Dairy and the Stockbreeders' Association continued up to 1958.

5. In March, 1958 a group of local businessmen submitted proposals and requested certain concessions from the Government for the establishment of a milk plant. In May, 1958 the Government agreed to grant certain concessions for the operation of the project by private investors.

6. In 1959 with the assistance of a Colonial Development and Welfare grant, a representative of the United Kingdom Milk Marketing Board visited

the island and wrote a report on the dairy industry with special reference to the marketing of milk and the establishment of a heat treatment plant. On the basis of this report discussions continued with the sponsors of the project with whom the Dairy and Stockbreeders' Association were now fully associated.

7. In September, 1961 representatives of the New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board associated with local businessmen discussed proposals with the Government and in January, 1962 they submitted joint proposals with the Dairy and Stockbreeders' Association for the formation of a company to be known as Dairy Industries Limited and applied for certain concessions. Another group of local businessmen submitted proposals in March, 1962 for the formation of a company for operating a plant on similar lines. The Government agreed to enter into negotiations with this latter company which later failed to put up sufficiently comprehensive details of its proposals for the Government's approval.

8. In June, 1962 Government representatives were in discussion with officials of Northern Dairies Limited of the United Kingdom in regard to the establishment and operation of a plant, and written correspondence commenced on the 29th June, 1962.

9. On the 10th July, 1962, after negotiations had commenced with Northern Dairies Limited, a local businessman submitted an application for pioneer status for the establishment and operation of a milk plant to be known as Miller Brothers Dairy Products Limited.

10. In December, 1962, the Chairman of Northern Dairies Limited visited the Island and held discussions with the Government and with the Dairy and Stockbreeders' Association. As a result of these discussions representatives of Northern Dairies Limited, and of the New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board visited the island in February 1963 and reached agreement with the Barbados Government for the formation of a public company comprising Northern Dairies Limited, the New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board and the Barbados Government as the three main shareholders.

11. In April, 1963, the Government decided that it would not be in the public interest to grant pioneer status to the company to be known as Messrs. Miller Brothers Dairy Products Limited, in view of the arrangements entered upon between the Government, Northern Dairies Limited and the New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board, and of the considerable experience and knowledge which these companies have in the heat treatment of fresh milk, the processing of milk from imported raw materials and the organisation of the dairy industry to enable it to make a substantial contribution to the national economy.

12. The terms of the proposals agreed upon between the Government, Northern Dairies Limited and the New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board are as follows:—

- (1) that a condensery and milk plant should be established in the Island for the purpose of —
 - (a) heat treating locally produced fresh milk;
 - (b) reconstituting liquid milk from imported raw materials;
 - (c) producing condensed and evaporated milk and other milk products.
- (2) that a limited liability company be formed with an authorised capital of \$1,000,000 this to be subscribed as \$250,000 by the

Government of Barbados, \$250,000 by the New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board and \$250,000 by Northern Dairies Limited with \$250,000 to be offered to allied Barbadian interest e.g. dairymen, feed suppliers, business houses etc.

- (3) that the company be awarded the status of a Pioneer Industry in terms of the Pioneer Industries Act 1958, and be granted all benefits arising out of such an award.
- (4) that the Government introduce a Dairy Industry (Regulation and Control) Act, and pursuant thereto –
 - (i) License the Company as an approved processor of milk and dairy products and limit the award of such a licence solely to the Company for a period of at least ten years.
 - (ii) Register the premises of and license the persons of all milk producers selling or intending to sell the milk (including any products made therefrom) produced on such premises and make the sale of milk (and any products made therefrom) by such licencees contingent upon the maintenance of their milk-producing animals in good health and the maintenance of their registered premises in good sanitary condition and repair.
 - (iii) License the persons of all milk vendors and establish the conditions as to consumer service and hygiene whereunder such a licence will be granted.
 - (iv) Establish a formula, acceptable both to the licencees referred to in (ii) above and to the company, which will determine from time to time the price or prices which the company will be required to pay the licensed milk producers for all milk of marketable quality offered by them to the company for purchase.
- (5) that the importation of all dairy products handled by the Company be controlled by licensing and/or the imposition of appropriate import duties so as to ensure to the company, as the sole licensed processor, adequate protection against unfair competition from imported dairy products.
- (6) that, as from a date to be agreed with the company, the importation of sweetened condensed milk and unsweetened evaporated milk be prohibited in any of their forms, but as a condition of such prohibition the company be required to ensure the residents of Barbados an adequate supply of similar products of equal quality at prices which while fair to the consumer will return to the company all its costs of manufacture together with a reasonable return on its investment.
- (7) that the technical and commercial management of the company be undertaken jointly by the New Zealand Dairy Production and Marketing Board and Northern Dairies Limited.
- (8) that the company, when in operation, will offer to purchase at a price or prices determined in accordance with paragraph (4) (iv) above all locally produced milk of a quality suitable for the use of the company.
- (9) that the company be granted by the Government of Barbados, at a peppercorn rental and for a period of 50 years, the exclusive use of an area of land suitable for its purposes with adequate drainage facilities and a satisfactory water supply provided thereto.

13. The main objects of the project are to encourage the development of dairy farming by providing a guaranteed market for locally produced fresh milk and to establish effective controls in the matter of standards, quality and prices of milk and milk products.

14. The site chosen for the project is part of the lands of the Pine Plantation near the Pine Primary School.

15. The agreement is subject to the understanding that the Government will take such steps as are necessary, including the introduction of legislation, for the implementation of the proposals. The Legislature will be invited in due course to enact whatever legislation may be required.

14th June, 1963.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of the parcel of land described in the Schedule thereto for the purpose of extending the playing field at St. Silas School.

Hon. J.C. TUDOR: On behalf of the Hon. Premier, Minister of Finance: A Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: A Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959 to extend its duration for a further period of one year from the 9th July, 1963.

QUESTION

Mr. BATSON: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Government aware that the road along Arthur Seat in the parish of St. Thomas is very muddy after a rainfall and is in need of repair?

2. Will Government explore the possibility of having the said road repaired for the benefit of the people living in the district complained of as soon as possible?

BILLS READ THE FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill to amend the Town and Country Development Planning (Interim Control) Act, 1959, was read a first time.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Reports of the Accountant General for the months ended 30th June, 1962, 31st July, 31st August, 30th September, 31st October, 30th November, 31st December, 1962 and 31st January, 1963.

REDIFFUSION'S SPEAKERS

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before you call the first Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member risen on a point of order?

Mr. SMITH: On a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps a point of order may be more appropriate.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have noticed speakers of Rediffusion here on the table and during your absence hon. members were denied the right of speaking through them, so I would like to find out if hon. members will be having the right to speak through them throughout the debate, whatever it is that is to be broadcasted, or whether they would be withdrawn after a few hon. members have spoken through them.
12. 25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say this? I received a written request that Messrs. Barbados Rediffusion Ltd., might place their speakers here today for the purpose of recording the Federation debate. To that written request I replied in writing that they may be so placed in order to record the debate. I was asked for approval in respect of recording the Federation debate and I have replied giving approval for the recording of that debate.

SPEAKER WELCOMED BACK

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the day, I should like to express the gratification of my colleagues, and myself and of the whole House I am sure, at Your Honour's return to preside over the deliberations of this House again after your refresher course in London. (*Cheers!*) It is sincerely hoped that Your Honour has benefited from the trip and that you have returned refreshed to carry out the arduous duties which lay before you.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to move for the suspension of Standing Orders for the remainder of today's sitting. I am asking leave to suspend Standing Orders, 5, 14, 16, 18 — in fact, all of the Orders.

Mr. WALCOTT: You cannot do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: You could hardly suspend all of the Standing Orders; in case that is done I have dictatorial powers.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That remark was merely made in answer to an aside. However, Sir, I understand that hon. members have already been approached and they are quite willing to accede to such a motion. I am therefore asking leave to make a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16 and 18 for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member just clarify his reasons for making the request?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: When the request was made to hon. members on the other side, it was pointed out to them that the reason for that was to facilitate a debate later on today on Federation, and the decisions of the Regional Council of Ministers at "Sherbourne" which ended a week or two ago. Therefore I did not think it was necessary to repeat the reasons again today because the hon. members have been told before.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, may I thank the Hon. Leader of the House for the kind words of welcome back and to express the hope that not only for today but for the remainder of the Session matters will proceed as smoothly and as satisfactorily as I am sure they proceeded when this Chamber was under the control of my good friend and colleague His Honour the Deputy Speaker?

The question that leave be granted the Hon. Leader of the House to move for the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16 and 18 for the remainder of the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16 and 18 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

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

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

TRADE UNION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Bill to consolidate and revise the law relating to Trade Unions.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee on this Bill on the last occasion, Clause 2 was being considered. The hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on the last occasion I was trying to demonstrate to the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour the clauses in this Bill in connection with which I made it known what relation this Clause 2 would bear on Clause 39. I hope the Hon. Minister has had the opportunity over the period which has elapsed to do a little research in order to satisfy his mind that the legal opinions which were enunciated by the Hon. Premier would be illogical. As I pointed out, this Section defines what a trade dispute is. I pointed out that it was illogical to have a trade dispute which means any dispute between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen which is connected with the employment or non-employment or the terms of the employment or with the conditions of labour of any person — I had pointed out that it was illogical to have that interpretation dealing with any person who is involved in a dispute whether it be in connection with the employment or non-employment of the person or the terms of the employment or the conditions of labour and then you pass a subsequent Clause in which you are denying the person the right to act in a manner in which you give an organization the right to act. That is patently illogical.
12.35 p.m.

You cannot have an Act to give a person the right to be vindicated, and then deprive the person from taking up his case. Let me put it as simply as this: a dispute arises because a man is dismissed. The hon. junior member for Christ Church said that I was labouring the point that when a man is dismissed my implication stated that the employer — in a trade dispute whether an employer is right or wrong, or the worker is right or wrong it does not matter. The question is, when a dispute arises, whether it is taking place between a person and an employer — an employer is defined as a person. "Employer" means a person who has entered into a contract to employ a workman. And then a "workman" means any person who has entered into or works under a contract with an employer.....

The whole gamut of this exercise is an exercise of persons, so that if a person is involved in a dispute and you come along and say that person and all persons who are involved in a dispute must be denied the right to vindicate their cause — but only an organization can vindicate the cause — it is patently wrong. That is all I have been pointing out to show that this is illogical and stupid.

When I come to the specific question dealing with these people, I am going to demonstrate to the Government of Barbados that as far back as 1947 this Act was passed by the Windward and Leeward Islands. Later on, I believe, we will have to debate the Windward and Leeward Islands Federation, and we still have some Barbadians who concede to themselves that they are superior to these people. We find that in the Windward and Leeward Islands this Clause was in their laws sixteen years ago.

I am not going to argue the Clause about "peaceful picketing" until I come to it. What I would like to draw to the Minister's attention is this: what did the Government or his Party have in mind when they said that they will, immediately after elections as Government of this country, amend the Trade Union Act to provide for peaceful picketing? I am sure if I ask the Hon. Minister: do you mean peaceful picketing like what is done in the U.K.? He would say "yes". They had it in their Manifesto and stated that they were going to amend the law in order to have peaceful picketing in accordance with what is peaceful and orderly. Therefore, I see absolutely no reason for me, when I come to this Clause, to demonstrate that they are going to pass a Clause here to give the person any special privilege, for you cannot give a person a privilege and deny it later on.

A dispute means any dispute between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment, or the terms of employment, or with the conditions of labour, or any person.

You cannot have a dispute between two employers. You must have the dispute between employer and employee. I feel a little bit diffident to be making a speech like this at this time, because you expect that members in a Chamber like this — apart from party loyalties — should have the basic reasoning to understand that legislation is legislation, and you must not pass legislation as a mockery. It is a matter of basic commonsense. You cannot deny a person the right to fight his case. When you come to this specific Clause — I cannot understand the bogus argument and all the clap-trap that we have been hearing all along. In Clause 2, which is the Definition Clause, you are dealing with the person and the other Clauses are consequential Clauses and must bear some relation to this one. I have no objection to this Clause as it is because the Barbados Workers' Union and I, myself, agree with this consolidation of the Trade Union Act.

The Premier is not here and I would not like the impression to go out that we are giving domestic servants and agricultural workers the freedom to join Trade Unions, or that it was a freedom which they did not have before. Even in the old Trade Union Act, there was no intention in the former Government or the Government before the former Government when it was serving its regime in 1939 when the 1939 Act was passed — I was not in the Chamber then — to preclude these people from joining Trade Unions; because subsequent happenings will show that nobody has ever said that because a man is engaged in trade and industry and another man is engaged in growing something that was not trade. That has always been subjected to legal interpretations. Industry connotes that you are building something and doing something. Growing carnations in a garden is not an industry because somebody sells a carnation to someone. It was not the intention of the Legislature then to preclude such persons from doing that.

This new definition that has been given to Trade Unions means any combination, whether temporary or permanent, the principal purposes of which are under its constitution the regulation of the relations between workmen and employers, or between workmen and workmen, or between employers and employers, whether such combination would or would not, if this Act had not been enacted, have been deemed to have been an unlawful combination by reason of some one or more of its purposes being in restraint of trade.

And then it gives the definition of employer and you will see specifically put in the Government, Local Government and so on. There was the view that it was not sure whether the Crown was an employer. For that reason, I would say that these things were now included. For many years I have been organising agricultural workers, and I would say that any Government would find it extremely difficult to preclude agricultural workers from becoming members of a Trade Union in Barbados, unless the Government wanted a big industrial dislocation and the slowing down of all valuable industries.

I would not like it to be said that the Act gives the people the right to join Trade Unions. It was not clear whether persons in the public and Civil Service and a few others in the Local Government should join Trade Unions, and I think it is well that it has now been written into the Act. Local Government Officers, employees and Civil Servants are now free to be members of Trade Unions, if they wish to join. I say that because I would not like the impression to go out that this Government of all Governments is giving agricultural workers or anybody the right to join a Trade Union. It is known that these peoples were in Trade Unions a long time before this Government came into power.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clauses 4 to 9 inclusive were called separately and passed,

12. 45 p.m.

Clauses 10 to 38 inclusive were called separately and passed.

Clause 39 was called.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, Clause 39 is one of the controversial clauses, and this is where the hon. senior member for St. Peter speaking for the Trade Union and the Government have parted company. Both last Tuesday and today the hon. member spoke at length protesting against this clause and pointed out the Union's viewpoint on this matter. The hon. member knows really well that in actual point he is dwelling on a fairly solid footing, but on the face of it, his contention logically is suited to a period which does not now exist in this Island. It would appear that there would be few arguments against him but what he must bear in mind is that in 1963 we are no more reactionary than the Governments of Antigua, St. Kitts, and other islands of the Windwards and all he has to do is to bear in mind the background to the introduction by the Government of this Bill at this time.

Even now, on the floor of this House there is considerable antagonism to the introduction of this piece of legislation. Both the opposing Parties, the Official Opposition and the other Opposition Party are still opposed to permitting peaceful picketing at or near the home of an employer. The arguments produced on both sides of this matter came before the House on a former occasion during the last session and are still undoubtedly fresh in the minds of hon. members. Those arguments have left no doubt of where the Opposition stands in this matter. One has to bear in mind despite the fact that we have gone far already, we are going to introduce legislation to permit workers employed, involved in a trade dispute, to picket at or near the house of the employer. The two Opposition Parties are still unrepentant and unprepared to go so far, therefore the insertion by the Government in this section of the contentious phrase: "Appointed by the Trade Union" was designed not in any way at all to present a reactionary attitude on the part of the Government, but merely to try to reconcile the viewpoints of the Opposition to my position, without in any way fundamentally interfering with the rights of workers.

The section reads as follows:

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons, appointed by the trade union, the firm or the individual employer directly concerned in contemplation or furtherance of a

trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

12.55 p.m.

The gravamen of the contention both last Tuesday and today by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is why should we put in the words "Appointed by the Trade Union, the firm or the individual employer"? Since a dispute is what it is in the Interpretation Clause, therefore in any dispute arising out of the relationship between an employer and employee, the employee should be able to picket whether he be appointed by the Trade Union or not. Since we are breaking new ground, since there is this uncompromising austerity to this section, one basis of approach might be — I am not saying that it will be — to ensure to people who are still opposed to this Measure that we meet them half way by ensuring at least that there is some sort of reliability or responsibility on the part of the pickets by insisting that they should be appointed by the Union for the purpose of picketing the house or the residence of the employer. In other words, you nullify as far as you possibly can, the possibility of having what might be irresponsible picketing by any employee involved in a dispute with an employer.

The contention of the Trade Union representative is quite valid. This has been legislation in England for a long time and we ourselves have contemplated the introduction of this Measure. I am merely suggesting, for the purpose of understanding the Government's position in this matter, that the hon. member should turn over in his mind the surrounding circumstances and he will appreciate the position in which we find ourselves. It is quite true that we could quite easily remove the phrase which has given rise to the dispute between the hon. member and ourselves and have the Measure passed; but it is not that everything which is lawful is expedient. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that on reflection the hon. senior member for St. Peter must appreciate the fact that in a way this serves to bolster the position of the Trade Union, not that it needs any bolstering from us because the Trade Union in its own right is in a position to command respect and attention in this country, of course; but with the insertion of this phrase, we make this proposal more palatable even to the members of the Labour Party who feel that we are taking a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Is the hon. member saying that the members of the Barbados Labour Party are against this Bill?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not understand that.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is what I am saying in the most precise terms. They have resisted the inclusion of this paragraph throughout their entire term of office. The Hon. Minister of Labour in the last Government regarded this as obnoxious legislation and he made the strongest condemnatory speeches in here when the hon. senior member for St. Peter endeavoured, on a private member's motion, to have legislation of this kind enacted. But every now and then the hon. junior member for St. Joseph gets up like Rip Van Winkle from one hundred years' sleep and pretends not to know one single thing about what went on in here. This legislation was opposed by the Labour Party Government. I want to say this; if in consequence of the hon. member's impotence to oppose this legislation today he is going to agree with it, well then, let him say so; but do not let him

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. I was never against this Bill, whether in my Party or not. Let the hon. member get my speech on this matter.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have never yet on the floor of this House heard the hon. member say one single word in support of this Measure. I challenge him to find two words of his in the records of the debates

of this House to prove that he said those two words in support of this Measure and in opposition to his Party's policy. If the hon. member were to do that, I would be glad.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. If the hon. member is throwing out a challenge, I will take it. If he is wrong, let him take his salary and give it to the poor people; likewise with my salary if I am wrong.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I ask the hon. member to give the date of the debate in which he said those words and I will send and get it.

Mr. SMITH: I will get it for the hon. member and I am also exacting his salary. (Laughter).

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am looking forward to that, because I have absolutely no recollection that the hon. member at any time has ever said one single word in support of this Measure when it was before the House. The only people who supported it were the members of the Opposition Party which is now the Government Party.

Mr. MILLER: I take it that the Hon. Leader of the House accepts that challenge. He wants to be a gentleman at all times; he wants to make a check on the debates. I think that my colleague has already indicated to the Hon. Leader of the House what he wants; that is, that he wants the hon. member to be denied of his salary.
1.05 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The Government Party, on the last occasion on which one member was a very distinguished member, refused in the most resolute terms to support any such inclusion in the Trade Union Act, and the Minister of Labour made the strongest possible speech against it. I have seen in the debate that it was referred to as obnoxious legislation and what not. I am saying that, in the face of this uncompromising attitude in this House, the Government was right in introducing this Bill to put in the words complained of by the hon. member for St. Peter in an effort to demonstrate that we, ourselves, although we had no doubt whether it was inserted or not that the workers of this country were responsible enough to be trusted with the power whether or not they were in a Union. Whether or not the worker was in a Trade Union, he still had the power. We did not think that the people would run amuck if they got this power to picket peacefully near the home of an employer if we were to insert the Clause.

There is no gainsaying the validity of what the hon. senior member for St. Peter said on this matter; it is logical, sound and parallel to similar legislation as he has in mind and, therefore, nobody can deny that. It is merely that the Government is trying to steer its way between the two opposing views on the matter. If the Bill is passed, as it is, today there is no reason why, after a short period of operation, when the apprehension of the people is allayed, we cannot with the greatest facility amend the phraseology which now does not meet the approval of the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not consider the difference between the Government's proposition and what I said, but it is a question of a scientific approach. As I said earlier, the Government sent a copy of the draft legislation to the Union, and it included the Clause about which I am speaking. I am not now introducing, as I said at the beginning, a new Clause, but I would like the Hon. Minister to know that in putting forward this legislation the similarity between circumstances in Barbados and the circumstances that obtain in England in 1906 should be taken into consideration.

In 1901, there was the famous Taffil case as far back as 62 years ago when the Judges at the time spared no pains in crushing the Trade Union and made the Railway Union pay £23,000 damages. When they went to the House of Lords the damages totalled £42,000, so you can imagine a fine amounting to £42,000, 62 years ago. The workers pledged that they were going to put people into Parliament who were going to pledge to renounce that type of legislation

and put the Trade Unions back into the position in which they were before.

This trade dispute Clause was the result of a recommendation by the Trade Union. It was said that if the Liberals were elected to Parliament they would have to swear that they would put back the Clause as it was before it was amended. I see something similar to what took place in the Labour Government in 1906. The Hon. Minister of Education who is an Historian, can very well remember that when the Liberals were returned in 1906 the legislation to which I have referred was put on the Statute Book.

It was only in 1926 or 1927 that the Tories came back and took up the question after the general strike, and they had to wait until 1946 before something substantial could be done. The hon. member, who is not *au fait* with these things, said that Mr. Bevin did it. The circumstances in 1946 were a little different. I say that the Minister should not bring this analogy before this Opposition, because the Government knows that when the Liberals were returned in 1906 they did not agree with what the Tories said about it. They said they were going to pass it and they passed it.

The Tories here have some bogus idea as to what is peaceful picketing. Their idea about peaceful picketing is that somebody would be peeping through a palling to see if people are bathing. When I talk about picketing, I refer to peaceful picketing. So far as the Tories in Barbados are concerned they say that a Trade Union is a good thing, but when it fights for the workers it is a different matter. The Tories were in this Island for a long time, and it was not until the Royal Commission came here and made a strong condemnation regarding the low wages paid to the workers that something was done. Before the Royal Commission came here, you could still find a man working for one shilling per day, and this rapacious thing is looked upon as something sacrosanct. I do not see any intelligent person in Barbados having any justification whatsoever for condemnation of an Act such as this. There is nothing in Barbados to prejudice the argument which this statement has made. What has happened in Barbados to justify this change? Moreover, in Barbados, the loss of mandays as a result of strikes are lower than anywhere else in the Caribbean. There is no justification in the saying that our behaviour, so far as strikes are concerned, will be different from anywhere else's.

This Act is in Trinidad. All the Trinidad Act says is that in a trade dispute no one should have any legal right to enter or remain upon any land or premises. That is what Mr. E. K. Walcott had suggested as far back as 1949. I pointed out to him that he need not have put that in as it was redundant, because in peaceful picketing a man had no right to enter on land to encourage anybody to work or not to work. The analogy between that and what the Hon. Minister is saying is that the members of the Labour Party, perhaps, were not only spiteful but ignorantly spiteful. They accept certain things and they do not want to accept others. If you take them as a lesson, they accept certain things because they think they will always remain in power. The Labour Party's action is the most hypocritical action that has taken place in an Assembly.

What the Hon. Minister has forgotten is that in 1949 the Labour Party introduced a Bill with the Clause to which I have referred and it was passed in this Chamber. It is amazing to know that 14 years ago, the Act similar to the English Act was passed in this Assembly.
1.15 p.m.

It was then written: "It shall be lawful for one or more persons or any individual." And that was similar to what the Hon. Minister set out in the Draft Bill.

In the year 1949 when the majority of the Labour Party was not even as clear as it is today, you did not hear what you heard today. You hear today all these bogus arguments. If it is true, you will get some members of the Labour Party supporting my claim as against that of the Government. The last Minister of Labour, when he was pointing

out that he did not agree with a worker picketing at or near the home of an employer thought that he made an outrageous speech against those who were representing labour, and he completely forgot the speech which he made in 1949. Therefore, when the speech which he made then was brought to the attention of the House, and it was pointed out to him with the argument, "look what you are saying now, as to what you said in 1949," that member said then that he did not put that in their Manifesto. I asked him, if you believe in God, do you have to put that in each Manifesto which you publish? This Island is small and even politicians are not immune from ignorance.

I brought in an amendment to the Trade Union Act during the time of the last Government and members of that Labour Party were so aiming at me, that they stupidly voted against the amendment. They aimed at me because they thought that I was good target to aim at. Of course, I do not believe that I look as anybody else. They thought that they were aiming at me forgetting the workers. I was used as a target, and they voted against the amendment. They thought when they did that that I would not have been able to picket any more, forgetting that if anything happened to me, I can picket it, close it down, burn it down, or do whatever I like. As I have said, they thought they were doing something against me as a person, but they are paying the price now.

Therefore, the hon. member should not use that as an example to show why he has put in the phrase "appointed by a Trade Union" because members of the last Government were defeated and, more than that, if you had put this in your Manifesto, and you have been elected to the Government and have taken over from members of the last Government, then there is no justification to use what they said as an argument to show why you have inserted this phrase.

The hon. senior member for the City who is the Leader of the Opposition has always been against the insertion of this amendment into the Act. He must. He was singing that too long, therefore he cannot change his tune now. I will only ask this. Has the hon. senior member for the City ever been a protagonist for Trade Union rights? Has the hon. member ever been in the vanguard for that? If he says he is a Conservative, both here and in England, the workers have received more torture from the hands of the Conservative than anybody else. The hon. senior member for the City is part of the Conservatives, therefore can he speak for agricultural labourers? Can he say that the agricultural labourers do not want this?

The hon. member is speaking for the minority. His side has been in the minority for the last eighteen or nineteen years and I cannot conceive that the Conservatives for whom he is speaking would ever be in the majority again and run this Government. They would always be memories and what good they have done in the past would also be a memory. People who are suffering against the background of slavery, poverty and lack of education for ever so long are not going to allow the Conservatives to preside over their destinies unless they have gone stark mad and ready to go to the Lunatic Asylum. Therefore, Sir, if I were the Hon. Leader of the House I would not use what the hon. senior member for the City and his Party have said as an argument to justify the inclusion of that phrase in the clause. If the hon. member thinks that he or the Conservatives will ever again preside over the destinies of the working class people or that with the emancipation of the working class they would ever underwrite a Conservative Government to preside over their destinies, that is a dream. If the hon. senior member for the City has a seat in the House of Assembly, he can say that he got it for himself. If the hon. junior member for Christ Church has got a seat in here, that is all that would accrue to them. That does not mean that anybody is going to send back to this House a Conservative Government. What have the workers to conserve? What are you conserving? Poverty; living in 1844 and cannot get a good meal of food?

It has no political significance when you are talking of political philosophy. I cannot see anybody using the Conservative element in this country as any real opposition against this, because all Conservatives would oppose this

measure. They have only supported Trade Union legislation because they had to do so. It is just the same thing as their refusing to give everybody the right to vote. If we had to wait until the Conservatives brought down legislation for Adult Suffrage, would we ever get that? They voted for it against their will.

What I regard as hypocrites of the first order is the Party which has always claimed to be in the vanguard of labour legislation was one in which you got a Minister who had the effrontery to get up in Parliament and regard this as obnoxious legislation. That only shows you what can get in your head and in your thinking when you get into power.

At that time the clause was worded as follows: "It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a Trade Union." That does not preclude a Trade Union from appointing someone. The reason why I say that is this. Let us be frank. An employer in Barbados would say yes to "On behalf of a Trade Union." But they do not mean this in another context. If you were to say that all workers should be in a Trade Union, they would say "Oh no." They would say a man must have his freedom. That would be all right if you would agree that everybody should be a member of a Trade Union.

Now, Sir, you are going to pass a trade dispute clause in which you are omitting "acting on your own behalf." I want to draw some examples to you. A clause which we passed earlier says that a trade dispute can take place between any person in any way. That is something for which the Governor may institute a Board of Inquiry. I would now give you a classic example. Some time last year or two years ago a man of European descent kicked a black Barbadian and, Mr. Chairman, you know that could have caused a riot. That in itself could be tantamount to the cause of a riot, far from being only a trade dispute. Are you suggesting that that boy who had got in those circumstances, were there no Trade Union, and the people were condemning the action, that they would not have the right to demonstrate to the public by peacefully picketing to show that they are demonstrating against the man who has kicked a worker? Let us be quite frank.

1.25 p.m.

Let us be quite frank. I would be the last man who would not want to have an Act passed. If I had my way, I would say that you should not legislate in this area for people to contract out of things like this, because they mean too much for them. If you are passing legislation, then this legislation must be scientific. There is no compulsory trade unionism in Barbados; a man is free to join the Union or not. We do not compel persons to belong to the Union although we have an agreement by which we have a perfect right to do that. We say that if you want to exercise your freedom you do not have to come in here; I am saying that you should give a person the same right to do what the Trade Union can do.

Mr. Chairman, what does this phrase "at or near a house" mean? You have a trade dispute on and workers have a right to restrain other persons from supporting the employer. Every measure by which we can make a strike effective must be used. You can tell your colleagues in St. Andrew not to come down to work. The employers always inject that we are getting at them but do you think that a person would picket an employer's house instead of his workplace if picketing at the house is more effective? The employer has not right to withdraw from his workplace to his home which he regards as his sanctuary at ease. The employer has performed an act here and you cannot go for him down in Speightstown. An employer is a person and a workman is a person. The idea of going at or near a man's house is to strengthen the workers' hands so that you can get people back to work. The Hon. Minister agrees with me; as far as I can see, he is not disagreeing with me on grounds of legislation but on grounds of accommodating the forces at an Election. This is a political issue. This is in the Government's Manifesto. The Conservatives have never agreed to peaceful picketing; however, the electors have returned four of them; four of them have got back in here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. If the hon. member means the members of my Party, I repeat that we have never said that.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member's Party has opposed this Clause.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. If the hon. member is referring to the members of my Party I say that we have never said that we were opposed to peaceful picketing. The hon. member does not usually misquote people, but he should not misquote what we said as far back as 1949.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member's Party was opposed to peaceful picketing originally.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I object to that statement; it is not correct.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. Too much circus business goes on in here. If the hon. member does not agree with me, he has the right of reply because we are in Committee. The Trade Union Act was passed in 1939 dealing with peaceful picketing and it was opposed by the Conservatives. They opposed the Bill which had for its object the Trade Union Act being put on the Statute Book. If you were to read the history of this island, you will see that it is replete with instances in which the Secretary of State for the Colonies had been calling on Barbados to pass legislation like this. Something like this was passed in Jamaica in 1919. Barbados had a Trade Union Act placed on the Statute Book in 1939 and who was in power in 1939? It was the same people of whom the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is now upholding their banner. I would like to see the hon. member adorning this Chamber in which he can make his contribution, but the banner which the hon. member is proclaiming is one which has been dragged down and only anybody who is mad would think that their philosophy has any meaning today.

No thinking person could say that he would uphold any Conservative banner. In 1939 when a Conservative Government passed the Trade Union Act, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was claiming that that Act should be amended as it was done in the United Kingdom. I am not asking the Hon. Minister to break any vows; I am asking him to refer back to 23 years ago and he is in a position to do now what he could not do 23 years ago. If you were to mind the other people you would not pass anything but to the other people, I say you have to be charitable. They have, by their business, put themselves in a position in which they have to play two tunes. If any members of the Labour Party are supporting this Bill today — they opposed it because I introduced it and I hope that this Government will never be as ignorant as the last Government. You have people who have this idea just as you have the Spanish Alphabet. That is to say, if I say "ad" you say "add". That is the Spanish Alphabet; it is the only alphabet in which you have letters without spelling them. That is the position of the last Government.
2.35 p.m.

I am not versed in Dutch or Spanish, but I know more about Spanish than I know about Dutch. I know that there is a colloquialism in Barbados and when somebody asks whether you are talking Spanish, it means that you are saying something outlandish. You have a situation here where you do not have to worry seriously about the opposition in this matter, because the record of the Labour Party has been a most vacillating one; at one stage the members of the Party introduced a Bill with all the Clauses in it and later they voted against it.

The members on the other side are always working true to form. From 1927 when Sir John and his group took charge of the Labour Party the whole record of this Labour Party was unassociated with Tory and Liberal thinking; it is diametrically opposed to this. In your Manifesto you said that you were going to amend the law to provide for peaceful picketing. I say to the Hon. Minister that the difference that exists is not a technicality.

The Premier is not here, but to suggest that you would not agree to what I have said is to reduce this thing to the level that any man in town would not be able to pick up a stick and start peaceful picketing. Last week there was a man in town picketing or objecting to the murder of a Negro in the United States of America. What is wrong if anybody else felt the same way as that man who was able to demonstrate in a free society?

I must say that the inclusion of the words "one or more persons acting on their own behalf" can do no injury to the Clause, because the Trade Unions would have the right to appoint people or a person acting on their own behalf to do it. I would say that if the Hon. Minister had put that in his draft, I would have been inclined to think that he was pressured and had to take it out. I feel that the Government as a Party should stick to anything it puts in a Clause. I go further and say that in 1949 this Chamber passed similar legislation and, through some bamboozling which went on in the Other Place, we have this type of Clause before us now.

I feel that if one or more persons acting on their own behalf or appointed are accepted, then I would have to move the insertion of the words "one or more persons acting on their own behalf" for the word "person".

I am going to move the motion for the amendment of the Clause to read:

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons, acting on their own behalf, or on behalf of the Trade Union".

You can delete the words "appointed by the".

I am told that another member moved the deletion of the words "appointed by". Who can tell whether the Union appointed a man? Can you ask a man, who appointed you to be a picket? A Trade Union runs on the basis of a resolution when it agrees to have a strike. You do not appoint a man to picket as you would appoint a man for a job. In what way do you mean "appointed by a Trade Union"? When a man is appointed or is acting on behalf of a Union, it means that a Union has already met and decided that it would have pickets.

I heard someone say that you will have shooting, because a man will go down a long gap to picket. It is amazing to me to hear people in Barbados in 1963 condemning the worker for conditions when they do not give him the maximum effort to pursue the struggle in his own defence. You should not deprive him of the right to pursue his case. I think it is necessary for me to see that legislation passed here is in keeping with legislation passed in the sister colonies of the Caribbean. I have the deepest respect for my colleagues and leaders in the other territories, and our legislation should not be inferior to the legislation in other territories.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church, or the Leader of the Opposition, has made the point that we might not even have need for legislation to do these things. But this is brought here against the background that you are pressurised to do it and against the occasion that may arise when one will be able to exercise a strike in a manner where the law gives one freedom to do so. It does not envisage people going on strike after strike. Speaking for myself, I do not think that if I am dealing with an intelligent employer I would have to call a strike to get what I want. If I am dealing with a fool or an ignorant employer, I would have to treat him to suit. An ignorant employer thinks about the withholding of labour, but an intelligent employer reasons and you can reason with him. I do not regard it as a criterion for putting in this type of legislation.

The Hon. Premier said that we do not have to follow the English Act slavishly. If I believed in slavery, I would have been a political slave.
1.45 p.m.

I stand in here as a man who can show his righteous indignation without following people slavishly. There are

three parties in here. If I wanted, I could have followed either one of them, but I do not want to be a slave. My forefathers were slaves, but I have escaped that; I like my freedom. I will not follow legislation drawn up in the United Kingdom slavishly. If there were instances in Barbados to justify the Barbados Legislature to be precluded, I would say "yes." But none has been proved. Let us take the instance of British Guiana where you have a complete breakdown of all the Services. What has it done? You do not get this wholesale disorder of people going into this mansion, this house or that place and what is happening now in British Guiana is not an industrial dispute. What is happening is total revolution in a country in which the whole nation is involved.

I am a bit surprised to find the Hon. Minister of Trade giving so much credit to the Opposition in reference to this clause, bearing in mind what they had said because I am sure in other circumstances he would not have given them much credit for something else which they were doing. However, it seems to me that as the Hon. Minister has got this Bill drawn up as it is, he wants to stick to it.

What do I find in this bit of legislation? It seems more of Cabinet pride than anything else, this is what I call legislative nonsense. If the Cabinet agreed to something now that they realise that it can be amended, there is nothing wrong in amending it.

Sir, I will have to move an amendment to this Clause just for the sake of amending it because the Hon. Minister and his group have not seen fit to amend it. The serious thing about party politics is that members of a party would agree to pass legislation which is obnoxious to some of them, but while they all would agree to that, too much of it weakens the party too. There is a time for which you can get a vote by it, but it is the little drop on the water which weakens you.

This piece of legislation is nothing to do with me. So far as this is concerned, it is better for the Union to do it, but I repeat it is not fundamentally right that a person should be precluded unless you are going to say that Trade Unionism is compulsory to all the workers, and I know that that will cause a bigger furore than saying that only a man who is appointed by the Trade Union can picket.

As this clause stands, it means that if a person has a trade dispute he would have to come in the Union. Of course it will suit me better to have every worker organised in a Trade Union so that all would be members of the Union. That is something which I do not regard as undemocratic.

Sir, I hope what I have said has been clearly demonstrated.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief on this matter because I do not think it necessary to generate any heat on this matter. At least the hon. senior member for St. Peter during his comments and his arguments could not refer to me as a turncoat or a reactionary in this matter. He has recalled as far back as 1949 when dealing with this section of peaceful picketing at private homes — not of peaceful picketing — that the party to which I have the honour to belong opposed it. The hon. senior member for St. Peter will also recall that when he brought in this same sort of amendment some years later, the very party which supported it on the first occasion and which criticised us then, came around to our way of thinking and opposed his amendment. Today the hon. member has demonstrated his knowledge of Trade Unionism and I think we all have appreciated it.

I was talking to my colleague, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, and I merely said to him that what the Hon. Leader of the House had to admit was this. If you read section two which gives you the definition of a person who enters into a contract, it follows as night follows day rather illogically to have what you have in that clause and then to have what you have in section 39. This is not a matter of Cabinet pride but it is set out in that definition clause that an employer means a person who has entered into a

contract to employ a workman; "Court" means any court of the Island of competent jurisdiction and then you come to this clause and say that only a Trade Union can appoint persons for the purpose of peaceful picketing. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the House. The hon. senior member for St. Peter, the Trade Unionist in this House when he was arguing that he was sitting surely on solid ground and I do not know if the Lord Chancellor could argue that he was not sitting on solid ground. If I were in his position, I too, would have picked it to pieces and even in a more ruthless manner than he has.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter in displaying his knowledge of Trade Unionism very dogmatically said what Mr. Gladstone and his Party did. Since Mr. Gladstone, the British Labour Party backed the Trade Union movement only on two occasions, and that was during the time of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, and Mr. Clement Attlee. Since then and before then a Conservative Party was in power. If the legislation had been repealed by the Conservative Party whom the hon. member has accused of being so reactionary, let him also deny that four out of every ten Trade Unionists vote for Conservatives.

1.45 p.m.

Let the hon. member deny this, that the statistics show that four people out of every Trade Union voted for the Conservatives in Great Britain in the face of the historian of this House, the Hon. Minister of Education, I say this, because if there is any contradiction he can make it. As to the question of the attack which has been launched by the Trade Unionist, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, I would say that it is a question of free enterprise against public ownership. The hon. member knows exactly that what I am saying today is true. Where you have a country like Great Britain with 50 million people, could you have a Conservative regime coming and going without a Trade Union? Where you have a highly organized Trade Union how could they go on without the Conservatives? I do not mind the attack which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has made; I belong to a Party and I must say that I shall never be a slave to any Party.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I have never said that the hon. member was a slave to any party; all I said when I was asked if I was going to be slavish in legislation, was that I would never agree to follow the United Kingdom legislation slavishly because I myself do not believe in that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member is prone to rise on a point of order and to object to what one says, but it does not matter to me. I can talk long enough and when I want to oppose I will oppose. If the hon. member had convinced me, I would sit around a table and say: "This is for the good of my country; we can part company on this particular matter." But I say that I am not convinced in this matter and therefore what are you going to do with that? Are you going to say that I am not to think as freely as the hon. member, who is a Trade Unionist, thinks? The hon. member must remember that I am an older man than he is. I have seen Trade Unionism in the United Kingdom; may I tell the hon. member that the Conservatives have intelligence and when you are dealing with fools you have to treat them like fools; but public relations all over the world mean that when you are dealing with employers who, for the greater part are Conservative, it is better to deal with the leaders in a body than to deal with the entire body. If you had to deal with them for the last century, to say that they will accept Trade Unions today when they are forced to do so, is not correct. The abolition of slavery for that matter had to be forced on people. There were people who were Conservatives who felt this way and there were those who felt that way; you only had to go and read the speeches. As far as I am concerned, I am the same today as I was in 1949. I said then: "I cannot vote for this." I was somewhat surprised at the reaction of the then Government but they knew best what they were doing.

Mr. Chairman, I am just going to make a small comment for the purpose of recording my position in this House. The other people launched an attack but the attack which the hon. senior member for St. Peter has launched on

Conservatism is just another joke. If you think that you have to have a lot of money and live in a big building to be a Conservative you are only fooling yourself; a man can be a Conservative but he can also be a humane man at heart. This is a different thing altogether, there is a difference between the man who can proclaim on the housetop and the man who can proclaim from anywhere; there are people who would proclaim that they are Communists but when you come to deal with them you will see that they are not really Communists.

Has the hon. member ever read the definition of a "Conservative"? That is very different from what the hon. member has said. I have never been ashamed to say that I am a Conservative but I say that by their deeds you shall know them. As I have already said, I agree with the Hon. Leader of the House that the Trade Unionist is absolutely sound in his argument because you have said in the definition Clause in this Bill what a person is. I repeat that the hon. Trade Unionist is right and the Hon. Leader of the House has seen that the Trade Union member is logical in his argument. I do not think that the argument that we who are in the same small group must be opposed to the Section, would be the same reason why the Government has put in that Section; but that is not the point on which I have risen to speak. As the Section reads:-

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons, appointed by the Trade Union, the firm or the individual employer directly concerned in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides....."

How many legal luminaries adorn this House? It must be seen that the persons who have a little commonsense are able to speak of this in the language which they understand. The interpretation of the laws which we pass must be left to the Judiciary of this country. This Section goes on to say this:

"or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or with peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working," 2.05 p.m.

I said to my colleague that in Barbados conditions are somewhat different from England and other big industrial countries. In Roebuck Street or some other place a person may be carrying on a business and he has a dispute with his employees. I see nothing wrong if there is a dispute and the person is living there and decides to picket. I see nothing wrong with the question of picketing where the person is employed. If I am living at a particular place and I have a row with my domestic servant, I see nothing wrong in her picketing.

I propose to make an amendment. I spoke on this in 1949 for a long time. As a matter of fact, I want to remind the Hon. Trade Unionist that when the Bill went to the Other Place it was sent to a Select Committee and the then Government did not bring it back. The hon. member made comments on things I said in 1949 and in nineteen sixty-something. The Clause states: ".....works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working."

I am putting in a simple amendment; it might only get seconded, but it will be a safeguard. To say that this amendment will be against peaceful picketing will be absolutely untrue. In line five, after the words "where a person resides", I would like to insert the words "provided that such residence is also used as a place of business or employment". I am dealing with the words which appear in line four, "a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house," I do not accept the Trade Unionist's definition of this sentence, but I prefer to wait and hear the decision of the judiciary. He read some legal authority which he had in his hands regarding the phrase "at or near a house or place

where a person resides". This brings in domestic servants, and it is absolutely fair for you to say "the place of employment". You cannot get away from the fact that domestic servants should be brought in.

I would also like the Clerk to add "provided that such residence is also used as a place of business or employment". That covers the domestic or anybody else. I am not afraid, because I get up on a public platform and say what my position is. From 1945 I made my position clear and I am still in this Chamber; I am not a turn-coat. This has been my view all along.

The hon. member has mentioned the fact that in the old Trade Union Act it merely mentioned "a person engaged in trade or industry". He also mentioned the fact that cane-cutters were in the Trade Unions and there was nothing to prevent them from being there. I do not pretend to know anything about the law, but I would like to hear anybody saying that, the chief industry in Barbados being sugar, the people engaged in an industry such as cutting and harvesting sugar cane are not engaged in industry. I would like to see a Judge trying to convince the jury or anybody in Barbados on this point. I do not want to bandy words with the hon. member. I, too, read many socialist and other books. I have two very good communist books on my book-shelf at home and you can have them. I am still wedded to the view of conservatism; I am wedded because the conservatives who are accustomed to our way of life have made contribution here.

The hon. member rightly said that no conservative gives way very easily; he must be prodded and persuaded and he never gives away certain rights. Nevertheless, he is conscious of the fact that he must move on with the times. As I said, whatever happens in Great Britain — we model ourselves on what happens in Great Britain. Whatever happened in Great Britain during the period when Governments other than the Conservative Governments had to introduce certain legislation dealing with conservatism, the hon. member cannot deny the fact that, for years and years and over a period of a half century, the Conservative Party gained power in the House of Lords and in the House of Commons and they have never done anything that would cause such a controversy in Great Britain that would cause an uprising. Everyone knows about the general strike in Great Britain and what took place.

Mr. Chairman, the Acting Clerk has suggested that my amendment does not make good reading. That is what he is here for; as a solicitor, he is here to guide those who are only laymen. It is suggested that the word "if" be substituted for the word "provided", and I agree with that. The amendment will now read: "if such residence is also used as a place of business or employment." The House will have to vote on it. I am in favour of peaceful picketing, but I am not in favour of peaceful picketing on people's private property unless it is done in keeping with conditions to which I have already referred.

I now beg to move my amendment to Clause 39.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is after 2.00 o'clock.....

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second the amendment to the Clause moved by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown; it is clearly put.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think that we should take the adjournment at this stage.

I beg to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CORBIN: I beg to second that.

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

2.15 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for thirty-five minutes of the clock.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

2.18 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY GOVERNMENT NOTICES

On re-assembling,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am now asking leave of the House to give notice of two Resolutions which it was not possible to give notice of earlier in the Sitting because the context of those two Resolutions did not yet arrive.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$3,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1963-64, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1963-64, No. 5, which forms the Schedule to this Resolution.

It is also the intention of the Hon. Minister to seek the leave of the House to deal with this Resolution later in the day in all its stages.

On my own behalf, Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to support the proposals contained in the statement made by the Honourable Premier in the Honourable House on 11th June, 1963, on the character of the proposed Federation of the Seven British Caribbean Territories and particularly to approve, commend and endorse the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government.

The Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the peoples of seven British Eastern Caribbean territories, through their several Legislatures, have agreed to establish, and enter into, a Federation of their territories and

WHEREAS they possess the untrammelled right to act freely and responsibly in determining the nature, purposes and functions of such a Federation, and

WHEREAS the Regional Council of Ministers, composed as it is of the Heads of democratically elected Governments of the area, has, at its recent meeting with the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the United Kingdom Government, outlined its views on the character of the Federation to be established, and

WHEREAS these views are embodied in a Statement made before this Honourable House by the Honourable Premier on Tuesday June 11th, 1963, and are set out as Appendix "A" of this said Statement.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House supports the proposals contained in that document, and particularly approves commends and endorses the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that copies of this Resolution are available and have been circulated.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Sir.

THE TRADE UNION BILL, 1963

Mr. SPEAKER: The House was in Committee on the Trade Union Bill and the Chairman had reported to me that the Committee had reported progress with leave to sit again. That was on my resumption to the Chair. The House now automatically reverts to Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the resumption, the hon. junior member for St. George was about to address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we return to the Trade Union Bill and for the sake of the record and history itself, I think it necessary that I should say something on this clause. You were told and reminded constantly that the last Government objected to peaceful picketing at or near a private home and further on we were told that the last Government was only a memory and why should this Government take notice that the last Government objected to peaceful picketing.

We also have heard the demonstration by the official Leader of the Opposition. I think that what the hon. member had better state was, consistent with world relief, it will be remembered that conservatism has a meaning and philosophy of Government which has lost its prestige and has completely collapsed with the introduction of the Trade Union movement. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not now in his seat. No allegation, no living on the grants of Conservatism philosophy were ever accepted by thinking people. We are in no doubt about this, therefore to suggest that in modern times there are Conservatives with human souls is so much nonsense. May be the hon. member is yet to realise that it was a Conservative Government which has punished the workers and banished six or seven natives from England. The first time that workers ever got together to form a Trade Union was under a cellar, and because of that they were banished for life from their homes. That was done under the cellar of a factory. I believe that two or three of them struggled back to their homes about twenty years afterwards. Conservatives have not given thought to the metamorphoses which have taken place during the last century and even to support an organization known as a Trade Union. This to me is the sort of thing which I am unable to absorb, nor will I ever be able to understand. We understand only too well what happened in those years which have gone before and if you are thinking in terms of the working class folk you will never achieve the best for them if you think they will be left to people who call themselves Conservatives. However, that is past, it could not go on forever and although it is good to look to the past sometimes, that is something to which we look with horror rather than wanting to glorify in a Chamber like this.

The other point is a request by the hon. member for a simple change in the clause; he wants the deletion of the words "appointed by the Trade Union."
3.05 p.m.

I still feel that it should remain; it should remain the responsibility of a Trade Union to appoint these persons, whether it is done by Executive Council, by Secretary, by Annual Conference or by Resolution. There must be some responsibility in appointing members of that organization as pickets. We are thinking of peaceful picketing and in the regulations the banners of the organization must be fixed on one arm. I seem to remember that on the last occasion when there was a strike at the "Advocate" there was a prosecution and I think that the Union gave the pickets the services of a lawyer in the case which was brought before the Magistrate. I do not think that you should remove the authority or the responsibility of the Trade Union to select or appoint these pickets for this particular job. It has been said that, because the last Government failed to agree in this Parliament with peaceful picketing at people's residences, we are now memories. We want to remember a lot of things as far as Trade Unionism is concerned. I believe that all hon. members would have read the Report of the Royal Commission of 1937. I think you will remember that it was the then Attorney General, Mr. E. K. Walcott, who was under pressure of the then Governor - I remember the reluctance there was to bring the Trade Union legislation in Parliament; but there is the person who was the Chairman and founder and he is still Chairman of the last Government Party - under his Chairmanship the Barbados Workers' Union was formed before all of this. We were unhappy about that little phrase "At or near a house." If you

were to go to a man's house you say that you at his home; you never say "to his home." We were hesitant about this for the simple reason that we were doubtful about people going on a man's premises and the Trade Union leader has mentioned this during the course of this debate. Although you say that it is peaceful picketing you will know the agitation of the moment and unless it is brought under control things can get out of hand.

Although the anthropologist is still toying with the idea of primitive man, we are now in 1963. We were worried as to whether it was right or wrong to permit peaceful picketing at or near a man's home. After some dispute, the Union decided that they could picket a man's home. However, if you picket my home, it is not merely the home of Miller as a person, but it is also a question of my family. We were told that peaceful picketing does not mean going on a man's property. You know that any approach at the man's property would be an approach on the man's property itself. We want to concern ourselves with these things. It was not that we had any objection to this, and if I had any objection to it I would say so. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that if I had any strong feelings about this matter and the majority of my Party were in support of it, I would go along with it; on the contrary, if I was in favour of it and the majority of my Party were against it, I would vote against it. You had an incident — I refer to the little strike at the "Advocate;" you had all the indications that if you attempted to damage a man's property you could be prosecuted. We were worried about this question of picketing at or near a man's house; that is what we were worried about. How can you brand the last Government as a living memory because we did not support this matter? The Chairman and founder of the last Government is still Chairman and founder of the Barbados Labour Party. I am speaking from memory now, but it was the Hon. Minister of Agriculture who was the first Secretary, then we had Mr. Herbert Seale, then Mr. Hugh Springer and now you have the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying all of this for the sake of the record. How could you legally say that we are in living memory because we failed to support this Measure some time ago? Whether we supported it or not did not mean that we were not in favour of trade unionism. How can you separate us from Trade Unionism in Barbados when there is still an active Trade Union with one in the person of the hon. senior member for St. Peter as General Secretary? Whether or not the Hon. Minister of Labour in the last Government thought that it was obnoxious for pickets to go on people's private land or on what have you, it was not made clear as to what the position was. However, it was said subsequently and repeated by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and today he has said that peaceful picketing applied to people's private property. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that we could not be separated from Trade Unionism in Barbados when you still have an active Trade Union with the hon. senior member for St. Peter as the General Secretary. It could not be said that the members of the last Government were living memories because we did not support this piece of legislation.

3.15 p.m.

In this country, you have a number of employers who own the long gap leading to their premises. Therefore, any attempt by any person to trespass on such property for the purpose of picketing such an employer's home will mean entry on the employer's property. We still have to be careful and think about posterity, and it is for this reason that we were unhappy at the time when this matter was introduced; but since we are assured, and it has been repeated here, that the picketing will not be done on private property, it is unfair to say that the last Government is now amending what it had introduced. The last Government would never do that because this is a fundamental part of Trade Union activity. The last Government was, to some extent, responsible for domestic servants living in the private homes of their employers. This does not apply to a girl working in a factory. As long as a domestic servant is a member of a Trade Union she must be protected.

This reminds me of something I read in *Pickwick Papers* about David Copperfield. This is the kind of baloney

which we have been hearing about for over fifteen years. We have never condemned Trade Unions. Even the glass-stained window with the photograph of Oliver Cromwell still reminds us of certain things. Today, we are told about kind-hearted people. Even Christians need the law, the Court and the prisons to ensure that justice is being carried out. Even the Bishop and the Pope must have laws to keep them in check. The hon. member said something about abolishing Trade Unions --

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order....

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member is saying something I did not say. Some people of his ilk are always talking about conservatism. Are you telling me that you can find a conservative with a good heart? I am saying that the Bishop wants a prison, police courts and a Magistrate to ensure that justice is administered. You are going to tell us about a kind hearted conservative today, and tomorrow when something goes wrong when wages are increased the heart of the conservative is soft when he is going to church and hard when he comes out.

The Minister in charge of the Bill must appreciate what I am saying, because the last Government rejected it. All of these things are now history and within our memory. I take exception to what is referred to in this Chamber as the Official Opposition, and what is degrading about the whole matter is that the Leader of the Opposition is being paid by the taxpayers. It is a fact that we are exposed to--

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the hon. junior member for St. George that we are still on Clause 39?

Mr. MILLER: Clause 39 refers to peaceful picketing which is in itself an amendment. We can speak forever on Clause 39. I apologise if I have strayed. Can we forget BALGO agitating for the rights of the workers just a few months ago? Did the Leader of the Opposition recognise that Union? I would like to remind him of what took place in the Suez Canal. Only a year ago they refused to recognise BALGO which was in charge of the workers at the City Council.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on Clause 39, and I would hate to have it said that because we declined to support peaceful picketing in the last Government. - (*Asides*) The hon. senior member for St. Peter requested — I do not know if it is an attempt to remove certain words, but I would ask the question. Would all employees get angry with employers and then go and picket unless something was wrong? I hope that the Minister will see that no change is made in this matter.

Mr. BOXILL: I thought that this Bill would have been passed by now, but I see that some of the members of this House have decided to go over ground and raise points that have already been settled. What some members here fail to understand is that peaceful picketing does not necessarily mean that you are going to picket an employer's place; it can also mean that you are going to picket a worker to prevent him from coming out. As long as there is legislation dealing with a worker, the employer feels that we will be victimised. Nobody in his right senses would think about passing legislation to work against an employer.

When I heard the hon. junior member for St. George who was just speaking so much about protecting the worker and so on, I felt myself that he should be the last person to get up in this Chamber and talk about protecting workers. If I may quote from Trade Union Law, by Norman A. Citrine — this is the second edition; the first edition was written in 1950. If I am not mistaken that Bill came before this House around 1959 to 1960, but I am not sure, I will quote from page 456: "The Section does not legalise trespass except to the highway." "At or near" it should be noted that the words used in the Section are "at or near" and not "in". It does not mean that because you say "at or near the residence" you can go into somebody's drawing-room. Somebody asked whether that should be so. I would say that such people should be shot and thrown out. Nobody could be so mad as to do a thing like that.

One hon. member said that a man might be living in a long gap. Nobody wants to go down a long gap to picket a man's property. The pickets merely want to remain in front of the long gap. The hon. member wants to amend the Bill to the effect that if an employer lives on the premises in which he is doing business, then the people should be allowed to picket.

For instance, let us say that an estate worker had an argument with the manager of an estate over a mule, and the manager retired to his mansion to have a drink with his friends.

3.25 p.m.

What sense will it make to have a bunch of people down in the yard picketing a mule, or if you have an employer living in Roebuck Street, according to what the hon. member says, the employer finds that you are picketing his premises and he decides to go down to Bathsheba? What is the sense of your picketing an empty place.

Sir I cannot understand why some hon. members can put forward these trivialities. Peaceful picketing does not allow you to take a seat in anybody's place. What has been quoted with regard to that by Lord O'Brien, Chief Justice in the Larkin versus Belfast Harbour Commissioners case is to the effect that the section does not legalise a trespass except to the highway. "At or near" which should be noted, are the words used in the section, not "in".

The hon. junior member for St. George said that the last time they objected to this bit of legislation was because they had their fears of what would have taken place and all of that. What I have just quoted was something which was put down in section seven of the 1875 English Act. Honourable members got in here and argued against peaceful picketing, but not one of them spent five minutes in looking to see if there was such a law, or such a decision was given since 1875. It is about time that we get through with this measure and I admonish hon. members of the House not to delay any more time, because I think they would be hitting their heads against a stone wall.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can sit down here this afternoon, and allow this Bill to pass without my saying something on it. Clause 39 is where I see the substance of this Bill lies. It says that it shall be lawful for the Trade Union to appoint one or more persons to go to a home or a firm or in any industry for the purpose of peaceful picketing. As I sat down, Sir, I worked out what is peaceful picketing and it gave me a recollection of something which happened in days gone by. If peaceful picketing is done in the right way, it can be done in any home, it can be done at a governor's home, it can be done at a king's home or any home.

Peaceful picketing is just like saying "Come let us reason together" if there is a dispute between the employer or manager and a worker, and you call upon him. It is good to marshal your people together so as to come let us reason together. If there is any dispute the person who has to know about it is the Secretary of the Union, and then it is in his prerogative to appoint a man or as many as he likes to go back to the firm and take some of those men or women who were working with the firm and line them up outside the employer's home. Then he can let one or two of them go to the owner or manager, or ask the servant to call him out and let him reason with the people. The workers who are lined up do not have to say one word because they have already appointed two delegates who would talk to the manager or employer of their grievances. That owner or employer would reason together with the two whom they have appointed in the hearing of all of them. Those two will go up to him and say, Sir, we have a grievance and we come here to reason together. We are not getting sufficient wages. Our tasks have been increased, and we are not getting sufficient money, therefore it is necessary for us men to get together and reason.

Sir, I remember a few years ago that I was put in charge of a hundred and fifty rockblasters in this Island and it was a time when the cost of living had risen, and everybody in Barbados from His Excellency back down had

got an increase in pay and backpay. My one hundred and fifty rock blasters did not get any increase in backpay. Their grievance was on my shoulder and I called on them and lined them up. I inspected them. I searched them to find out if they had any weapons. In short I inspected them as if they were on a battlefield. We were going in for peaceful picketing. I called on the Executive Engineer of the Department of Highways and Transport. At that time Mr. Gill was a representative for the parish of St. Andrew. I said to my men: "Boys, stay easy and allow 'Homie' to go forward." And as I went up to Mr. Minethe, he asked me what was my grievance. I told him that my men have now reached the steep of the hill and they have run out of lubrication. I said further that they have a mind to work but no energy. He asked me what is the cause of that, and I told him that their task is hard and there had been an increase of pay given to everybody all over the Island, but his men had not received one cent. He asked me: "Would you allow your men to go back to work pending an increase of pay?" I said: "Not for one moment! Not until the Director of Highways and Transport and His Excellency the Governor saw fit to give them an increase." The Engineer told the men that they may go back home and I took every cent I had from my purse and gave them. The next day I received a telephone message that my men were getting an increase of pay and back-pay and in consequence I summoned every one of them and told them to go back to work.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but I must remind you that we are dealing with Clause 39.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am still on Clause 39. I come back to peaceful picketing. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is asking to delete certain words and insert certain words in the clause, so that the Trade Union should not be empowered to make the appointment of people to picket.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I will say that there is wisdom in this Clause having been introduced in this form, because it is for the protection of the Union as well as it is for the protection of the workmen and for that of the employers. Why is that? If two, four or twelve men go out on peaceful picketing then they are responsible for what is happening but if the law stands other than this then all kinds of workers can run about the streets and parade and make a noise at the homes of employers. As the law now stands those who are not members of the Union and who join in the demonstration can be prosecuted, and if this law comes into effect these people can be prosecuted. This law which we have in force is good but the Union has to preach to the people the right kind of doctrine and let them know how to go about peaceful picketing and instruct them how and when to approach their employer in this matter of peaceful picketing. I am sure that it would be justifiable for them to go about peaceful picketing in the right way. No matter what happens we have this passage: "Come now, let us reason together; though your sins be as scarlet I will make them white as snow." You may have about four or five servants in the home and how good it is for one of them to come forward and say: "Sir, our work is hard; our cost of living has risen so high that we cannot meet with the demand. Will you give us a little more facility?" That is what you would call reasoning. These people do not have to go out and bring other people to the home. Peaceful picketing is a matter of reasoning; if that is considered, then this island would be a good place to live in.

Mr. Chairman, what do you think is causing all of this dispute in British Guiana today? All that is happening there because people have refused to reason with the workers and with the Union; it is the Government which has refused to do these things. I hate to hear people who are talking against this Bill. When I first came into this House, a Bill dealing with peaceful picketing came before the House and it was turned down. I heard the members of the Opposition say that you should not picket at a man's home; the then Government did not give any further reason as to why you should not have peaceful picketing at a man's home. Nevertheless they had the numbers and the Bill was passed; now those who are in favour of this Measure have come into power and they have put their words into action. Now we

see that this legislation will be passed for the good and benefit of this island.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have no objection to this Bill at all. I have heard hon. members on the other side of this House speak on this Bill; I have heard both sides, both the Official Opposition and the semi-opposition. I want the Official Opposition to understand that when they are speaking or supporting a Bill they must be either hot or cold. Their machine should be generating sufficient heat so as to cause the Government machine to spin around fast enough. Let them get their machine hot or let it remain cold; but if they are lukewarm we will spue them out of our mouths.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, for an hon. member to make this pentecostal excursion may be all right for this island, but it serves no useful purpose when you are dealing with this Bill. When you read these things in years to come, you will have some reflection of what hon. members knew of what we were passing. This may be melodramatic as if you are having a circus excursion but I do not regard this matter as any excursion, nor do I believe that the hon. member, who has just sat down, understands what he means by getting people together to reason. Peaceful picketing is the result or outcome of a dispute; therefore, if there is no dispute then there is no idea of peaceful picketing. The idea of peaceful picketing is to persuade people either to work or not to work. I have heard some monumental ignorance about this question of peaceful picketing as if that means that you can go on the premises of an employer, but that is not so. This is aimed at having people to canvass the support of the workers so that they can participate in the dispute with their colleagues.

This idea of preventing people from going at a man's home is nonsense. You cannot pass a law saying that you can go at a man's home or that any person can go at an employer's home and think that you mean that the Trade Union or the members of the Trade Union can do that and not a person. What is dangerous in this matter is that persons who are legally trained use arguments which the untrained catch on to and they say that no one person can use this legislation. This matter does not deal with organizations or with an organization *per se* but it deals with persons.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for St. George spoke on this Clause. The hon. junior member for St. George is not now in his place but I say that as long as this piece of legislation comes to the House I will be as consistent as I ever was. What amazes me is that this Clause, which we are now discussing, is a Clause with which the Hon. Minister was in favour and the Minister voted for this Clause.
3.45 p.m.

Already in this Chamber the Minister voted for this Clause. I just want to remind hon. members of what was introduced in this House. Clause 6 of the Bill reads: "It shall be lawful for one or more persons acting in their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union." It is not always because you give a man the right to act on his own behalf that it precludes a trade union from doing something in the matter. That type of argument I did not expect in a Chamber like this.

Then the hon. senior member for St. Andrew gets up and says that I spoke about deleting the words "trade union."

Mr. CORBIN: I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Peter did not suggest that it should be changed. If he did not say that I would not have mentioned the word "delete". If certain words have to be removed, then you would have to insert other words. The hon. member is merely prolonging this Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, there is going to be a time when I will be extremely rude in here because of this sort of palaver one gets. I sometimes try to be kind, but sometimes I get brutal. Whenever I am here, I am completely at home and sober; I make no fuss about my parliamentary rights. This is not a side line with me. It is for

the Chairman and the hon. member to understand what I have said, and it is for the Chairman to put the hon. member right.

I moved an amendment and it did not preclude a Trade Union. I said "on behalf"; and that is similar to what is in the English Act. I do not regard this Chamber as a place for any lighthearted exercise when we are passing laws. It is impertinence for the hon. member to say that I am prolonging the debate on the Bill. I am in complete control of my senses. What does he know about this Clause? He says let us get together and referred to certain Biblical injunctions, but he knows absolutely nothing about this matter. This is not the Old City; this is the House of Assembly. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for St. Andrew allow me to hear the speaker?

Mr. WALCOTT: We will soon have to pass a law here to ensure that the members who come here are sane and not intoxicated. If Parties cannot control their members, then it may be necessary to provide an ante-room for them. We have had lunch at random, and we also get other things at random.

So far as this Clause is concerned, the Hon. Minister knows that this is something which was brought up in 1949. As I pointed out, this is no problem so far as the Trade Union is concerned. You cannot come here and say that this is something which was passed in this Chamber and then we hear the hon. junior member for St. George, who is not in his place at the moment, pleading as a penitent soul that they were in doubt as to what "at or near" meant. How can a truthful man say in 1960, eleven years after the party agreed to this, that he did not know what it meant although he had agreed to it ten years ago. It is the type of speech that you get from Government. The Government today justifies its stand by disagreeing to what it had agreed to when the matter was discussed on the last occasion. This seems to be a disease.

Last week, we heard the Premier saying that one could go on picket. I have been in the United States of America, and I have seen one man picketing Crawford's store in Brooklyn. As I have already said, this is a law which states that a trade dispute means any dispute between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment, or the terms of the employment, or with the conditions of labour, of any person.

What right does any employer have to retire to his sanctuary with his children while the workman is left starving? What nonsense is this? A man cannot pay his rent because a dismissal has taken place. What is wrong with a workman picketing? We are talking about a dispute between the labourer and the employer, and it seems to me that it is typical of the Barbadian mentality that a man can do as he pleases and then run to the sanctuary of his home and the people working in the industry have to forget him. They have forgotten that things may be in the reverse and that the employer may have to go to the employee and persuade him to work. The act of peaceful persuasion is one for which you give both sides the right to persuade. Do not forget that they will be about one hundred employees to every employer.

When the hon. junior member for St. George made the statement that he was at a loss to understand what was meant by "at or near", I was rather surprised. It must be remembered that this member was a member of the Labour Party at the time when the Bill was discussed. In 1949, all of them voted for this Clause and there was no talk about "at or near a house". The Minister of Labour made the most drastic speech against the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown at that time.
3.55 p.m.

I want to remind the hon. junior member for Christ Church of what he said. It is a lot different from what he said today. I would also remind him that the Leader of the House then, Mr. E. K. Walcott said that he would not sup-

port the clause and I would show you that a legal man, who wants to use his mind honestly and seriously, cannot talk ignorance.

This is what Mr. E. K. Walcott said in relation to the Clause. It is on page 970 of the *Official Gazette* of 1949 on December 6th. He said: "I am going to move that the following words be added to section 6: 'provided that nothing in this section shall be construed as conferring any legal right to enter or remain upon any lands or premises.'"

He was using the amendment which was in the Trinidad Act. Barbadians pride themselves of having a Trade Union Act with this clause in it. I am not a new-fashioned Trade Unionist; I have been in the Union for a long time. To show you that I am respected by the people in Antigua, they sent and asked me who can I recommend as a barrister to plead for them in a Trade Dispute which they had there, and I recommended the Honourable Premier. They asked me because they know that I am a man who tries to approach my work seriously. I want to show you that the situation in Antigua is even better than the situation in Barbados. In Antigua, they have the same legislation as that under the English Act, because they follow the Act slavishly, and it is through that the Hon. Premier was able to win their case.

The hon. member talked about appointing. What you want a Trade Union to do to show that we have appointed. Listen to what Mr. E. K. Walcott said in agreeing with it. I want to show you what a man who studied the law said. He said: "It is of no use going over old ground in respect of peaceful picketing only that the hon. senior member for St. John did not appreciate the position. This is the section which merely allows you to walk up and down for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information or peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working; but it is ordinary courtesy not to withhold a Trade Unionist from visiting the home of the person concerned in a dispute."

He said that it was ordinary courtesy to allow a man to visit your home. We are colleagues together, therefore what is wrong with going there? You have this bogus idea of you are going to the owner and his children are home. We are all in a struggle, therefore what is wrong in persuading the man at his home. As is pointed out, it is not any dispute between the people where you work, it is a dispute between the employer and you. The people do not tell you to go back home. Why have you this mediaeval and feudal way of thinking about the workers in Barbados? Whenever you come to anything dealing with the conditions of a worker, somebody is always looking at the unsavoury aspects.

Now, as I have said earlier, what is wrong in going to a man's house. As the English Act is stated as well as the Acts of the Windwards, the Leewards and Trinidad, "acting on his own behalf," is inserted. They have inserted "acting on your own behalf or on behalf of a Trade Union." What is wrong with that?

Sir, I was asked last week to bring a case to show that it can militate against the workers. I say that it can militate against the workers. The hon. junior member for St. George said that he was not clear about what "at or near" means. I say that he ought to know what it means because he was a member of a party which knew what it means and what "acting on your own behalf" means. You are not living in 1926 when the British Government re-instituted this thing in Great Britain. This is forty years after. It was first instituted in 1906. As I told the hon. member, the Act came into existence after the 1906 elections, after the famous Taffil case which cost them £23,000. Are you going to tell me that 57 years ago, after the Liberals came into power and said that "at or near" means this that the Barbadian worker would do this and that? We praise ourselves of having self-government for 300 years but we had no Trade Union Act with peaceful picketing in it until 1949. Of course, Barbadians always differ from anybody else. They feel that they are different from anybody. They seem to think that they are some prehistoric being which nobody now knows anything about, therefore anything for Barbadians has to be

different. Whenever there is something to give more rights to the people, you get all this talk.

Sir, I have moved that amendment but you can pass whatever you like; I am not going to support anything you pass. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew gets up and quotes people. I want to tell him that he must quote people correctly. If he hears members of his party saying something, let him find out what they are saying. When the hon. member gets up and speaks not knowing exactly what it is about, it only reduces the debate. These are serious things which we are debating and I do not go in for pentecostal sayings as "Come let us reason together." If we have to reason together, we have to reason together here. The hon. member has projected some argument which has nothing to do with this matter whatsoever.

You have this disease of hon. members getting up and saying that you are wasting time. They are saying so as if you come in here at their good graces. You have this total disrespect for people's ability to debate something. Whenever you get up to debate something, they tell you that you are wasting time. They talk as if you come in here to be a rubber-stamp. Moreover, they say so when you are debating something which is not affecting you but affecting other people's lives. I do not see at this stage how the amendment which I have inserted has nothing to do with it.
4:05 p.m.

I feel happy to know that I am more armed than disarmed when I can produce these arguments. If you were to read the speech which was made by the Minister you will find that he was more buoyant than now. If I were making a speech with which the public did not agree, I would not be here. I am being consistent in what I have said because, as I pointed out, the Clause is simple and it is one which was originally put in the draft. If the Government feel that they should not have put that in the draft, well, then I would say o.k.; but I do not see that anything has happened with this Clause in Antigua, St. Kitts, and in other places. What has happened since you have had it in Barbados? You can catch people in an easy trap; if you have put it in and now you have withdrawn it and you do not feel that the original draft was better than this one, then it is a matter for you and you should justify it.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in the piece of legislation which is now before the House. We are dealing with a Clause in connection with peaceful picketing and which is nothing that is not on the Statute Book. The law has been stated and stated in a heated manner and I hope that, in a very dispassionate way, having been able to study this Clause, I will be able to make my contribution. I believe in peaceful picketing. I have been serving in a Trade Union for a number of years. I have served at a time when a strike was on and when peaceful picketing was being done. I have even had on one occasion to give instructions to strikers who were pickets and therefore I know about this matter. My colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, must be very, very interested in this Clause. Of course, he was waiting for the Government to act on its promise and to introduce this Clause. It is not that every bit of legislation must redound to the profit of the workers. I am on that side, but I think that, being at the head, we should act with some vision in matters of this sort. I do not think that legislation in Trinidad, Jamaica or even in Antigua must be slavishly followed by us.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. HUSBANDS: It is not my business if the hon. member cannot hear me. I intend that he should hear me, but I am not going to shout.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: We, on this side, are saying that we cannot hear the hon. member and he says that he is not going to shout. I would like to know for what reason is he talking if he does not want us to hear him.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I will continue my remarks, Sir. This particular Section with which we are now dealing is very far-reaching. It reads as follows:-

"It shall be lawful for one or more persons, appointed by the Trade Union, the firm or the individual employer directly concerned in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, to attend at or near a house or a place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be...."

That is very wide, that not only applies to trade unionists but also to individual employers and business people collectively as a firm. This Act is now to be a consolidated Act and we have to look at it from both sides. Those of us who care to see that the workers are well defended are interested in this matter and those of us who care to see that the employers are well defended are also interested in this matter. But the words "at or near a house" would appear as if they would invite difficulties. There may not be any difficulties, but there may be some. I have no faith in the interpretation of lawyers in Parliament; I have faith in the interpretation of judges in Court; I say that because no matter what the lawyers say in this House, that is their opinion; it is not the interpretation of a judge in Court.

4.15 p.m.

I am happy to hear that "at or near a house" does not mean entering anybody's premises. I want to be clearly understood and not misunderstood, and I am going to repeat what I said earlier that whenever legislation is brought down to this Chamber for the advancement of the worker I will support that particular bit of legislation. If it happens that my senses and mental perception are so clouded that I misunderstand what is written in the Bill, well, I will suffer.

I am glad to hear that "at or near a house" does not necessarily mean, in law, that the worker would be on the premises of the employer. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has said that the employer has no right to be at home with his family snug and happy while the worker who is on strike remains hungry. The worker who has decided to go on strike can also remain at home. He had elected to remain out of work because the Trade Union Organisation has decided that certain workers should no longer offer their services to a particular employer. We have various-minded people in Barbados; we have good ones and bad ones. If I am of the opinion that passing this particular piece of legislation will open the worker to any disadvantage, especially physical disadvantage, I will not support it. When I say that, I do not mean that I want to deprive the worker or the Trade Union of any of their rights, benefits and so on. I will say that it depends on the mentality of the worker, how he is instructed, and how he acts within the existing law. This Clause is old in some countries and it has not caused any disturbances and difficulties to the individual members of Trade Unions or the Trade Unions themselves, so I am absolutely happy about that.

I am very practical in dealing with this measure. If I am of the opinion that by including Clause 39 in the Laws of Barbados it is going to open the worker to any disadvantage, then I am against it. What I say can be shouted from the housetops. My sympathies are on the side of this Bill; I am prepared to study it as closely as possible. I am very glad to hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter, my colleague, say that on a former occasion in this House, a former lawyer offered a certain amendment. I do not want to prejudice anybody who is not a member of this House, but the particular amendment that was offered would have prevented the worker and the Union as a whole from getting into difficulties.

This bit of legislation is a two-way piece of legislation. It concerns the workers' interests and the employers' interests although certain things are in the Trade Union Act. I believe there are not many members of parliament who view it in this manner, and they have only been thinking of it from the angle of the Trade Union. It is not only the Trade Union that has the right to associate and persuade, but the employers as individuals coming together collectively, firms and companies, also have that particular right.

I do not propose to offer any sweeping criticism about this matter, because I like very much to restrain myself

when discussing a matter of this sort; but I would hate to be misunderstood. I have no recrimination to indulge in regarding past or present Governments in this matter. I did not hear the suggested amendment by my colleague regarding the words "appointed by the Trade Union and acting on behalf of the Trade Union, or on their own behalf." But my colleague, who is familiar with legislation of this sort, sees no harm in including the original form of legislation "acting on their own behalf or on behalf of the Trade Union."

As a matter of fact, if you support the words "acting on their own behalf", it means acting in their own interest. There is nothing wrong in substituting the words, because such persons who are members of a Trade Union and are engaged in picketing are appointed by the Trade Union. I do not know why the original words offered by my colleague have been substituted by the words we now find appearing in this Clause, but I am not going to attribute any motive because I do not know the reason for it.

Personally, I do not think the inclusion of the words would weaken the interest of the Trade Union. I am not one who is versed in the law or, probably, I might have been able to see or find some reason why these words have been substituted. But, as I see it in a practical manner, pickets who are members of a Trade Union must be appointed by the Trade Union. The law makes no provision for workers who are non-members of a Trade Union picketing. If the words "persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of the Trade Union" had been inserted in place of the words in the Clause, it might be interpreted that workers who are not members of a Trade Union might be able to picket. I do not know the reason why my colleague's amendment was not accepted, and I would be glad if it could be pointed out to me.

This Clause is very wide and far-reaching in that it states "at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be,...." This is indeed very wide. A man may be peacefully persuaded not to break a strike.

The whole principle, I think, behind picketing is that it must be peaceful. The workers are allowed to do certain things and they should do them peacefully. We are merely moving an amendment to this Clause, because we have had pickets functioning in Barbados peacefully. The whole idea is that picketing will be conducted peacefully. If the picketing is conducted peacefully and sensibly there will be no trouble.

4.25 p.m.

Now, that I have heard what these words mean, I do not see why the Barbadian worker if he is well informed and who has a responsible Assistant Secretary of Trade Union to advise him would commit himself in the eyes of the law, therefore the Section does not appear as harmful as it may appear on casual reading. I say that because the condition of peaceful picketing is that it should be done merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information. That to my mind is the whole crux of the particular clause. The whole purpose is that the workers may merely picket for this purpose and to undertake this in a peaceful manner by persuading their colleagues not to forsake their joint cause and for giving any information, one to another.

Sir, peaceful picketing is not new; the only thing in it new is "at or near" a house. I understand that it does mean your entering the premises but I would not permit myself to anything which might open a worker to a position of exposure to harm. That is my particular interest in this particular clause and I say so quite firmly and without any bias one way or the other. I think my own interest should be in the defence, protection and the advancement of the interest of the working-class, therefore my hon. colleague who is a great champion of the rights of workers would have preferred the inclusion of other words than appointed by a Trade Union. However, I do not think that in itself would produce any difficulty for the Trade Union. The words "acting on their own behalf" may be by now the classic phrase

but in truth and substance when you get down to the whole of it, pickets will be appointed and their duties arranged by their trade union, so materially I do not think there is any great disadvantage. It may be that I am not an expert in deciphering legal phrases. If because of that shortcoming on my part, I fail to see any friendly difficulty, I do not think I could be blamed for that. However, since I have had certain assurances that they would be no exposure of the workers to any harm, especially physically harm, I do not think there is any great disadvantage. Sir, you know that we have in Barbados different types of people, and during the time of a strike with passions high and people hungry, they become desperate and they may get out of hand, or attempt to get out of hand. As long as I have it that they are not to be exposed to their own passions or other people's passions. I do not think there is any harm in these particular clauses.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is -

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, I think the hon. senior member for the City moved an amendment which was seconded. That motion should be put.

The question that the words proposed to be inserted stand part of the Clause was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Mr. GODDARD (1).

Noes: Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CORBIN, Mr. WEEKES, Mr. LOWE, Mr. YEARWOOD, Mr. BOXILL, Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. HUSBANDS, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. SMITH, Mr. MILLER (15)

The question that Clause 39 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 40 to 45 inclusive were called separately and passed.

The First Schedule was called and passed.

The Second Schedule was called and passed.

4.35 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee with amendments.

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

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

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

On motions of Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, seconded in each case by Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION RE FEDERATION OF EAST CARIBBEAN TERRITORIES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House at this stage that the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier today be taken as the next Order of the Day. I refer to the Resolution in respect of the Federation of the East Caribbean Territories.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave that the Resolution of which he gave notice earlier today be taken as the next Order of the Day. If there is no objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. *(After a pause).* Hearing no objection, the Hon. Minister is granted leave.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of the following Resolution:-

"WHEREAS the peoples of seven British Eastern Caribbean territories, through their several Legislatures, have agreed to establish, and enter into, a Federation of their territories, and

WHEREAS they possess the untrammelled right to act freely and responsibly in determining the nature, purposes and functions of such Federation, and

WHEREAS the Regional Council of Ministers, composed as it is of the Heads of democratically elected Governments of the area, has, at its recent meeting with the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the United Kingdom Government, outlined its views on the character of the Federation to be established, and

WHEREAS these views are embodied in a Statement made before this Honourable House by the Honourable Premier on Tuesday June 11th, 1963, and are set out as Appendix "A" of the said Statement,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House supports the proposals contained in that document, and particularly approves, commends and endorses the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government."

Mr. Speaker, the great philosopher Aristotle has laid it down that political institutions not only exist to make life possible but also to make life good. This principle has been carried on and accepted throughout all the major achievements of human political societies and statesmen throughout the centuries and in every country have not only insisted that whatever contrivances are arrived at in so far as constitution making goes, such political contrivances should always inure to the benefit of the people for whom they are arranged. There is no reason therefore why the people of the Eastern Caribbean should be different in this respect; there is no reason why, in framing constitutions for their future Government, they should not at the same time be framing constitutions for their betterment as well. The Government of Barbados feels that the people of the Eastern Caribbean have reached such a definitive and important phase of their history that in contemplating the next forward step in association with one another, they are exercising their undoubted rights to see beforehand not only what step has to be taken but the kind of step and the direction in which it will be taken.

Last year, this Honourable House had the opportunity of debating what we may call the first stage of the Federation arrangement. Since then the position of the Eastern Caribbean Territories has become much more clear and enough time has elapsed to enable them to say with a fair degree of accuracy, just what they intend the new political arrangements that we have to be, and to say also with some detail how those arrangements are to be worked out. This conclusion was recently arrived at when their responsible leaders, elected Heads of their Governments made a solemn decision here in Barbados at a meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers with a representative of the United Kingdom Government, that they were not prepared to have a Federation and, better still, they were not prepared to work a Federation which did not give them from the time its elected Government was established, the right to order their own affairs. Now, it is clear, Sir, that we have not a trifling affair here between the thinking of the West Indian people and that of the United Kingdom Government. The United Kingdom Government, it is true, has always boasted that it has no obstacles to put in the way of dependent people achieving independence. As a theory and principle they may be doing that.

4.45 p.m.

But the biggest obstacle in the way of independent peoples achieving and maintaining independence is their inability to know beforehand what, or to what extent, their economic viability will hold. All the people of these territories, through their leaders, having observed the trouble and inconvenience which other dependent territories in similar circumstances have been put while on the threshold of independence, and especially immediately after the attainment of independence, these people through

their leaders are not prepared to share that dreadful example. And, consequently, fully realising the responsibility which they should discharge to their peoples, the leaders of the Caribbean territories have solemnly decided that the new Federation of the West Indies must be an independent Federation from the time its elected Government is established, and for that good reason so insisted. (*Cheers!*)

They have noted that despite all the theory and fair promises, despite all the long statements of continued interest by the United Kingdom in the independent territories, despite all that, the one thing needful to make dependent territories less dependent, the one thing necessary to give them the assurance that any new form of Government they undertake will have a life of its own and a good life too, that one thing has always been either withheld or played down by the United Kingdom Government. And not only Nigeria, Ghana, Malaya, Ceylon, Gambia and the rest of them had this experience in finding out absolutely in a definitive manner from the United Kingdom Government what help, if any, and the extent of that help, the United Kingdom Government was prepared to accord to the peoples emerging into independence. They look forward to hearing that, and they look forward in vain.

The peoples in these Caribbean territories are not prepared to stand on this unworthy path; they are not prepared to jeopardise their future on the ground that if only they start a colonial federation the British Government may come to their rescue and even that may well be as thinly drawn out as possible. They are not prepared to exchange the relative security which they now have, meagre as it is, to enter into a larger association with one another and find their circumstances in that larger association less eligible than those which they now enjoy.

This a matter of principle in which neither the leaders of the Eastern Caribbean nor their peoples are prepared to recede on. They are prepared to take whatever responsibilities are laid on them, but to take these responsibilities in independence. They are prepared when independence comes to take their destinies into their own hands and to assume before the nations of the world and the international field that dignity and posture which, though allied to paucity of numbers and scarcity of economic resource, will still be buttressed by a tremendous amount of dignity and self-respect.

And the peoples and their leaders in insisting that the Federation must be independent are mindful of the fact, Sir, that it is only through independence that they can make a claim upon the generosity and sympathy of powers independent and larger than themselves. Make no mistake about it, Sir, independent countries, whether acting through the United Nations or other international organisations, or acting individually, do not readily come to the help, if they come at all, of territories which are still yoked to metropolitan countries and which do not have the possibility of striking a posture which will impress upon the outside world that they are in command of their own destinies.

And we make no bones about this. Government of territories and the Governments of the other Eastern Caribbean territories associated with this Government are convinced not only that the future of these territories will not be worse in an independent federation, but they go farther and have expressed their undoubted conviction that the future of these territories in an independent federation must necessarily be better than a future in territories not so independent.

An independent federation playing its part, however small, though with dignity will conform to the aspiration of the twentieth century thinking and will be linked in its thinking with the vast movement which is now spreading throughout Asia and Africa for a greater self expression on behalf of dependent and undeveloped people. They will be linked with the ferment which is going on in Europe and South America for the twin demands of social justice and greater political freedom by being an independent state. No matter what size it may be, it will be able to command on the floor of the World Assembly just that degree of attention for which all independent states are entitled.

And since as an independent state it will be able to assume obligations — without such status it could not assume obligations which the individual territories cannot undertake now because they are colonies. With such status they will be able to strengthen the Federation which they form with one another, and they will be able to play an important part in the development of the area for which they form part. Moreover, if, Mr. Speaker, they do not insist on independent status from the time the elected Government is first established the whole rationale and reason for the struggles which they are now making and emphasising, and which they are now placing on the political organisation, would be entirely lost.

It would appear, however, that the United Kingdom Government takes a different view; it does not conceal its desire to be rid of the people in these territories, and I think it does not conceal its desire to see a Federation of some sort established. And if the Leaders of these territories were as anxious and, therefore, as shortsighted as the United Kingdom Government, they would be inclined to accept a Federation of the kind which the United Kingdom would dearly love.
4.55 p.m.

They are not so short-sighted and although they are anxious to establish a closer association of these territories one with the other they are more anxious that the new Federation should bear a certain character.

But of course, Mr. Speaker, the United Kingdom Government has its reasons for wanting to impose on us a colonial type of Federation. In a Federation, which is not independent and which needs not be even self-governing, in that kind of Federation, the power of the United Kingdom and its agencies is almost paramount and if the Federation were to enjoy a Constitution below the status of independence, the United Kingdom Government would be in a position not only to dictate the very life of the Federation itself, but even more, it would be able to dictate and lay down the pace at which that life should be carried out. For instance, if we do not have an independent Constitution, the United Kingdom Government would have the power to put in a non-independent Constitution the terms and conditions upon which a non-independent Federation would be able to receive financial and economic aid from the United Kingdom Government and they could hedge these clauses in the Constitution with all sorts of conditions, with half truths, with doubtful interpretations, and with anything they like, and the upshot of it all would be that the one thing which would make the Federation viable, which is substantial on financial help from the United Kingdom and elsewhere, would be hard to come by because lacking an independent Constitution, you would have to refer to the United Kingdom Government for permission to ask the United States Government for help, a permission which they could quite easily and frankly refuse.

Therefore, the Eastern Caribbean territories are not likely to fall into this trap. They would prefer to accept independence with all it implies, with all the dangers and difficulties of charting a new path and steering a new country through perilous international waters. All these they would accept because coupled with these dangers and difficulties, associated with these perils and trials, would be the power to set their own house in order and to say without reference to any outside authority just what policies are needed and therefore what trends are required to help the new independent territories.

That is why I say that the concept of principles exists and without independence there is no guarantee that any Federation can live in these days and it is there even a good reason for non-independent territories ten years ago, or possibly five years ago, and there are some people who as recently as 1958 saw no reason why a Federation of the West Indies should not be an independent state. But what may appear to have been valid five years ago, whatever may have been valid one year ago, is not valid today. The position at which world events are moving, the frightening and perilous conditions of this temporal world, the fast movements which are taking place in the seven continents and the two hemispheres — movements for greater economic

development and greater economic viability — all of those conspire to make us believe that the people of the West Indies are in no way inferior to others and make us avow that there is as much talent among the West Indian people not only to produce but to maintain stable political institutions and there is equally as much genius among the leaders of the West Indian people and the people themselves to devise all these policies and programmes which when outlined by their international assemblies would gain the attention and sympathy of the outside world.

It is no use asking us to think twice about a matter like this; it is no use any element in any of these territories entertaining doubts about the rightness of this stand, and if any doubt is entertained here in this territory, I shall like to say on behalf of the Government that we have examined this matter with extreme care and considerable attention and the Cabinet of Barbados has come to the conclusion that if we cannot get a Federation which was independent from the time its government was elected, the Government of Barbados would reserve the right to seek independent status for Barbados alone because we would not be prepared to jeopardise the future of the people of this territory in any situation where we cannot guarantee to all the people of the territories just what we desire for the people of Barbados.

Therefore, in saying that we agree to the principle which exists between our thinking and those officials in the United Kingdom, we are saying no more than that we accept all the obligations which arise in the twentieth century from the desire of independent peoples to overthrow and do away with colonialism.

Unfortunately, in the metropolitan countries, the impact of twentieth century thinking is not as great as it is outside of the United Kingdom and consequently, from time to time, the United Kingdom Government attempts with little justification but with no success to retard the progress of independent people merely by using a formula. Well, if the formula which they want to use which in effect would delay progress and the future of the people of the West Indies, that formula we substitute all along a Federation, "yes" but a Colonial Federation, "no".

Therefore, Sir, in moving this motion, I want to make it absolutely clear that the Government of Barbados intends to pursue this matter with all the strength and authority at its command and the strength and authority at its command is no greater or less than the unanimous approval of the House. (Cheers). 5.05 p.m.

And it is this unanimous approval which I now have the honour to invite in moving this motion. (Cheers).

Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. F. C. GODDARD rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was looking in the direction of the Government Benchers because the motion was made from there and I anticipated that it would be seconded from the same Government Benches.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, one week ago, I laid a Statement regarding the Federation of the Eastern Caribbean Colonies consequent upon the release which was issued on the 10th June, 1963, by the Secretary of State for the Colonies and Commonwealth Affairs. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Statement which was released by Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies was not released at a time when it would give the organs of public opinion in this territory the advantage of the information simultaneous with the receipt of that information by similar organs in the United Kingdom. We have made representation to the Secretary of State for the Colonies over this procedure and it was explicit in a document which I intend to read in a short while, that we have made our position clear and that we not only deplore but we resent and deprecate any attempt intentional or otherwise to treat the Legislatures and peoples of this area in an off-hand manner. If I express myself in clear and unequivocal terms during the course of this debate, it is not because I am spoiling for a fight with Her Majesty's Government. I do not believe in

kicking people when they are down and therefore it is done with a spirit of nationalism, a spirit of independence and a spirit in which we find ourselves in the position of being the custodians of the fundamental rights of the people of the Eastern Caribbean.

On the 11th June, the Statement which would give rise to the Resolution introduced by the Hon. Minister, was made by me on the floor of this House and on close examination Your Honour will find that we did not appear — the Secretary of State for the Colonies and I — to be speaking with a single mind; because it was subsequently brought to the attention of the Government of this Island that certain statements have been made in London which have not been vouchsafed to the Government of Barbados and which were certainly not in consonance with the decisions and conclusions arrived at by the Chief Ministers of the Leeward and Windward Islands and myself at the Conference which was recently held. In these days of modern communications, with the full panoply of communications, of devices electronic and otherwise, which a country in the position of Great Britain has at her disposal, it is very difficult to understand how such a substantial departure from something which had been submitted with all due solemnity to one of Her Majesty's Ministers only ten days before, could, in such a short space of time, be distorted so as to expose the elected representatives of the Governments in this area to ridicule and contempt.

If I may give you the background, which you may undoubtedly well know already, of the Conference which took place from the 24th May, until 31st May, 1963, the Conference was presided over by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Nigel Fisher, a Conference at which the United Kingdom delegation was supported by legal, financial and administrative experts, and a Conference at which the West Indian Governments were represented in the first instance by their Heads of Governments and supported by Ministerial and official colleagues. If I may go back then, Sir, to bring you up-to-date with the situation at which we have now arrived, you will remember that on the break-up of the now defunct Federation or earlier on the secession of the Territory of Jamaica from association with the nine territories which comprised that Federation in September, 1961, as soon as the Federal Government was elected on the 4th December, 1961, I, accompanied by some of my colleagues and the Hon. Minister without Portfolio and certain officials went to the neighbouring territory of Trinidad to meet the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Reginald Maudling, to discuss with him as he had not individually and severely, what could be done about an association of the territories which then remained. On the very night of my arrival in Port-of-Spain, I was confronted by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of the West Indies and the Chief Minister of Antigua and presented with a declaration of independence issued by the People's National movement in the Island of Trinidad, the result of which was that the other eight smaller territories in the Eastern Caribbean were left completely on their own. Unlike the then dying Federal Government — it is the opinion of some that they had been dead for a long time but they were merely waiting for *rigor mortis* to set in, unlike that Government the elected leaders of those eight small islands did not waste any time on academic discussions as to whether the Federation was still alive or whether it was completely dead or nearly dying. They did not waste any time making representations like the Leaders of that Federation, that the Federal Government could carry on as if nothing had happened; they did not waste time calling for an expensive excursion to the United Kingdom in order to do what was described as putting the case of the West Indies before the United Kingdom Government. 5.15 p.m.

The elected representatives of the Windward Islands, Leeward Islands, and of Barbados got together and in one single day between themselves without any assistance whatsoever from the United Kingdom or any of its officials, or Ministers, or advisers, and agreed that they would come together in a new association, and they resolved all the questions which had been vexed and troubled the uninspired leaders of the past federation. And those questions

were chiefly the questions of customs union, freedom of movement and the location of the Federal Capital. These were three questions which had never been satisfactorily settled, or settled at all, and these were the very points which had proved to be divisive in the association which existed up to that time. I say divisive because although there was a Government Party — a so-called Federal Labour Party — yet even inside the ranks of that party with something which must be taken to have approximated to some kind of majority control in the Legislature, they, even within the confines of Party Council and conference — they could not agree unanimously or at all on either the location of the Federal Capital; that there should be a customs union, or that there should be freedom of movement to places from one part of the region to another.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to conceive how you can have a Federal Government in which there is not the fullest possible freedom of movement of both people and goods from one part of the area to another part of the area. And, therefore, the show — I should call it a show — then masquerading under the title of a Federal Government was no Government at all, but purely an instrument of the personal policy of the few misguided West Indian politicians.

I have to speak very strongly on these matters, because we have kept quiet on these issues for so long we have allowed leaders to blame one another for the breaking up of the Federation. Apart from the debate which we had in this Chamber approving the proposals of the London Conference in 1961, we have decided or we decided to allow sleeping dogs to lie and to spend our time on the constructive side of the exercise to which we are now engaged rather than to perform any post-mortem examination on the carcass which was lying and offending the nostrils of the West Indian people.

But it appears that we did not, Mr. Speaker, accurately assess the powers of the survival of the body which was supposed to be prostrate — I am not now referring to an individual, I am referring, Sir, to a point of view which the West Indian Press is trying to resuscitate even at this moment by trying to impose on the peoples of the West Indies a structure and a form of Government which, as far as we here in Barbados are concerned, is unacceptable and obnoxious to our way of thinking.

You will remember, Sir, that the Federal Government which then existed was not an independent Federal Government. It has been stated on several occasions that the leaders of the Government did not want independence. I believe this to be true knowing them as I do, because it would have necessitated the Federal Elections and the replacement of the then leaders by people, perhaps, who were more progressive and had the interest of the West Indian people more at heart.

There was insistence from Dr. Williams right from the outset — I refer, Sir, to the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago — that the Federation should have been independent. All kinds of objections were raised by his colleagues and by the people who should have supported him. Eventually, a conference was convened in June 1960, after the round of inter-governmental Conference here in the West Indies and at that Conference in June, 1960, it was decided that the Federation should become independent on the 31st May, 1961. It was also decided at the Conference held a matter of days after that Conference — a Conference Sir, which I believe you had the honour of attending with dubious distinction I should say rather than honour, Sir. I have no doubt that you graced the proceeding with your august presence, but the aftermath of that Conference was not so happy for the people of the West Indies. A few days after, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the Windward and Leeward Islands Constitutional Conference was held in England and at that conference in the middle of the year 1960, the Secretary of State for the Colonies with the full backing of the British Cabinet decided that each small Island in the West Indies had arrived at the stage which it should have full internal self-government, that each of them should have a Governor and that each of them should have a Cabinet with no limitations on the number of Ministers which the Premier or the Chief Minister of each Island may have

decided to recommend to the Officer administering the Government of these territories.

It is also remarkable that at that Independence Conference there was no decision as to the kind of financial support which the West Indian Islands would expect or could expect from Her Majesty's Government on the attainment of Independence. It has been the practice of Her Majesty's Government whenever territories have come to the stage where they graduate from the stage of dependence to a stage of nationhood that some kind of financial provision is made either in the form of developmental loans or otherwise, such as, Colonial Development and Welfare Grants over a stated period so that the transition period should not leave the territories in any severe difficulty, and that they should be able to overcome the shock of having to stand fully on their own two feet when having overseas representation, defence forces and matters of that kind.
5.25 p.m.

I say that because when a country becomes independent, usually, inevitably, the country depending upon its size either has to provide for its common defence or make alliances and pacts with other countries who may be in a better position to defend them against what may turn out to be the common enemy. It is also usual for territories achieving independence depending on the illusions of grandeur which they may entertain, their concepts of their own importance in the scheme of things, to have legations and embassies in different parts of the world; whereas before the metropolitan country would normally be provided, these services as a natural corollary of the imperial status, upon the achievement of independence, fresh arrangements have to be made because it would be inconsistent for the metropolitan countries to have undisputed authority over those matters when the countries are looking after their own affairs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have made reference for that very reason to the fact that the leaders of the West Indian Governments or the leaders particularly of the Federal Government, left London without knowing exactly what revision was to be made for the independent West Indian nation.

Shortly after this conference with the full sanction, approval, advice and consent of Mr. Ian McCleod, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Government of Jamaica held a referendum as to whether Jamaica should stay in or out of the Federation. The disastrous results of that referendum are already well known and it was in this atmosphere of division, separatism and secession that the leaders of these small islands got together and made this decision for themselves.

I have stressed this point over and over, Mr. Speaker, because it is very important to remember that the Secretary of State, Mr. Reginald Maudling, in January 1962 did not bring the Chief Ministers of the Windward Islands the Leeward Islands and the Premier of Barbados together; the leaders of these eight territories came together by themselves and therefore if I may do what Barbadians describe as cutting a long story short, it is incompetent for Mr. Reginald Maudling or Mr. Harold Macmillan or their successors in office to tell the eight leaders who made that fateful decision in January 1962 in the face of doubts generated by the foreign Press in the West Indies, in the face of the almost demoralising atmosphere which prevailed as a result of the secession of Trinidad, in the face of all the difficulties, financial and otherwise, which confronted the derelict people of the West Indies, that these elected heads of Governments made that fateful decision for themselves. It was made for themselves; it was not suggested for them; and after threshing it out with the assistance of the Vice-Chancellor of the University and without the assistance of any of the Ministers or the Prime Minister of the then dying Federation, the new constitution on the Friday morning following the beginning of the week of the 18th January, 1962, instead of interviewing the Secretary of State individually — we had previously as a matter of courtesy and as is right that we should, sent a message to the Secretary of State, Mr. Reginald Maudling, telling him that we had no desire to see him or any British official individually, but when we arrived at our own decision; we would see him collectively, together, and on the

Friday morning we went to the Governor-General's house and presented Mr. Reginald Maudling with the programme which we had drawn up in the form of a new association of the Eastern Caribbean countries, Trinidad and Jamaica having gone their independent ways.

We were not downhearted in any way. We know what we were doing. Having presented that document to the Secretary of State, a document which disposed of the three questions which I mentioned before had vexed the leaders for so long, in which we had decided to have a Customs Union and freedom of movement and decided on the location of the Federal Capital here in Barbados without a single shot being fired by us on behalf of the people of Barbados, without all kinds of remorse and excursions and bribery and corruption and men coming out from Great Britain which had gone on before to try to get the Capital here, these leaders decided that they wanted to have the Capital in Barbados. I am happy to say that these three fundamental issues having been settled, issues which I consider to be central to the federal exercise, no one leader no one Government in the Eastern Caribbean, has up to this date, up to this moment of speaking, departed from the decisions which we originally made unassisted.

Sir, you can imagine the shock with which I received the statement issued by, let us call it, Colonial Office, the statement which you will find on page one of the document which I laid last Tuesday. If I may quote from that document, this is how it reads:-
5.35 p.m.

"The Secretary of State for the Colonies last night issued the following statement in connection with the East Caribbean Conference which it had been proposed to hold in June, 1963:-

"Following upon the break-up of the West Indies Federation and the decision to grant independence separately to Jamaica and Trinidad, a conference of the remaining Eight West Indian Colonies was held in London in June, 1962. At this Conference the representatives of these territories agreed to form a Federation. The main feature of the proposed Federation were set out in the Conference Report (Command 1746).

Shortly afterwards there were elections in Grenada which resulted in a change of Government. The new Government decided to seek association with Trinidad in preference to joining the proposed Federation.

In December, 1962 the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Duncan Sandys, took the opportunity of his visit to the Caribbean to hold a joint meeting of the Chief Ministers of Antigua, Barbados, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Kitts, St. Lucia and St. Vincent. In a statement issued after this meeting the Ministers unanimously re-affirmed their conviction that Federation offered the best prospects for the economic and political progress of their peoples; and it was agreed that a conference should be convened in London in June 1963 to reach final decisions about the form of the Federation."

Up to there I do not quarrel with the document at all, but the sting of this is in the tail. The next paragraph, paragraph four, of the Secretary of State for the Colonies' release goes on impertinently, and I repeat impudently, to state this:-

"In preparation for this conference, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, had discussions in Barbados with the Chief Ministers of the Seven territories on 24th to 31st May". It is accurate up to there. It goes on: "These discussions revealed a significant divergence of opinion between the Governments concerned. Some of the differences arose from further reflection upon the original proposals while others arose from consideration of recent expert studies of the administrative, fiscal and to reservations by three of them.

Since the suggestions in this statement involved radical changes in the proposals previously considered and since time would clearly be required to study them, it was agreed

that the constitutional conference in London would have to be postponed until later in the year."

Why I say that it is an impertinent statement is this, and it is an untruthful statement coming from the Colonial Office, was that the divergence of opinion was not between the leaders of these Governments. I want to make that clear. The divergence of opinion was between the delegation of officials headed by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the West Indian Leaders; the divergence of opinion was not between us at all and that is the kind of tactics which I think is calculated to sow dissension amongst the people of the West Indies. It is perfectly true, Mr. Speaker, that we held discussions on a variety of points arising out of the publication of the reports of the Fiscal Commissioner, the Civil Service Commissioner, the Economic Report and the Customs Union Report. We had these discussions for three or four days amongst ourselves, and, as is usual when any statesmen or politicians or representatives meet to thresh out matters of detail, we were not necessarily at the outset unanimous on the approach which we should make to Her Majesty's Government. Of course we were not; but what I find reprehensible is the fact that after those discussions we presented a document to the Chairman of the Conference, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, in other words, having kept him waiting for three or four days as has now been our habit, because we did the same thing with Mr. Maudling; but the delay was necessary for our purposes, and, as in the case of Mr. Maudling, as a matter of courtesy we informed him from time to time how things were going and we asked for a further deferment of the opening of the Conference so that we would not waste time quarrelling in front of him. We preferred to quarrel amongst ourselves, or argue if you like to put it in that way; but we presented a document to the Secretary of State for the Colonies which was described as areas of agreement; we presented that document on the 24th May, 1963, setting out all the things we had agreed on and all the matters which we wanted to discuss with him after having previously agreed among ourselves. It was then a question of the West Indies against the rest; that is the whole position. It was not a question of this person coming to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, to referee a dispute between him and his neighbour. I think that this is what alarmed them for the second time. After that, Sir, we went through the document in detail and in going through this document in detail, the Colonial Office delegation started cross-examining each delegation one by one trying to create disagreement between the members present at the Conference. Having been presented with the document they wanted to find out who had had some reservations on some minor or major point during the course of the discussions which we held.

Mr. Speaker, I could not come out and say what was being done because we were sworn to secrecy; but since what has happened I do not think I should keep back from the people of the West Indies the kind of force which we have to fight against. Therefore, for the next three or four days the exercise of Her Majesty's Government was directed to tearing this document which we had unanimously agreed upon to pieces - a document to which we had agreed unanimously. Let us put it bluntly; they did not succeed, I would not even dare to say that they even met with a modicum of success. There were times when, after persistent hammering away at some individual delegation in trying to stir up confusion in the minds of the people, it would appear as if they were going to be successful in breaking up the prospects of the West Indian Federation and all. There were times when we came perilously close to that; but in the end when we stood firm on the agreement which we had made which did involve some departure from the report of the London Conference - and I will deal more fully with that in a moment. When we stood firm the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies adjourned the Conference for half a day and came back and delivered an ultimatum to the responsible heads of Governments of the seven islands of this area and went further and stated that the United Kingdom position was not negotiable.
5.45 p.m.

What we find remarkable was that the document which the Secretary of State presented as being the unnegotiable position of the United Kingdom was *in pari materia, in consimili casu* in every way almost identical with the 4,000 word document issued by the Barbados Labour Party two days later in which they said that the federation should be a dependent federation and that some time in the future the questions of independence, financial and economic assistance for this area would be discussed by the Secretary of State.

Now, that is the whole truth of the matter, and the document which we had presented, I would say tentatively. We had a one-stage and a two-stage procedure, and the United Kingdom had a three-stage procedure in which you could not get independence in the never, never, land and in which it would be left to a fledgling Federal Government and Legislature to be subjected to the same irrational treatment that had been meted out to the experienced Governments of Jamaica and Trinidad on their separation from the Metropolitan country.

Now that is the position, and our decision was that we wanted to go to London not to discuss a constitution for a Federal Government which was going to be dependent upon the United Kingdom in any respect, but that we really wanted this conference projected for June, 1963, to be a final conference. I went further and stated that the Barbados Government and the people of Barbados could not afford these expensive excursions year after year, year in and year out, to settle points which were no longer debatable. All of these matters had been settled in 1960. There was no drafting to be done; the drafting has been done before by all the legal draughtsmen; the constitutions for the Windwards and the Leewards has already been outlined; the Governments of the Windward and the Leeward, the seven surviving territories, or the six surviving territories since the seduction of Grenada — the Governments have been the same. And since there has been no upheavals or replacements of Governments, no constitutional crisis in any of these territories, and if these territories were going to be entitled to internal self-government on the 31st May, 1962, and be associated in an independent federation, we saw no reason why the same territories who had been granted this dispensation after one of these expensive conferences in London should now be told that they were not entitled to have internal self-government and independence.

What has taken place was the question which was postulated between the 31st December — I beg your pardon — 31st May, 1962, and the 31st May, 1963, except that we are wiser and sadder, more experienced and more tolerant one to the other? What has taken place? Why, therefore, should these territories accept a constitution which was inferior to that granted to the Bay Street Boys. I make no apology for using the term. In Barbados we have the Big Six; in Bermuda, they have the forty thieves, and in the Bahamas, they have the Bay Street Boys. The Bay Street Boys represent the vested mercantile and hotel interests. The Bahamas after having universal adult suffrage for only six months, Sir, two or three weeks ago was granted full internal self-Government by the same Secretary of State for the Colonies, and they were told at that Conference — I have received the report — that they were to have no less than eight Ministers. But they were telling the Islands here with a population of 800,000 people as compared with a population of 150,000 in the Bahamas that they cannot have internal self-government and independence.

Western Samoa with a population of 103,000 people got independence on the 1st June, 1962. All sorts of obscure people on the Persian Gulf with national income of £75 with 368 people in some provinces and 1,400 in another are now advancing towards some kind of an independent federation. About 26 countries in Africa are doing the same thing. It is true that they have civilisation much older and more cultured than European civilisation, but it is also true that they have much mineral resources. It is also true that not one of them, in the sense of Western Parliamentary democracy, has had a history as ancient as that enjoyed by the members, say, of this Chamber and the people of this Island. All of those countries are sitting down around

the United Nations and making their voices heard and their votes felt in the deliberations of that Council. But the people of the West Indies, apparently, have been kept down for such a long time that they have lost confidence in themselves, and you can always find some imported newspaper promoting the interest of the metropolitan countries and telling people in the West Indies that they should be scared of anybody who talks to them about independence, as if some man is going to come out of the forest and chop off their heads because of independence.

I have to repeat the constitutional exercise in the form of a nancy story so that it will be appreciated by some of the people who may be listening to this address, because we like to make these graphic illustrations. I want to make it clear that this was the attitude of this Government, even before the Government was elected as you will see, Sir, from the programme which we put before the people.

In the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party it was stated that the road to destiny is the road to independence. Towards this goal the country must press on. Since Barbados has never been a grant-aided territory, there is no reason why, either within or without the framework of the West Indies Federation, Barbados should not be independent. The document, Sir, I have in my hand, and you will find what I have said on page 16. I was paraphrasing what was actually said. What I did say was: The road to destiny is the road to independence. Towards this goal the country must press on. As the Island has never been a grant-aided territory there is no reason why, within or without the Federation, Barbados should not attain the full statue of independence within the British Commonwealth. I went on to say that the Party is irrevocably promoted to foster development to sustain the principles of Parliamentary democracy.
5.55 p.m.

The British delegation at that Conference did not seem to understand what I was telling them, so I had to go back to our Party Headquarters, I think it was and get sixteen copies of the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto and presented each member of the British delegation and each Head of the Government one and I showed them, right on the cover, the pages to which the Party had referred to the question of independence.

There is another reference on page twelve of the Manifesto. On page twelve it is stated: "The Party will continue its policy of endeavouring to obtain, wherever and whenever possible, outlets, even on a temporary basis, for our unemployed. It is also prepared to work towards the achievement of W.I. Independence with all possible speed in order that an Independent W. I. nation might benefit by the terms of the U.S. Immigration and Nationalisation Act, 1952, which places no limitation on emigrants from the independent countries of this hemisphere to the United States of America."

At that Conference in 1963, I was informed that there had been no mandate for independence and I had to remind the United Kingdom delegation that far from not knowing that, immediately after this Government came into office, they had sent me a telegram saying that I misunderstood the position of the United States with the countries in the Caribbean and countries in South America and that it was not true that you would have unlimited entry in the United States because the United States Government reserves the right to stop anybody who has an infectious or contagious disease. Right away they began to get disturbed. I ask you can they really be serious? At one moment, they were trying to say this was a misrepresentation, that we were quite wrong to want independence on that ground. They were trying to correct the statement that we would be able to enjoy unlimited entry in the United States. Unlimited entry as far as the Democratic Labour Party is concerned does not mean if you are suffering from infectious or contagious disease you can book at Idlewild, but it means that we would not be subjected to a quota of one hundred persons and that we would have the same right of entry which the emigrants from South America enjoy right now who do not even speak the same language and people who do not have the same

concepts of parliamentary democracy. Therefore I had to shut up the United Kingdom delegation by reminding them by pulling out the telegram when they said we did not understand and we said: "How you say you did not know?" They mentioned that subject no more. They even conceded that Barbados had a mandate.

I was saying, Sir, that this very important matter was made abundantly clear to the United Kingdom delegation. I am going to quote from the Minutes.

Mr. Nigel Fisher came in with this statement which I said was identical with the statement issued a few days later by the Barbados Labour Party asking for a Colonial type of Federation. I was the first person to speak after the Under-Secretary who said that the United Kingdom's position was not negotiable and you will see that I made further reference today in a cable which I sent today to the Secretary of State.

"The Premier of Barbados said that he had consulted his colleagues in the Cabinet and was therefore in a position to state that the proposals contained in this Official Memorandum were considered too dogmatic and inflexible and did not entirely meet with the Government's approval. He still felt that for financial and other reasons some obligation to the Unit Governments should be possible for a limited period."

"He did not regard paragraph 63 of Command 346 — this is the Report of the London Conference — as binding on the Government of Barbados. It merely expressed Her Majesty's Government's conception of the time table for implementing Federation."

"He felt that Barbados had the power to negotiate for independence in the future since this question had been settled in December, 1961, when the people of Barbados elected his Party to power and he did not see why the people of Barbados should be stampeded into an election next year without sorting out the problem involved."

Continuing to give the following reasons why his Government was not prepared to enter in any colonial Federation: (1) he referred to the West Indian (Dissolution) Act and said that for the first time in the history of Barbados, its constitution was in danger by an Order-in-Council; (2) Barbados had never been a state of grant-in-aid and it had no intention of being so in the future; (3) Her Majesty's Government should be more sympathetic towards granting loans and requests.

The Barbados Government had very strong views on the attitude of the British Government relative to financial matters. The education policy of this Government, for instance, was being challenged by the British Government as being too liberal and expensive.

"(4) The British Government should continue her financial obligations."

It was evident on the examination of the Draft Federal Scheme that Her Majesty's Government was attempting to evade her appropriate financial obligations.

Mr. Maudling said that the islands must be federated so that the islands could seek financial aid from Canada and the United States. This was in the document which I read out here in the Federation debate.

I continue to quote:-

"The position was that Unit Governments were being told in the U.S.A. and in Canada that they could not obtain aid until they become independent."

It may have been a matter for regret that the financial assistance channelled through the Colonial Office remained unanswered for many years.

The Premier of Barbados said that what had been put forward as obstacles were mere shibboleths.

Even within or without the Federation he felt that the Government and the people of Barbados must strive after independence and self government and the people of Barbados would not expect anything else other than an independent Federation.

Those were the statements which I made and I stand by them and make no apology for them.

On the 10th June, 1963, this statement was released from London and the statement released by the Secretary of State which was not released to the Press or to the people of Barbados on that day, but released to the British Press and Associated Press on the 10th June, 1963; contained a document pertaining to be the final conclusions arrived at by the Conference on the 31st May, the closing date of the Conference.

You must understand, Sir, that that document was not seen by this Government before its publication in London or at all, because it would not have seen the light of day if we had seen it before. The final paper was drafted by the Hon. E. R. L. Ward, a member of the Other Place, when an atmosphere had been generated anti-conference by the United Kingdom delegation, when the Conference was in danger of breaking up all the hopes and aspirations of the people of the West Indies, when they were about to wreck the Federation, the Barbados delegation under the leadership of Hon. E. R. L. Ward came to the rescue and produced a document which was handed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies as a conference document. After the submission of that document, the Conference adjourned and the Secretary of State for the Colonies said that he would put it to the United Kingdom Government. He told us that and we never saw the document afterwards. You can imagine my personal horror and consternation when something purporting to be a document of the conference was released by Her Majesty's Government which contained matters which had never been discussed at the closing day or at any other time. If I may come straight to the point, the most damaging part of that document was the insertion by a person or persons unknown of several matters in a statement that the Ministers had proposed that a Governor-General should be elected and before there was a Federal Government that the Federation should be independent with a Governor.

If I may remind you, Sir, what I was trying to make clear at an earlier stage of my address was this; the point of difference was not between one territory and the other territory but between the United Kingdom and the Barbados Labour Party on one side — the Barbados Labour Party extra-mural and the United Kingdom Government intra-mural on one side at the Conference and the rest, the West Indian territories on the other side. I say that because the Barbados Labour Party was postulating a colonial type of Federation. We said that we did not want to hear any more of it; let us shake hands and part company here and now. We also brought strictures to bear on a document which called on the United Kingdom Government to make development loans, expenditure loans and establishment loans of something like \$310 million. Up to now that report has not been published, although the Government of Barbados offered to print it in our own Government Printing Office. The Report of the Fiscal Commissioner has been paraded all over the United Kingdom and the West Indies and that is a Report which is completely misleading. I have a great deal of respect for Mrs. Hicks, but the Report is based on projections which were out of date before they were printed and that report, if it were accepted, would mean that the people of Barbados would have to forego three million dollars in taxation alone to take over the responsibility of the Colonial Office in London. As I told Mr. Duncan Sandys and Mr. Nigel Fisher and the Colonial Office, we are not looking for any more colonies; therefore we are merely looking for partners in this association and we are not prepared to pay up the bills for Her Majesty's Government and relieve them of their original responsibilities to the people whom they have been exploiting for such a long time.

Mr. Speaker, let us get the position clear. As to the report which was issued in the United Kingdom and sub-

sequently released in Barbados — I do not know whose fault it is; I am not criticising anyone. As to the original document I know that that document, fortunately for me and the rest of the West Indies, is a true and exact copy which was delivered to the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. That original document is still in my possession and nowhere in that document will you see — it has been reproduced in the Statement which I laid before this Honourable House last Tuesday. That document in paragraph 7 states this:—

"The Conference further recommends that the steps to the establishment of the Independent Federation should be in the following order:

- (1) Appointment of Interim Federal Public Service Commission to appoint key Federal Officers;
- (2) Preparation of Constitutional instruments and organisation of Federal Departments and Services.
- (3) Introduction of Independence Bill in House of Commons June-July 1964."

and this is the crucial paragraph:—

- "(4) Appointment of Governor-General and creation of Federal Council of Ministers into a body corporate with power to legislate by Regulations made by the Governor-General on the advice of the Federal Council limited to a number of subjects, such steps as are necessary for the launching of the Federation."

How anyone who is not smoking opium or anything like that could imagine that a council of Ministers which is created under a body corporate could assume full authority of the Hudson Bay Company and such institutions should be an Independent Federation — the words were inserted inadvertently, I hope, and I hope that the inadvertence is like none of the inadvertence which is now played by Mr. Harold McMillan. These words were inserted: "proclamation of Independence on creation of Federal Council of Ministers in a body corporate."
6.15 p.m.

I want this position to be clearly understood. When the last Federal Government was established by the same Act of Parliament in 1957, the West Indies Federation Act, the Governor-General was appointed. There was no Federal Government, the Governor-General, Sir, legislated by Regulations, and he had an advisory body around him. Three months later, Federal Elections were held. The proposal that the Federal Council of Ministers which is composed of the elected Heads of Governments to the territories in this area should be a Body corporate, Mr. Speaker, did not come from us, that came from no less a person than Mr. Duncan Sandys himself in a despatch dated 20th March, 1963. Some six or seven weeks before the Conference he outlined these proposals himself and these proposals were not contained in the Federation Report of the Conference in 1961. But this was a step along the road and so we agreed to it. How can we expect, speaking rhetorically, to set up a Federation successfully with a lot of fledgling politicians with no Civil Service, no customs union, no control over the Department which the Governments had already agreed should be unified, but you bring in a legislature to get in the way of the successful establishment of the machinery which would make the wheels of Government run smoothly?

Therefore, we adopted the suggestion that the Federal Council of Ministers should be a body corporate, so that you can get all of these things out of the way so that when the Federal Government and the Prime Minister were elected they would find a smoothly running Civil Service with people moving freely from one part of the Caribbean to the other and goods flowing freely in and out of Barbados, provided that they stayed within the area and with a common external tariff.

Therefore, the institution of the Federal Council of Ministers as a body corporate to legislate on a limited number of subjects by regulations or otherwise was a kind of bridging operation to make sure that all of these things which should be done were actually done to make the Federal Government function properly. This was the recommendation although not spelt out in these precise terms they came from Mr. Duncan Sandys himself. We said that the next step was the holding of elections. First, we appointed the Governor-General and then with the Regional Council getting ready for elections, getting Civil Servants appointed, passing Customs Tariffs, Acts and all that which perhaps would subsequently be ratified by the Federal Legislature, and then after that you could have Federal Elections and the Federal Government would then be established or inaugurated.

The difference between the United Kingdom — the Barbados Labour Party on the one side and the rest of the Eastern Caribbean was this; we said that any suggestion that such a Government having being elected by the people and in the light of the progress made by the neighbouring territories of Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, that that Government should be a Colonial type of Government that such a suggestion was monstrously inept and should not be entertained and supported at all. That is what we were saying.

It is remarkable, therefore, that in the light of the fact that the Minutes of that meeting have up to now not even been confirmed that Her Majesty's Government should put out a document with alterations and departures from the document submitted to the Secretary of State. So this is what the Leaders of the West Indies have decided. I have, Sir, never brought you up to date, but I will bring you a little more up to date now. I felt myself, Sir, constrained to make representation to the Secretary of State in the following terms. This telegram is addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and I am going to read it slowly, Sir, so that it can be digested by all who are interested in this debate.

"To the Secretary of State for the Colonies

Your Telegram 96 of the 17th June. Barbados Constitution. I beg your pardon, Sir, I am reading the wrong one. I will read the correct one. It reads as follows:—

"FROM: Governor, Barbados."

"TO: Secretary of State for the Colonies."

(Repeated to Administrators Windward Islands, Leeward Islands for Chief Ministers).

"Your unnumbered circular telegram of 10th June."

"East Caribbean Conference."

"Following from Premier, Barbados begins:—"

"Your telegram 10th June and Press Release of alleged statement tabled by Regional Council of Ministers on afternoon 31st May. Reference also unconfirmed minutes of proceedings of Regional Council of Ministers of same date."

"Barbados Delegation deeply perturbed unauthorised insertion in paragraph 8 (4) of Appendix IV of said minutes of words, "proclamation of independence". Premier has caused thorough investigation to be made of original document and copies circulated to Conference. Also of detailed shorthand notes of minutes of said meeting and *viva voce* questioning of Regional Council of Ministers Secretary and four other persons present throughout proceedings on said day. All reveal not only that such a proposal was never submitted to Chairman but was never proposed as amendment by the conference at any stage of proceedings. On contrary the only Statement made on "proclamation" by spokesman E. R. L. Ward — paragraph 5 on page 4 of unconfirmed minutes refers....."

That was done to draw his attention to what the Hon. E. R. L. Ward said.

"On contrary the only Statement made on "proclamation" by spokesman E. R. L. Ward — paragraph 5 on page 4 of unconfirmed minutes refer explains that proclamation should take place at time of assumption of office of First Federal Government and inferentially not repeat not simultaneous with or immediately after appointment of Governor General. It is to be regretted that text of statement released to British Press and broadcast throughout world should have departed so substantially from wording of formal Conference document and that such text was not submitted to Governments in this area prior to release or at all." Note the words "nor at all". "Government of Barbados considers paragraph 4 of statement contained in your telegram unfortunately conveys impression that Governments disagreed not so much with unnegotiable position of Her Majesty's Government as amongst themselves which in face of the document submitted cannot be supported."

I will read that again.

"Government of Barbados considers paragraph 4 of statement contained in your telegram unfortunately conveys impression that Governments disagreed not so much with unnegotiable position of Her Majesty's Government as amongst themselves which in face of the document submitted cannot be supported."

If I may digress for a moment I should like to say this was a statement that the Secretary of State released to the British Press. We were saying that we considered that paragraph 4 of the Statement contained in his telegram unfortunately conveyed the impression that Governments disagreed. I continue to quote:

"In view of criticisms in British and West Indian press of alleged proposals referred to above and imputation of political ignorance and legal incompetence of delegates from Windward Island, Leeward Islands and Barbados, it would be greatly appreciated if publicity could be given to the fact that such a submission was never made nor was such inference capable of being drawn either from document tendered to Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Colonies or from decision taken by West Indian delegates to the Conference."

I used the words "West Indian delegates to the Conference" advisedly, because what decisions they took when they went back to London were not made by our group of political leaders in the Caribbean. I hope I have made the position of the Government and the parties clear. I hope that the Secretary of State and his associates will have no doubt at all where the Government of Barbados stands in this matter. That had nothing to do with us. That was all right for the last type of Federation that they had before, but not for this group of enterprising political leaders in the Eastern Caribbean at this moment of our history. 6.25 p.m.

I hope, Sir, I have made the position of the Government of Barbados clear. I hope, Sir, that the Secretary of State for the Colonies and his associates will have no doubt at all where the Government of Barbados stands on this matter. There is a body of uniformed opinion operating chiefly within the confines of the shores of Barbados that entertains the idea that you cannot have a non independent State following upon an Independence Act of the Imperial Parliament and after the interregnum during which the Federation will be a caretaker Government without the trappings of independence as well, because if you take out the words "proclamation of independence" which were inserted, inadvertently or otherwise, but certainly without our knowledge, into our document which we presented to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, you will see that the procedure calls for the introduction and of course the successful passage of the West Indies Independence Bill with the Constitution attached as an Appendix in the Imperial Parliament and after that the appointment of a Governor General and the creation of the Federal Council of Ministers as a body corporate and subsequent to that, the holding of Federal Elections which must be coincidental with the inauguration of the independent nation of the Eastern Caribbean.

Submissions that it is impossible to have that kind of procedure can only stem either from ignorance or malice because there are people unfortunately in this Island who would never, particularly as long as this Government happens to remain in office, want to see the West Indies independent or even get a Federation. Let us face facts; we know that is so. They feel the Almighty has granted them a special dispensation to bring about all the changes of the Constitution in the Island of Barbados. Similarly, they did not want Mr. Manley to lead the West Indies into a Federation and rather than seeing that happen, rather than to have the West Indies go forward to independence, they preferred to see the hopes and aspirations of the West Indian people wrecked on the altar of their personal ambitions.

But as far as this Government is concerned, there is not only precedence but a super abundance of precedence, if precedence in our case is needed. Let us go back to 1957 to the West Indies Federation Act to which I was referring at an earlier stage. Under that Act, when the Imperial Act was passed, it made provision for different parts of the Constitution to come into effect by proclamation at different times. That is why with a deep tinge of regret, and I am not being hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that it is almost with deep sorrow, that I have a sad duty to inform you that all of this was drawn to the attention of the British delegation on the 31st May. It was spelt out in detail and the Under Secretary of State said that that was not only possible, but perhaps under the prevailing circumstances the best way to go about it without committing Her Majesty's Government to the idea of the programme which we had outlined. The Parliamentary Secretary of State agreed that it had been done before and that the Constitution after that could come into effect, even after the Act was passed, in different stages and, in truth and fact, it actually had been done with the last Federation, the only difference being that the time factor which was estimated by us on the 31st May was slightly longer than the time factor ordinarily for the previous Federation which had nothing like a Police Force and a unified Civil Service to look after, it did not have to build a Federal Capital because we cannot put them down at the Deep Water Harbour and it would be necessary to have these things first. What is the point of having a big Federal Legislature and a Speaker and all that kind of thing without proper Parliament Buildings? Therefore, we say that it will be necessary to have these things first and it would take longer than three months.

The only point of difference between any of us and the Secretary of State was the question of time and that is why I say that it is with sorrow that I have to report this to the House because there is no oath of secrecy in a situation similar to the one with which I am confronted because my duty is to the people whom I represent. I took no secrecy on this matter. I read out the telegram and I sent it directly to the Cable Office so that anybody who wanted to read it could read it; therefore, I think it is only right that I say to hon. members of the House what I have done.

Let me make the position clear. I find it remarkable that in the light of detailed explanation being given to the British delegation on matters on the 31st May that they were trying to throw out suggestions which were contrary to what we postulated, that even inadvertently they could have published a statement like the one to which I have referred to on Monday, 10th June, saying that the Ministers presented this document to the Secretary of State, a document which was tantamount of forgery. 6.35 p.m.

When you try to build a nation mistakes will be made, but in the light of all that we had gone through, in the light of all the mis-information which has been generated, a publication controlled by British investors who want to create contention all along the line, it is very important that we who are in a position to do so should bring public opinion to bear on this matter and we should not be misrepresented at this stage of our history.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go into the merits or demerits of the reports which were published or the one

which has not been published for reasons best known to Her Majesty's Government; but I do want to say this: that in all of these reports it was clear that these islands were going to be subjected to a financial burden over and above the burden which the West Indian taxpayers are now called upon to bear. In Barbados alone, according to the revised figures of Mrs. Hicks' Report, the additional taxation which we would have to advance for something of which would be of no direct benefit to us, was in the vicinity of \$3 million. In December, 1961, we were confronted with a bill for payment to the Civil Service of \$4 million and I now understand that one of the political pundits is going to remove all the taxes in Barbados. But the people in Barbados are being asked to bear an additional burden of \$5 million because of the Jacobs Report and because of increases in pension, Old Age Pensions and matters of that kind, nothing to do with school buildings. Do not let us get these two things mixed; we have our school building programme and our hotel programme is being financed independent of the taxes of this country except in so far as current revenue pays interest and so on. The truth of the matter is that out of the five million dollars additional taxation, four million dollars was a bill which was presented to this Government in the week during which it came into office — a bill for the Civil Service which had to be paid on the 19th December, on the very day on which the Legislature was opened. No Government would accept hook, line and sinker an additional bill from the British Government for another three million dollars and put it on the people of Barbados. We may make recommendations and amendments to the Report and decide that from the point of view of Barbados and Antigua it would be undesirable to take over the Post Office. That would mean an additional bill of nearly one million dollars for Barbados. In some of these islands they have never seen a postman; if you want to post a letter you would have to take a boat and go down to the Police Station for some fifteen miles. If you are running a Federal Post Office you could not give the people in Barbados one standard of postal services and the people in Montserrat, the people in Chislehurst and Soufriere, a different standard because it would be a Federal Post Office and it would mean the upgrading of the salaries of the employees and the employment of two or three hundred postmen, the purchase of mobile equipment and so forth. We said "No, let us run our own post office ourselves." Is that a departure from the Federal principle? The Post Office is still on the Exclusive List. We say that with the enormous increase of staff and the increase which the Barbadian taxpayer would be paying for Her Majesty's Government — we say that we should let these things remain with the units for now and we will consider them in three or four years' time. We have not departed from the Federal principle. We said we would have a mobile police reserve and that we would have non-commissioned ranks in the Police Force with the unit administrations. Who would take a policeman who is married and has nine children living in St. Lucia and put him in a place where you have to pay all kinds of fantastic allowances? Although we can learn lessons from the mistakes which have been made by other people in the 20th century, we have to set up the type of institution which suits the West Indies. An area like this has never been federated before and the trouble is that we have been slavishly imitating the Australian type of constitution for a country which is in no respect or in any way even remotely similar to the Australian continent. Therefore, we considered that it was incompetent for any delegation from the United Kingdom to tell us, who are the leaders of the West Indian territories, how we should come together. If we do not come together the British taxpayer is in duty bound to put his hand into his pocket and pay Grenada a grant-in-aid — he is in duty bound to pay grants-in-aid to Montserrat and Grenada and St. Vincent until the end of time without anything happening in the country except a few disturbances later on, because of all lack of sympathy with the metropolitan country and this colony. We have everything to be proud of. I have always agreed with my fellow student when we were at school and now as my colleague, as Minister. The Minister of Education started off his address by quoting Aristotle and therefore it would serve a very useful purpose for me to quote Plato who said: when you want to build a nation you either have to get a psychological myth or to have a common enemy and a common cause. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to report to the members of this House.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report to the members of this Honourable House that, even though I am not prepared to say that we have been an identifiable common enemy; we have at last found a common cause.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. Premier rose when he did, for, had I spoken before, my speech would have been entirely different. We have heard today something of the Federation Talks not only for this year but for last year that is very new to us. When we read the release from the Colonial Office which was printed in the English newspapers and reported here, we were indeed alarmed that an intelligent person would do something like that. There was a great divergence between what the release stated on the matter of independence and how we should go about it. The release from the Colonial Office did say, I believe, that the Right Honourable Ministers did take it upon themselves to ask for independence to be brought about before the Federal Elections. That was alarming, and we could not understand what had gone wrong at these talks that people should make such atrocious demands.

We are all West Indians and we do wish to see a Federation working and working sensibly. We do wish to know that, eventually, we will be independent because, as the Minister of Education pointed out, and we knew it all along, the benefits of independence will mean that we would have a source of revenue through loans from friendly Governments other than the United Kingdom Government. Today we cannot go to the American Government or even the Canadian Government for any assistance of a capital nature to help us in our development. Such claims should be made through the United Kingdom Government, and we all know how little comes through their hands. But with independence we would be free to do as we please, I am sure that a helping hand is already held out to us and whenever the Eastern Caribbean territories form themselves into a Federation and become independent financial assistance will be made available to them for any worthwhile schemes for development that we put up to them.

The Hon. Premier has given us a great incite of the acrimonious things coming from the Colonial Office. We heard about the postal services in Antigua and the income tax being collected in that area being left in there for a measure of economy. Had the matter not been explained by the Premier, I would have been asking him why was there that change of attitude, because in the Eastern Federation there is so much more income between the territories today than there ever was. We feel that some of the problems facing us regarding freedom of movement and what has caused Trinidad to opt out from taxation in the last Federation have been overcome, as the Premier told us, on the very first occasion they met in Trinidad.

The people in Barbados have always felt that Federation meant nothing to us at all without freedom of movement of people and goods. We could not understand how you could establish a Federation with a Capital in any one island, and deny the people of the other territories the right to go and work and live there freely. That was one of the things in the Federation to which we could not agree, but that has been overcome.

I may have believed the release from the Colonial Office, had it not been denied by the Premier today. If it were true, it would have done the Federation of closer association of these territories great harm indeed. It would have gone out to the world, and it has gone out to the world that, as a result of asking for independence before the institution of the Federation and the Elections, we are irresponsible and do not know what we really want. The impression has also gone out that the seven units, or the remaining seven units of the territory had so much diversion of opinion over coming together that we were unable to do anything. That was the impression, and that is what I was going to question the Premier on today. That is why I was glad that he got up and said what he had to say and so allay our fears.

I have every reason to believe, from the manner in which he has spoken off the cuff, that the Premier's statement is absolutely correct and I have every confidence in

his statement on this matter.
6.55 p.m.

There are questions which I was going to ask, but there again, he has already answered them. He answered the point as to why Antigua and Barbados could not be federalised yet was because of a matter of economy.

The Hon. Premier also stated that we would have in like manner income tax collections. I would like him to say when he rises to reply that it has to be understood that there will be as soon as possible after the Federation comes into being a uniform income tax rate for the entire area. This is a matter of urgency because we in Barbados cannot tolerate one form of income tax and allowances as well and to have the other Islands paying a lesser form of income tax and getting greater allowances because we all must share the burden. Just as we are going to bear the burden of importation by customs duty equally, we should also bear the burden of income tax and allowances equally. The Hon. Premier did not mention that.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to commend the Hon. Premier and I think he was absolutely right in bringing this Resolution in today because were it that the statement in the White Paper released from Colonial Office had been allowed to remain much longer without being answered, it would have gone further afield and would have done more damage. The sooner these things are corrected, the better.

I feel confident that the desire for Federation of the Eastern Caribbean Islands is as great today as it ever was and that the coming together in a Federation and achieving of independence soon after is possible and would be another desire of the people of these territories. The people have yet to learn of the great benefits which stand awaiting them with such a constitutional advancement of Federation and Independence. When it is brought home to them, they will appreciate it. Of course we realize that it would also call for greater burdens and responsibilities, but I feel the people of these areas have developed sufficiently that they can bear these burdens. We know that we will have to find representatives in London, Washington and Ottawa, but there is also a means of sharing these commitments with other people. That has been done by countries bigger than this Federation which we are forming and there is no reason why we should not follow their example and do likewise.

Jamaica and Trinidad are still part of the area and we have every reason to believe that they are friendly and will remain friendly to us. Should they have an ambassador in England and we find the burden of the Eastern Caribbean to be too great, there is absolutely no reason why we should not be able to ask them to undertake certain of those duties for us. That will be discussed in the new Federation, but I do know that the cost of the Federation will be great. The people are prepared for the burdens which will face them and it will be the duty of the August Conference in England to apprise the British Government of the sum of money which they say they are expecting to give us over the period of development.

One may wonder how can people who say that they want to be independent should ask for help from the Mother Country, but that is something which is due to us today. We are not asking for it in a lump sum but over a period of years, because we feel that they would still have a sufficient interest in the people of these areas. After they have had the responsibility for us for over three hundred years, they cannot cut us off by just the stroke of a pen. But these are things which we have to fight for.

Sir, I do hope when the next delegation goes to England to continue the talks on federation and independence, it would not have any rancour.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree with me when I say that so much has been said about Federation that I am a bit surprised to see the Hon. Premier coming in at short notice with this Resolution and what is in the text of the Resolution. I am wondering if the Hon. Leader of the House agrees with me now over what I said

when I spoke on the Budget as regards the way in which the statement by the Premier was delivered. I say so because you have found it possible to come in with a Resolution like this today and although there are several items on the Order Paper, they have been interrupted to deal with this Resolution as I consider it should be dealt with.

When the Hon. Premier introduced this Resolution and said that I may not approve of this method, I just want to say that I consider this as the way how debates of importance should be dealt with. Moreover, if you are going to broadcast the debates, you should agree to give every hon. member opportunity of using these contraptions, although to some it would mean their political death, because after they have spoken and their speech has gone to the people outside without any editing of what they have said, it would give constituency members a correct transcription of the member's performance in here as the constituency members will not be getting it from the newspapers. And for one thing, the opportunity of using this broadcasting system would help raise the standard of debates.

The Hon. Minister of Education and the Hon. Premier were very classic. It can be said that one was an Aristotle and one was a Plato. I remember sometime ago, about six years ago, Dr. Williams, the Prime Minister of Trinidad gave a long discussion on Aristotle, and it turned out that he had to apologise. I do not intend to quote any of these classical people, but there was an American by the name of John Kenneth Galbraith, an Economist who wrote a book called "The Affluent Society" and he spoke about "The Concept of the Conventional Wisdom" and in it he said: "The hallmark of the conventional wisdom is acceptability. It has the approval of those to whom it is addressed."
7.05 p.m.

"There are many reasons why people like to hear articulated that which they approve. It serves the ego; the individual has the satisfaction of knowing that other and more famous people share his conclusions. To hear what he believes is also a source of reassurance. The individual knows that he is supported in his thoughts — that he is not left behind and alone.

Further, to hear what one approves serves the evangelising instinct. It means that others are also hearing and are thereby in process of being persuaded."

I attribute this to the Premier's speech. I believe he was in the same mood of the concept of this as conventional wisdom, because when he spoke of Federation and what the Colonial Office is doing in this country, I remember vividly that he said he had a discussion in Trinidad and I warned them at the time of the dissolution of the West Indian Federation that what we are getting was a lower status than what we had at the time. These lawyers like to bamboozle people all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Did the hon. member say "certain lawyers"?

Mr. WALCOTT: I should have said certain lawyers, not all. I made it clear in the House that there was much anxiety to get married. Marriage is a good thing; when you are young and inexperienced you feel the opening up of this new vista as something which you cannot forego. That is to say, these young sweethearts were so much in for this federal marriage that they did not take time to examine all the implications of marriage. At the beginning I warned them — and I am not one of those who will allow the people of Barbados to believe that Federation is going to be cheaper than what we have now. Some people are now catching up with reality but I believe I will be living with it for many years. What was clear to me and what is still clear to me is that the West Indian attitude and the attitude of the West Indian Leaders is one with which I am not in complete agreement. It is not now but since 1947 I have seen more shilly-shallying amongst West Indian leadership than I have seen in any other part of the world. The conceited West Indian thought that he was superior to the African, but Ghana is today independent, Kenya is independent and of the people of the territories who were made to feel superior to the

African, I say that the West Indian is more conceited than the people in any other part of the world. I am very pleased to see that if something is brought forward and the Premier feels that it is wrong, we feel in the same way as when we are subjected to the treatment which we get from the Government. Just as the Premier feels about this Statement from the Colonial Office, we feel hurt when we get these things pushed before us too. I am not going to be as mild as the hon. member; I am not here to share out any encomiums; I am going to be brutal and if you are not brutal in your politics it will be sad for the people of this country.

Your Resolution does not sound so strong to me. If you are so strong about what the Secretary of State has said, why have you not stated that in this Resolution? This Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the peoples of seven British Eastern Caribbean territories, through their several Legislatures, have agreed to establish, and enter into, a Federation of their territories, and

WHEREAS they possess the untrammelled right to act freely and responsibly in determining the nature, purpose and functions of such a Federation, and

WHEREAS the Regional Council of Ministers, composed as it is of the Heads of Democratically elected Governments of the area, has, at its recent meeting with the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the United Kingdom Government, outlined its views on the character of the Federation to be established, and

WHEREAS these views are embodied in a Statement made before this Honourable House by the Honourable Premier on Tuesday, June 11th, 1963, and are set out as Appendix "A" of the said Statement.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House supports the proposals contained in that document, and particularly approves commends and endorses the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government."

Where in this Resolution have you said anything about that? Are you here because you want us to give approval to your statement? Was this whole exercise to give approval to your statement in Appendix "A"? I say: "No". The Premier's remarks were to the effect that the Secretary of State for the Colonies published a document which the Government was not aware of. You had a London Conference and you should have been able to work out these things here. The Secretary of State made an implication and I will read his statement; This is what it says:

".....These discussions revealed a significant divergence of opinion between the Governments concerned. Some of the differences arose from further reflection upon the original proposals while others arose from consideration of recent expert studies of the administrative, fiscal and to reservations by three of them."

Those are the words to which you are objecting and why are you afraid to let the Secretary of State for the Colonies know that you disapprove of the Statement made in the text of the Resolution? Why are you afraid to do that?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I thought that the hon. member was addressing me through you, Mr. Speaker, because although the Resolution is in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education, the statement was laid by me last Tuesday, I do not see how the hon. member could accuse me of being afraid of letting the Secretary of State for the Colonies know that we are objecting to his making the statement to which the hon. member refers, when I myself today read out the telegram which I have sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies which no one could describe as having been couched in mild or even friendly terms. It may be that the hon. member was out of the House at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will realise, as I am sure he does, that he can make an amendment to this

Resolution so as to make it stronger or weaker as he thinks fit.

Mr. WALCOTT: The text of the Resolution itself is most important.
7.15 p.m.

They have come to the House because the Secretary of State made a statement which they do not approve. If this Statement had not been made by the Secretary of State we would not have been discussing this matter today.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The answer to that is "yes"; the two things are not mutually exclusive.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are not going to London next week, and if the Secretary of State did not make that statement we would never have been discussing this matter today. On what basis would you bring the talks of the Secretary of State for approval or otherwise before us today? I am different from the hon. member; I am not a member of the hon. members' Government; just as the hon. member spoke about the elected representatives who tried to preserve things, the hon. member should tell the Hon. Premier and his Government the facts. This is an elected Chamber and you come here because you want the seal of approval.

I am not so much concerned about what you said to the peoples of the Eastern Caribbean territories. We are the representatives of the people of Barbados. We represent the people, but when you come here with this matter you want to show to the Secretary of State that the members of the Barbados House of Assembly are behind you. That is why I am very pleased to find you coming here now. I know that a Daniel will come to judgment some day.

I am, myself, a parliamentarian. Sometimes, parliamentarians are ignored, and when you find yourselves backed up against a wall you have to get the unanimous support, not only of your Government, but of the entire parliament. I will tell the Hon. Premier this: people who are elected, are elected; the people whom you appoint, you appoint. I see a lot of colonialism taking place within this Government. I do not have to pat a friend or anybody on his back. If I believe in democracy, I believe in the elected people having a voice in all matters.

So far as the question of Federation is concerned, I do not believe in allowing the Hon. Premier to adopt the democratic process and then utilise people who have not seen the electorate. The hon. member spoke about the Hon. Erskine Ward. I have the deepest respect for this gentleman's ability, but I am not going to support the idea of having hand-picked people doing what the elected members should do. If you cannot find elected people in your cabinet to form the nucleus of the elected representatives in this country, then something is wrong. The people have in no uncertain terms elected us to the House of Assembly. You are now practicing what we are trying to get rid of. I am going to tell the Hon. Premier and he should begin to get this idea in his head, that if elected members cannot find their true place in this Government, then something is wrong.

In England certain things are done because they have thousands of people to do the job. I do not believe in taking nominated people and putting them in the position of elected people. One can only be a Premier if he is elected by the people. When we talk about the voice of the people here, to whom do we refer? This aspect of work in the Colonial Office, I do not agree with. I do not like the Colonial Office treating territories as if they were children.

When it comes to independence, I say, Mr. Speaker, that we should have had independence long ago. We were supposed to have independence on the 31st May, 1962, under the old Federation. Of course, that is broken down.

We are now starting something now. What do we really want? What do we find? They are spending more money on meetings, they are spending more money in the Regional Council on this and that, and they are spending money going

to London. The politicians in the West Indian Federation have spent thousands of dollars on conferences, and they have left these countries poor. If these countries had this money that was spent on conferences since 1947 until now they would have been richer.

The temperament of the people in the West Indies is of such that they started a Federation in 1958 and in less than five years it was broken up, and the same men whom we put into the Federal Government have the brass face and effrontery to pay themselves out. This is indicative of the mentality of the West Indian. He is so close to the Colonial Office and the Englishman — we are so close that we have the same outlook. We give them the impression that we are a rapacious type of politician and at the slightest inconvenience, we are prepared to reward ourselves fully.

This Federation was broken up not by the people — the people did not have a chance to break it up. The people expressed their will. Are we going to say that as a result of the breakdown of the last Federation, we are going to accuse the people? The leaders are now looking at each other and saying that the other one is responsible for the breaking up of the Federation, but at the same time the people who have borne the burden are left alone.

The Hon. Premier says that this Resolution would have come here today in any case. I have not yet been given an opportunity of discussing any of the proposals from the Regional Council of Ministers, since they came down from London, apart from those for which we gave given legislative approval. I imagine that this would never have been here today. I want to be frank, this would not have been here today in this form. It would not have made sense to bring it here today if the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies did not make the mistake he has made.

I am surprised that the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies could come here and, in a comparatively short time, return to the United Kingdom and make a statement like this, not to mention the way in which it was published. Is not that the same thing I have said years ago? By making an Order-in-Council, we would be treated the same way as the little territories. Fortunately, the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies is an elected member and a parliamentarian. I would like to say that any Government in power has the right to select its representatives.
7.25 p.m.

What I said was that Mr. Ward is an excellent man. I would not deny the Government the opportunity of utilising his abilities, but I must advise you and I must warn you that I will be as strong against this type of colonialism which you are getting. I want the people of Barbados to know that I am a champion of independence, but as I have said on many platforms, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. I do not believe because I have turned over to independence all my local representations that I do not have to be watchful and preserve every bit of my liberty and freedom, because when Colonial office rule goes and we become independent, there are no more referees, no more umpires, and you can very well understand that when you are playing without an umpire or referee that it is the survival of the fittest. The Spanish territories in South America after Spain left, were left with dictatorships, revolutions and counter-revolutions because the youthful leaders, not experienced in years and years of Government, became entirely unsuborned and impatient with their Government and therefore tried to liquidate those Governments by any means.

Anyone aspiring to independence has a price to pay. I say that at this stage because I have had some unfortunate experiences about West Indian concepts of liberty. As I have said, and I repeat, we have to be aware that all of the processes of democracy are not used to liquidate democracy itself. For that reason, I am championing independence but in championing independence as proposed, it means giving your new leaders the opportunity to remove all the safeguards and then they will find that they are landed in a situation which you can do nothing about.

I have no axe to grind for anybody but you are going to have the situation where when you want laws passed for these territories, you want that to be done by the Federal Council of Ministers. I do not believe in any Federal Council of Ministers being given authority to do that and I do not agree to it. Even if Mr. Sandys agreed to it, I do not agree with it.

Mr. Speaker, as it is here now, there is some idea percolating in somebody's mind that the West Indies cannot produce enough people to run a Federation, therefore it would mean that somebody will have to be in a dual position. I have said already that I do not agree to dual membership. If it were that we could be in two places and attend to two things God would have made people with two heads, but even now where you get two-headed births, doctors try to perform miraculous operations to separate them.

Why have I said so? The Hon. Premier made use of a remark — I will not say it applies to him — but it applies to West Indian leaders. He spoke as if God had given them some special dispensation to do things. Unfortunately that seems to be a West Indian cult, particularly a Barbadian cult. I do not subscribe to that way of thinking. I believe that we are all mortal and that we are going to die at some time, therefore we should do what we can when we can do it. For that reason, I have never subscribed to the idea that a man can be a member of the local Unit Government and also a member of the Federal Government. I do not agree that the pre-Federal situation must of necessity be run on a basis that at the suggested year, you want a Council of Ministers with power to legislate. It seems as if we want to set up a pre-Federal Legislature before the people in the territories have voted you in to deal with Federation.

Let us be quite frank. The Hon. Premier and his Party did not make our joining the Federation a specific issue during the last Elections so as to know what the views of the people were. At the time when the General Elections were held in Barbados, Jamaica had already withdrawn from the old Federation and the idea of having a Federation of "The Eight" or with Trinidad and Tobago was not known, and, Mr. Speaker, you remember that when the proposed discussions in the West Indies were to take place in the early part of 1962, Trinidad and Tobago came out with a Manifesto which stated that they were withdrawing from the Federation and going it alone. Consequently, from the action taken from the Manifesto by Trinidad, the Grenada people held elections and there was a change of Government and as a result of that they said that they were going over to Trinidad and it further reduced the prospects of the Eastern Caribbean Federation.

We have to prognosticate what may happen as a result of elections in St. Vincent where the situation is that Mr. Joshua was in power for some time and these things loom. So it is not any problem with the people themselves, the problem lies with the leadership. If you make an analysis of the leadership, you will find that they have to vie with each other. The Government was run by the Barbados Labour Party and while I do not intend to go into that, I just wish to say that there are people with the sort of thinking that there is some mythical power of the Barbados Labour Party that seems to hang over the Hon. Premier and his Government. I regard it as a most stupid thing to regard the Barbados Labour Party as an extra mural, but these statements have been made and they seem to coincide with each other. You are according somebody with so much power when that somebody has no power whatsoever and their spectre seems to hang over you at every footstep. It makes the people who hear these things feel extremely powerful. Imagine the Hon. Premier according these people so much power! It is childish and puerile because what power can they possess in so far as Federation is concerned and the discussions which took place among the Council of Ministers.
7.35 p.m.

They are dealing with the Government which is defunct. Mr. Bird, Mr. Bradshaw and Mr. Bramble are leaders in Antigua, St. Kitts and Montserrat respectively, and some of

them canvassed for the Barbados Labour Party. The Barbados Labour Party cannot negotiate, in fact, no such Government could negotiate and why do you say that they have this power to negotiate when they have no power to do that? I wish you would get down to the fundamentals and let us know. If the Secretary of State for the Colonies has made such a statement which is a damaging one, that cannot damage the Federation if the Leaders want Federation; but what is damaging is to make a statement without reference to the accredited leaders of the territories.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in public life for long enough to know that when you act in a manner which demands respect from people it is extremely difficult to achieve nothing. I remember that the Colonial Office wanted to send a commission to Barbados; they elected Mr. Evans of the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture and we felt that a West Indian should be placed on that commission. I think you, Mr. Speaker, at that time moved a Resolution deploring the idea that a West Indian was not put on the delegation. When I was in London Mr. C. W. W. Greenidge and myself worded a strong Resolution to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. George Seel at that time was the Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, and Mr. Greenidge himself was made a member of that commission.

This treatment of these members makes me feel how these gentlemen acted to the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies so that he could have reacted in the manner in which he did, so that he could have made that statement in the manner in which he made it. This statement is a very strongly worded one; this is very strong language. It says this:

"These discussions revealed a significant divergence of opinion between the Governments concerned....."

Are you saying that there is any difference between us? The Secretary of State for the Colonies is making a statement like this and nothing is being put into the Resolution to say that this statement or that these statements are untrue and they do not represent anything pertaining to these things, because your statement says that we approve of them; but that statement cannot divulge these things. You make an examination of the things and you will find what you are agreeing to, but let us understand that there is no reservation. You cannot have a Federation without a perpetual Federation. Are you going to marry a woman and say: "I am going to come and look for you whenever I get an opportunity to do so?" Are you going to sleep at your mother and tell your wife "I will come and sleep with you on Sunday nights after Church," or something like that? What kind of marriage is that? The more I see the attitude of the leaders of the Federation, the more my enthusiasm is dimmed. My concept about the unitary system of Government is that although it is the strongest form of Government I could not see myself that people who could not get together in a Federation and the units become poor among themselves — if it is difficult for them to Federate it is infinitely more difficult for them to form a Federal state. That is how I look at it. That is why I ask people to be careful in their approach to this matter of Federation. I find that each conference produces another problem for these islands to look at.

Mr. Speaker, I am really shocked to think that in a country like Nigeria there is the equivalent of a Minister of this Government in a commissioner who is in charge of a territory with a population which is bigger than the Federation of which we are thinking. The commissioner is in charge of something like nearly 800,000. In Lagos you have a population of one million people. In Nigeria you have forty million people and the people in the North speak differently from those in the South and the West; but here we are really looking for problems. With all its difficulties Nigeria is independent with three federal states operating, but it looks to me as if you have to give the West Indians extremely bad treatment in order to get them together. I do hope that this bad treatment will bring them together.

The Hon. Premier has mentioned something about the Bahamas but there is no point in talking about the Bahamas

in terms of population; you have to talk about the Bahamas in terms of money. Manhattan in New York is bigger than Barbados and the population density is greater than in Barbados; but the density of population does not matter, it is a question of how much money you have. You have more than fourteen hundred people to the square mile in Manhattan but that does not matter; it is a question of the money which they have.
7.45 p.m.

I agree with what the Hon. Premier has said on the question of independence and Barbados or independence itself. In my view, Barbados has been enjoying a kind of independence for some time until the Federation Bill was removed, and then they started with the kick-backs. I do not share the view of some people that you cannot have independence before this, or that you have to wait until after this to have independence. You can have independence, but what is now taking place is in a muddle. Some of these Ministers and Chief Ministers in the area seem to adopt the idea that they own the people in their territories and they do not expect any sort of opposition.

You have a spectacle in some of these territories still working in an outlandish system like what obtains in Jamaica where you have the Prime Minister as a parliamentary head and also the head of a Trade Union. We have the classic example of a man who is a leader of the Government and leader of a Trade Union. You hear some people saying: "Do not mind the Australian people", but you must create monstrosities in your territory. They create a status of total dictatorship that you cannot get away from. Some of them say that if the people elected them, they will never stand in the way of the people. Why do you want all of this power? To hold the community up to ransom? In these days certain politicians have to side with these people in order to get power, and if they do not side with them, they will not get power. I do not have any power to look for, so I can speak my mind to any man. This is one of the problems we are having in the West Indies, and we also had it in the last Federation.

I am not talking about Ministers on the grounds of how much money you will be saving. I am talking about Ministers on the grounds of work to be done. You will find a Minister of Agriculture in England and we should have one in Barbados, but because there is a Minister of Agriculture in England it does not necessarily follow that we should have ten here. If you are going to make the West Indian Federation the most expensive thing in the world, you will not get anywhere.

The Hon. Premier talks about the Civil Service. Does he want to run an efficient Civil Service without paying Civil Servants well? I say that the salaries being paid to the Civil Servants in Barbados are not exceptional. Are you going to call them princely? Some of them are working for over \$400 a month. Look at the industrial field and see what wages are being paid there! The people who are getting \$20 a week are the people you have to look at, because you can find a lot of them. I do not think the Civil Service should be drawn into this in an effort to show how much Federation is going to cost the territories, because it is going to be an international cost. It will be necessary to have an efficient Civil Service, and no Government can work without an efficient Civil Service.

What I think this Government should endeavour to do at this stage is to create a structure for the Federal Parliament and the Federal Government to work on. What the Premier says is not quite clear: "(4) Appointment of Governor-General and creation of Federal Council of Ministers into a body corporate with power to legislate by Regulations made by the Governor-General on the advice of the Federal Council limited to a number of subjects, such steps as are necessary for the launching of the Federation."

What are these subjects he is talking about? What are the subjects that he has to set up a Federal Council of Ministers to deal with by legislation? I would like to know about them. Why do you want a top-heavy legislation? You want to start giving people legislative powers and authority without an election?

This Government did not say to the people of Barbados: if we are elected, we are going into Federation on these terms. Far from that, I remember that the Federation was somewhat avoided because the Federation was in so much of a muddle that any new Government would find it very difficult to project a programme for Federation, when the old one was on the brink of disaster. For that reason, no statement was made on it. I think at the beginning the Government made every effort to create a Federation of the Windwards and Leewards for which everybody would like to see come into operation.

As I said earlier, I feel that all Barbadians should welcome the idea of Federation, but I would say to the members of this House that I would be failing in my duty if I were to allow Barbadians to think that Federation with the other territories is going to make it cheaper and easier for the Barbados Government. With Federation, this country has to face new taxation proposals. I do not consider that this is going to be the end of the taxation proposals despite what some of the members of the Party said. I have repeatedly said that you cannot get roads without taxation, but they do not realise that taxing the people is not an easy matter and you cannot continue doing that forever. There is a limit, I believe, in taxation. It is not a question of putting a cent more on an aerated drink or two cents more on rum. You can reach the stage where you can say that a rum is for \$5.00, but a man need not drink it and you would not get taxes. Some members say, Sir, glibly, that you do not have to use these things.

7.55 p.m.

If people stop drinking rum or smoking cigarettes, you will have to put taxation on something else, like housing. We get money from taxation, so do not talk about these things as if they come up out of the earth. You do not give a man anything more because he drinks rum. A smoker does not get a premium for smoking cigarettes. You do not tax a man because he does not use a particular thing.

Therefore, Sir, Federation is going to cost us something and I feel that the Hon. Premier must tell us that. One of the things which we have not been told is how much more Federation is going to cost us since the Hon. Premier has said that the Council of Ministers has thrown out the Hicks' Report. They say that they have thrown out the Hicks' Report and what they now agree to is the establishment of an Interim Federal Public Service Commission to appoint key Federal officers. But I am asking, to appoint people on whose recommendation? On what basis now is the Interim Federal Public Service Commission going to appoint people?

There is also the recommendation of the preparation of constitutional instruments and organisation of Federal Departments and services; the introduction of the Independence Bill in the House of Commons between June and July, 1964. I hope that we will have the opportunity of seeing the Independence Bill before it is introduced in the House of Commons.

Why do you want us to agree to the appointment of a Governor-General and so on, to the exercises that Mrs. Hicks has carried out and say that this was based on Colonial Office. I do not agree with everything that Mrs. Hicks has said in her Report. Of course, I know that it was only to serve as a plan. This was the sort of thing which the leaders asked for. It has been gleaned that you were ready to get out of it. I know that Mrs. Hicks projected the idea and I agree with the Hon. Premier that this is an idea of relieving Britain from her responsibilities but I do not believe that Britain will ever get out of her responsibilities to these territories.

Mr. Speaker, Australia is an independent territory and so is New Zealand but we in the Commonwealth have an agreement with Great Britain to buy sugar together with the independent territories and we are in no way treated differently. Barbados has to depend on sugar as its mainstay for many years to come. Let us examine the proposed units of the Federation. You are going to enter into a Federation in which Barbados' chief economy for the next

25 years would be sugar so you are building on your economy out of sugar. The economy of Antigua and St. Kitts is sugar also, therefore all the other things would be supplementary.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what has been stated to us? Let us examine our population growth. Our population is growing annually by 2 1/2 per cent. They say in progressive countries that your gross product must rise at least by three percent to take care of your present standards at the present level of unemployment. These are problems which we have to face. What we have to get is an economic breakdown to say that Federation would cost this and these are the results which you are going to get from Federation; your gross economy is placed at this figure but at the same time this is what you are going to get.

I feel if we are entering into a Federation on this basis, the Hon. Premier must be prepared to tell us that all the units are really willing to pay the cost of the Federation. When I say "pay the cost" I do not mean with the subventions which Britain would give to some of the territories. I feel that is something which the Hon. Leader must inform us about. He should tell us that we must be prepared to make these sacrifices in order to build the Federation.

I would say this to my hon. colleagues. So far as the Hon. Premier is concerned, I would join with him in the same method which he has used. We do not have an Australian economy to cope with it. What I would say as a citizen is this. Do not approach the West Indian problem with the same political concepts as if you were living in a high income territory. What I would like to say to those persons in those sectors of our economy is that they should not expect our economy to produce for them what the United States, what the United Kingdom and richer countries can expect. I think there are some West Indians who want to say that you want them to expect worse standards when you say that West Indians have to work harder and although you work hard, you may not receive so much income as people in the other countries can receive for working easier. That is something which the leaders must be able to project to the people in their units. Our attitude is that we must have a complete re-orientation in order that people who are operating in a poor community do not expect from that poor community what people operating in a rich community can expect from a rich community. That should come from the leaders themselves. They should tell the people, do not expect us to have all the grandeur in a ministerial structure as what the Australians have.

I do not know what valid reasons there would be in these poor territories to carry on the top heavy functions of an Administrator. Can we not form something more akin to the needs of the people? What some people say to us is that we have not reached to the stage of having an Administrator. I am not depriving anyone but I think the functions of an Administrator and a Governor can be performed by a Civil Servant. You do need that structure because you cannot build that sort of structure in these territories to carry on those things alone.

8.05 p.m.

Do not let us then create in the minds of the people whom we are representing that we must have all the trappings that the President of the United States would carry. You are starting off in service; you are starting off without getting any money from other sources and you still want to have all these embellishments which you need not have. For that reason, I consider that the Resolution which we are asked to approve on the face of it is a Resolution to approve the statement in Appendix "A" to this document; but there is nothing in the Resolution which conveys any of the things which the Premier says about the statement which has been made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. After what has been said, why does the body of the Resolution not carry any reference to the statement which the Secretary of State for the Colonies has made? The only mention of that is by the Premier, that the Secretary of State for the Colonies made this Statement. The Premier has said that this statement gives a false impression and

as to the hon. Junior member for Christ Church what did he say? He said that if the Premier did not say what he said about this statement then his views would have been different; but what does the Resolution say about this? — No comment. If you want a Federation let us have it and let us have an independent Federation. This Statement says this in relation to the Judicial and Legal Services Commission:—

"The Commission should consist of two members appointed by the Governor-General after consultation with the Chief Justice, at least one of whom has been an ex-Judge of a Court of unlimited jurisdiction in some part of the Commonwealth."

Is it that the only person who can sit on a commission is an ex-Judge? Why has he got to be an ex-judge. You write in here:— "Two members appointed by the Governor-General after consultation with the Chief Justice....." and I am saying that you can make these appointments without writing that in. If the policy of the Government is that you must appoint somebody who is an ex-judge, well, we have Sir Hugh Wooding who is now Chief Justice of Trinidad and Tobago, but if he were available to the community would you not appoint him as a member of the Commission? It looks to me as if you are salvaging your professional colleagues or you are making room for them.

Mr. Speaker, I close as I began. Any such statement which was made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies would be an insult to us and I agree that a strong statement should be made and the Secretary of State for the Colonies should be put in his place immediately. But I warn this Chamber that I see a similar thing percolating this community. In the same way as we feel about this statement, we feel hurt about any affront when it comes from within this Chamber. Let it be made clear that there is no point in having people elected in here and then you select those people who are not elected in here in these matters. Mention has been made of Mr. Ward; we want to hear names like Hall and Sobers; we do not want any miscellaneous player. We have elected Ministers in here and I would say that the Premier is only Premier because he has been elected in here. We had a Conference of the Caribbean Commission and the Governor wanted to pick out people outside of this legislature and send them to represent Barbados on that Commission. We protested against it in here and I do not want to see resurrected any type of colonialism. We are the representatives of the people and we choose our people who are to advise us. I am not walking about and butting up against big stones in tenantry roads and have people saying that you have only now come to look for us but we do not see you until the Elections.

I want to say this; if people want what the elected people are getting, let them get some of the insults too. You must have some of the insults if you want to enjoy the privileges. I am not going in for any type of imperialism. Mr. Laski was the Leader of the Labour Party but he had no seat in Parliament; when the Labour Party won the Election in England in 1944 did the Queen call for Mr. Laski? No — she called for Mr. Attlee. This thing does not worry me; it worries the Party people. Just as colonialism wanted to take up people and play them in front of the elected people, that is what you are doing here.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going forward to independence, let us act in that way; let us give the image to the other people. The Secretary of State for the Colonies or the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies is acting in this way because he found that there would be a prevailing climate which would be suitable for this kind of action.
8.15 p.m.

I was once told by a Party Leader when we were going to Government House that I should take things easy. I went to Government House and talked with the Governor. I told him that I would tell the Governor what I felt. If I went to see the Governor, I would treat him with respect as Her Majesty's Pro-Council; if I did not agree with him, I would tell him so.

I treat the Hon. Premier with more respect than he sometimes deserves. I am not dealing with him personally,

but I have to respect his office. I treat everybody with respect, but, if you fail to treat me with respect, you will see what kind of man I am. At the beginning, I warned them that withdrawing the Bill was going to give us colonial status.

This Resolution is here because the Hon. Premier objects to the attitude taken by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and there is nothing in the Resolution that will indicate to the public what is happening. It merely shows that we are offended with the Secretary of State. They have by-passed the public and brought the matter to us.

I do not approve of any Council having power to legislate before legislation gives them the power to do so. I have been elected to run the affairs of Barbados; I have not been elected to give anybody any power to do this. I am not voting for this because the people in Barbados did not give me any power to tell somebody: "I will elect you to legislate for them in any field."

If you want interim measures, you can have a Committee to make recommendations and bring them back to this Government to make the necessary legislation. I feel, that people who want to legislate for the Federal Election must be prepared to go and say to the people: I am running for the Federal Elections. These are my views, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There is nothing in the Resolution, in substance, that I will object to. But in the light of what is mentioned in the Appendix, I could not at this stage give my approval to having a Federal Council of Ministers being a corporate body to legislate for these matters. I do not know what the matters are and, moreover, I believe that a debate like this should be sent to a Committee so that the members on the other side could explain things. I must retain reservations on the question of giving them the right to legislate. For that reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to know clearly what these subjects are so that the members in this House would be able to know what is the position.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, obviously, I am sure that hon. members, to say nothing about the staff, would like a break.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

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

8.25 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I propose that the bell be rung as we do not have a quorum.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the Hon. Minister for drawing it to my attention.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the hon. senior member for St. Peter had concluded his speech and, even so, he is not in his seat. Is there any other hon. member who wants to contribute to this debate?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is either fortunate or unfortunate that on this occasion we are provided with this opportunity to discuss Federation of the Windward Islands, the Leeward Islands and Barbados. I take it that all hon. members of this Parliament are aware of the responsibility of the seven leaders in trying to get these Islands formed into an association. It would be well if Barbados apart from the other territories could survive and make a success of it, but I wonder whether that can be so.

Why is it impossible? If you look at the country's statistics without paying any attention to the country's Premier and his statements, we would say that it is quite obvious that the economy can no longer support this large

and ever growing population. In the next twenty-eight or thirty years our population would be something like half a million. Whether or not we want to support this population on agriculture alone, I think I am correct in saying that it is impossible.

We therefore want to begin this Federation with the knowledge that the United Kingdom Government is anxious to be rid of the responsibilities of these territories. I have the feeling and I remember the period of about twenty-five years ago when there was the great old man, Mr. Albert Marryshaw agitating time in and time again that we enter a Federation and the Colonial Office was not prepared to release us in any form of union. Then as years moved on I do not believe that the Colonial Office was ready to call us.

If you look at recent years, when we attempted to federate — the ten territories — let me say here now as I have said before that I was never enthusiastic over the idea of Jamaica in the Federation, not only because of the incident, but I always thought of the possibility of the country's success to hold things together across this continent. But I saw something different from my dreams. I was surprisingly let down when Trinidad and Tobago decided to withdraw from the Federation and which would have meant only a Federation of the other eight territories. I think, Sir, the greatest surprise of all was this strange, reckless speech of the last few months when Dr. Eric Williams agitated for a closer association of Trinidad and Tobago with the other eight territories of the Eastern Caribbean in order that they may have a market for their manufacturing products. He is more or less looking to these territories to help solve his difficulty of finding a market for that island's products. We are also having a Customs Union so as to provide us with a market where we are able to extend our trading area in the territories which more or less now are going to form the association.

Sir, I have sat and listened to some good speeches but we want to be assured whether or not we are doing the right thing. The statements by the Hon. Premier have offered little help to the hopes and aspirations of the people of this territory. For instance, I am prone to believe that all the meetings of the Chief Ministers of the various territories and the Hon. Premier at Sherbourne over the last year were exactly of no useful purpose.

Listening to the various speeches, one would imagine that the Hon. Premier was dictating the terms and we have seen this ugly spectacle that the idea of independence is to come before anything. The idea that we are to do something spectacular, that we have to get independence immediately instead of submitting to the humble feeling of coming together to form an association of these territories. I say that with some measure of grief. It is contrary to whatever we had hoped for. We think today of what is likely to take place.

Today, as I see it, we are confronted with the stark fact that the territories of the Federation which the people now are trying to form is now directed from the Colonial Office. We must be honest about these things; we must be sincere. We know how much that would mean. That is a responsibility which hon. members of Parliament must face up to. I have a responsibility of being a member of a Party which represents the greater percentage of people in this Island, and for this reason I must be grateful to Your Honour for allowing me to put my Party's point of view.

The question of financial assistance as set out in the course of the debate in the Hon. Premier's speech is disheartening. We are told that there will be introduced in the House of Commons a Bill for Independence in June to July, 1964. They are just rushing and rushing it. That means that the British Parliament would decide on independence for the seven territories to be associated before they have had a Federal Government. Just think for a moment. Independence must mean our having sovereign rights and human dignities, but our national pride will be sunk if the Governor General has to be appointed by the Colonial Office. Face up to this. What did Bustamante ask for in Jamaica? Is there anything wrong or to be ashamed of what has happened in Trinidad as regards to the appointment of a Governor-

General? But now we are having the Colonial Office appointing the Governor-General. The original idea and that which was put in the Memorandum by the Barbados Labour Party was that we should have a Governor-General appointed for a period until we were satisfied, and then we would ask for independence. You are destroying the early and latent tenets of all that is morally free. It is acceptable nowhere. Nkrumah came out of prison to become Prime Minister of his country with the understanding that his country will be granted independence. Quite recently Jomo Kenyatta even when he was in prison forced the Colonial Office into understanding what the people of Kenya required.

Now we are going to have independence before Federation, whereas our aspirations and ideals, lofty as they are, are that independence must mean something more than something spectacular happening in a party. Our ideals and aspirations are not based on the lands and hills of the various territories. They reside in the hearts of men. What human rights mean to us if you are going to have the Colonial Office appointing and dictating?
9.05 p.m.

That is bound to happen; it has happened and that is what we are facing. You are interested in what is going to take place in this country. Independence must not mean further dependence and that is what it is going to be. When the ten Federating Territories suffered from the departure of Jamaica and Trinidad, we were in trouble to meet our mandatory levy. Do you know what this is going to cost us? The Queen's Government must die so we must be shackled and probably be like Bustamante. He is asking for co-operation now when he could have come along with us. What will independence mean to Trinidad when the Colony will continue to be dependent? With the flags having been dragged down we will be faced with the stark reality of what it all means.

You have never been able to get away from the attitude of the Barbados Labour Party towards Federation. Let us make sure what we are doing with the country's finance and then deal with independence. You are having a type of directive which I do not think the Colonial Office has seen anywhere in any territory. This is what you must realise; a Council of Ministers will be appointed and by regulations of a Governor-General. By innuendo natives of the territories will be at the head of the Federation.

Any study of the West Indies is a study of poverty. What are you going to do with the million souls? We know what it is like in the other territories which have their poverty levels; you have poverty of thought and poverty of industrial development and we must yearn over these things. We know what a University for \$5 million would mean anywhere. The question is: Can we hope that the Colonial Office will be willing to spend such funds on educational institutions? We are not expected to buy coal and fuel in the winter and that is the only reason why we are alive. We will be wallowing in the mire since the power for ten years will rest with the Colonial Office. We well remember that the Hon. Premier wanted \$28 million by telephone but he has gone to the Colonial Office and he has returned to this country without a dollar. You can see the Premier's attitude when you have Mr. Erskine Ward sending a cable to the Colonial Office asking him not to think in terms of an Election.

Mr. Speaker, I feel at fire on this matter. I know we will be told about the glories of independence. It will be scattered all around, but when we are up against stark reality it will be an entirely different story. It must have been an awkward thing for the Premier to put his tail between his legs and come in here and say that we do not need any conference. That is the type of thing which we have suffered for three hundred years, the type of thing for which Nkrumah spent many of his years in the prison. The Premier said that he will tell the Colonial Office this, that and the other; but now with his clothes torn and his feathers out he is talking about the last Government and the last Federation. This would not have been expected of us; this is a shocking thing to happen to us. Mention has been made about the Federal Capital falling to Barbados. I want to say

that anything I hope for before the grave would be to be a member of the nation of West Indies and today this is what we are told; this is what we have got and it is unfortunate. We have seen the iron rule of the oppressors; that is what we have seen. We have got lost and on this occasion I do not know what we will do.
9.15 p.m.

We ought to be ashamed of this. We know what the English taxpayers have done for us by way of Colonial Development and Welfare grants. This means that we are beggars and not independent. Let history tell you this three or four years from now, although I do not want to remind you of it. Sad it will be for me, to say: "I told you so". This is a miserable thing we will have to accept.

I am looking at the hon. member, and I do not know what to say to bring him to his feet. Independence in 1963? In 1964 the British Government is to decide the question of independence of the West Indies and the British Colonial Office will appoint a Governor General without consulting the Premier regarding whom he should appoint. This is shocking, and it is something to be ashamed of. *(Laughter)*. You may pretend to laugh like a hyena because you do not understand the position. Do you think of our forefathers who have died like flies fighting for this?

A request has been made by Mr. Erskine Ward — and he is not a member of the Government or of the territories — to send a telegram to the Colonial Office. What do they mean when they act like that? We must indicate to the Colonial office that we are men. You want glory by having independence, but you are not thinking of what you are getting the territories into. We know that we do not have the money to support independence. It will be remembered that 42% of the cost was paid by Jamaica and the rest was paid by Trinidad. What do you expect the starving territories to do but get out of the Federation?

The attainment of Federation will be very hard. We will have to depend on the Colonial Office for about ten years, and will have to pay them back with our sugar, bananas and so on. What is attracting us into a full Federation of the West Indies? What will happen to us for the first ten years of the Federation? You will have established independence even before the Governor-General is appointed and, having no election, there would be no Prime Minister and hence there would be no one to consult. I tremble with fear and anxiety over this matter.

We must realise that in all of the territories we have had leaders selected by the people to look after the finance of the seven territories. We want to see a happy independence formed, but it not an easy thing to make a change. You may smile at this, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not smiling at all; I am serious.

Mr. MILLER: When I look at what is taking place today, I can think of Kenyatta going back to prison for this. There should be some enshrinement in this, because it speaks of the human rights and that is the sort of thing that we expect. What does this say?

Mr. Speaker, we are probably taking a decision here today that will hurt thousands in St. Lucia, in St. Vincent and maybe thousands in Montserrat. This matter is not as easy as it appears on the surface. How do you expect to look at Jamaica where the Governor-General is elected by the Prime Minister? The same thing has been done in Trinidad. There has been so much fumbling that I have to ask whether it is true.

Every now and then, the Premier is saying that he is not like Mr. Adams; he is no "Massa" man; how he talks back to the Secretary of State and so on.

I believe that the late T. A. Marryshaw, would turn in his grave if he could hear what we are asked to accept here today. We find that the horrors of this matter are something spectacular. No other country would accept this. You must have a sense or national pride, honour and dignity.

People want to be proud and do the things that make them rich and great.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we will live long enough to see this thing or live long enough to put this matter right. Reason tells us that the majority is on the other side of the Table, and we have to accept what is done by the other side through the vote. We have to think of the people who will have to represent us and those who will be appointed by the Colonial Office. We must go hat in hand to the Colonial Office when the Prime Minister of the West Indies should be an adviser to the Queen and the Governor-General should be a native of these territories. These things are true and we cannot change them. Deep in your hearts, you know that what I am saying here today is true, and I know that you will want to change it.

I know that the Colonial Office will want to give you independence when you will be more dependent on them. You will be demoralised and you will have to go hat in hand to the people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown caught my eye first; I do not know whether he will give way.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Now that the hon. junior member for St. George has finished his speech; he has completely made a mess of his shirt, and I hope that he would put it back in his pants.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Minister making an address to the House?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the hon. member's shirt. I now want to suggest that we should postpone further consideration of this matter and revert to Government Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the intimation made by the Hon. Leader of the House, I do not know if the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown would care to move the postponement of this debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That meets my approval, and I would move the motion because it would give me an opportunity to speak first when the motion is debated again.
9.25 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I am not doing that for a moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of that intimation, I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who caught my eye first would agree to move the postponement of this debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this debate be postponed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I second the motion for the postponing of the debate for further consideration but the Hon. Leader of the House said that he is going to revert to other business. This is time for any honest man to go home. I second the motion for postponement of this debate for further consideration and I also object to any other business being done.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House said earlier that he was suspending Standing Orders in order to deal with this Federation debate and another Resolution. I would suggest personally to hon. members that as we have suspended the Standing Orders in order to deal with these two matters that we proceed to deal with the other matter.

It has been moved that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed. I think there is another reason for the proposed postponement. If you did not postpone now, those who speak from now onwards may not be on the air which may be a good thing or bad thing.

The question that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Orders have been suspended for one other Resolution to be dealt with.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1963-64 No. 5

TRAINING AND CAMP EXPENSES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which I propose to deal with is a Resolution for the sum of \$3,000 for which we have to go into Committee of Supply. I heard the hon. junior member for St. Joseph saying that it is time for honest men to go home. I wonder whether when we used to sit here in the past until one o'clock in the morning, whether we were dishonest men.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. BATSON, Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD, Hon. J. C. TUDOR, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. LOWE, Mr. YEARWOOD, Mr. CARMICHAEL, Mr. BOXILL, Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. GODDARD, Mr. MOTTLEY — 11.

Noes: Mr. SMITH and Mr. HOLDER — 2.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the House when in Committee of Supply to deal with the Resolution which notice was given of earlier today.

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman hon. members of the Committee will quite easily appreciate why this supplementary provision is being required. If the detachment of the Barbados Regiment which is going to camp in St. Vincent, could have been transported there and brought back on one of Her Majesty's ships, the expenditure would have been much less than what it would be now.

The members of the Regiment were to be taken on one of Her Majesty's ships, but because this has not been possible they have to make their own arrangements, consequently, the amount already voted in the Estimates for this purpose proved insufficient to defray all the expenses of the camp.

Going out on camp by the Regiment is something which takes place every year and something which we feel ought to be encouraged. Of course, hon. members will see that it is not a Government freeness on which the Regiment embarks, because they make a contribution to the expenses of their own in camp.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$3,000 do now pass.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Would the Hon. Minister tell us how many persons in the Regiment are likely to make the trip? 9.35 p.m.

Mr. BOXHILL: Before the Hon. Minister replies, I see that note No. 4 to the Addendum of this Resolution states this:

"The members of the Regiment who will be going to camp will be required to make a personal contribution towards the cost of their passages."

I am wondering if this is really fair to these men. I know that some of them are not even working and I do not know how they will be able to make this contribution. Those who work only for a very small amount and I am wondering why it is that they are called upon to make a personal contribution towards the cost of their passages.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. junior member for Christ Church first, the camp will consist of about 200 men. As to the question asked by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, I think I ought to say that this has been apparently the custom over the years with overseas camps. They do not pay more than \$10 each and that is a nominal amount; that amount cannot feed these men for two weeks. It is not a question of a person being required to make a large contribution which he might find it difficult to make.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 21st June, 1963, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question I should say that certain Standing Orders have been suspended and it is in order now for Private Members' Business to be commenced. Is it the desire of any hon. member to proceed with any Item under Private Members' Business now?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if there is any particular significance for our sitting on Friday. That is not a normal day for meeting of this House. I would like to know the particular significance of our coming back here on Friday. We make arrangements from week to week and coming back here on Friday will interfere with our business. We are not debating anything which is out of the ordinary and which has to be passed on Friday.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items on the Order Paper which we want to be finished at the earliest possible date. We wanted to get through more than we have got through today. A meeting tomorrow is not convenient neither is a meeting for Thursday convenient, and we want to finish the Federation debate. We also want to conclude some other important items on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the Hon. Minister would be so good as to say what business it is proposed to deal with on Friday so that hon. members will come prepared to deal with that business.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Before we deal with the Federation Resolution we want to dispose of Orders Nos. 2, 5,

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16— as many Orders as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER: And then do we turn to the Federation debate?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: When we have disposed of them we will start with the Federation.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are starting in Private Members' time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: We have not done any work today particularly; we have only passed one Resolution and one Bill. I hope that hon. members will co-operate to the extent of allowing Government Business to be dealt with on that day.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister is moving the adjournment of the House until 2.30 o'clock p.m., on Friday, but how much work is he going to get down when the Federation debate is going to take up to 9 o'clock? 9.45 p.m.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would suggest that we should postpone the Federation Debate and take it on Tuesday next. I think that the best thing for us to do would be to try and get through some of the important items on the Order Paper on Friday and then go back to the other matters.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader of the House proposing that if we meet on Friday of this week at 2.30 p.m. o'clock, we would not be discussing Federation, and assuring hon. members that Federation would be dealt with on Tuesday? Are hon. members willing to proceed in accordance with what the Hon. Minister has mentioned?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if hon. members agree, we will be able to dispose of a number of outstanding matters, especially the three Bills dealing with urgent matters. We have a Bill dealing with the amendment to the

Pioneer Industries Act. We have a number of applications for pioneer industries awaiting the passage of this legislation. There is another Bill to amend the Pensions Act and if we can get these Bills through, we can then resume the debate on Federation next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members have given up their rights today, and they will be asked to give them up on Friday. On Tuesday next, will they be asked to give up their time also?

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: No, Sir.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Why can't we adjourn until 12.00 o'clock noon of Friday? You are calling us out on Friday to deprive us of Private Members' Business and we cannot do much if we start about 2.30 p.m. o'clock. If the hon. member is serious and he wants work done, he can adjourn until 12.00 o'clock noon on Friday.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I have already pointed out that we arranged to hold a meeting with the Central Planning Committee at 10.00 o'clock, and it will last for three or four hours.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House now stands adjourned until 2.30 o'clock p.m., on Friday, 21st June 1963. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No".

Ayes: Mr. BATSON, Hon'bles W. A. CRAWFORD, J. C. TUDOR, G. G. FERGUSON, A. DaC. EDWARDS, Messrs. LOWE, YEARWOOD, CARMICHAEL, BOXILL, WALCOTT, GODDARD and MOTTLEY — 12.

Noes: Messrs. HOLDER and SMITH — 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The "Ayes" have it. This House now stands adjourned until Friday, 21st June, 1963, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.
9.50 p.m.