

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1961 - 66

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16th November, 1965

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. c. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health, Housing, Local Government and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CORBTN, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries);

Mr. W. R. COWARD; MR. W. R. LOWE; HON. N. W. BOXILL,

(Minister of Communications and Works); and Hon. A. Dac. EDWARDS, (Minister of Trade and Labour).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the Meetings of this Chamber of the 19th and 26th October, 1965, have been duly circulated and unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed. (A Pause) There being no objection, I declare these Minutes to be duly confirmed.

ALLEGEDLY LATE COMMENCEMENT

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that today's meeting was summoned for 2.30 p.m. o'clock; that at 2.45 p.m. allowing 15 minutes' grace, Your Honour had not yet opened the meeting; and that, in my opinion, is a contravention of precedent and the rules of this House. On previous occasions a similar thing happened. I was asked to take the Chair through no fault of my own after the expiry of 15 minutes' grace and it was because members were not able to attend in time and the result was that there could be no meeting. That was different; but on this occasion, Your Honour was not in the Chamber at the time when Your Honour should be.

It is contrary to all precedent and customs of this Chamber and, as a matter of fact, the House may not meet after the time that it is summoned. Allowing for 15 minutes' grace this sitting should have commenced at 2.45 p.m., and after that time, Your Honour in my opinion should not have taken the Chair.

I am submitting to Your Honour that we cannot be said to be properly assembled. We have been given 15 minutes grace; we adjourned to meet at 2.30 o'clock p.m. and we cannot meet after the appointed time. It is as simple as that and, as I have said, there is precedent for it. In view

of what I have just said, I do not think if we assemble today after 2.45 p.m. that we have been properly assembled. It is always a question of time. It is obvious that Your Honour arrived in the Chamber after the appointed time. I compared the time with my watch; I heard the Public Buildings clock chime for 2.45 p.m. a few minutes before Your Honour entered the Chamber. Every member who was in his place is aware of that. That is a fact.

Make no mistake. If it happens once, it would happen again; therefore, it is good to know these things and take objection at the proper time. Things may get completely out of hand if we allow this to happen, and one day we may be summoned to meet at 2.30 p.m. o'clock and find ourselves meeting at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Sir, we cannot say today that we were assembled at 2.45 p.m. allowing for 15 minutes' grace. That is the rule and custom of the hon. Chamber. Because of that, I do not think that we are properly assembled today,

Mr. SPEAKER:

For the information of hon. members, this sitting was summoned for 2.30 o'clock p.m. In the absence of an official clock in this Chamber and in view of my receiving information as to the hour, the time at which this meeting started is not more than 15 minutes after the hour to which the House had at its last meeting been adjourned; therefore, I deem and rule this sitting to have started in conformity with the Standing Orders of this Chamber.

Another thing is this. No objection was taken before the commencement of the House or even after Prayers were read. Objection was taken for the first time after I had spoken and declared the Minutes of this House to be duly confirmed. Minutes can only be confirmed as indeed

they have been, after the House has duly met.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Your Honour, I was actually on my feet before you began to make any statement to the House.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following-

An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the Several Districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 30th September, 1965.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (NO.7) Order, 1965.

The Civil Establishment (Part Time Officers) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1965.

Statement showing the Amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados And the Amounts received from Her

Majesty's Government in the U.K. under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, for the period ended on the 31st March, 1965 in respect of Schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following-

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 7) Order, 1965;

A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part Time Officers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1965;

A Resolution to approve the advance from the Public Treasury of a sum not exceeding \$310,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of making advance of salary or wages to Government employees.

I would like to say that it is my intention to ask leave of the House to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

Also, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to

place the sum of \$2,500 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1965-66, No. 27 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, on my behalf, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$159,768 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1965-66, Part I Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1965-66, No. 28 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution. 3.00 p.m.

In connection with this Resolution, I should like to give notice that it is my intention to ask leave to deal with it in all of its stages at today's sitting of the House,

Mr. SPEAKER:

Are copies of this Resolution available for circulation amongst hon. members?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Copies of this Resolution will be circulated to hon. members at a later stage.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions-

A Resolution to approve the transfer of the sum of \$134,500 from the amount allocated in respect of Pumping Stations as set out in Note to Item 23 of Head 2 of Part II Capital, of approved Estimates for 1965-66, to the amount allocated to mains.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$21 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1965-66, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1965-66 No. 29, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947.

REPLIES LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I big to give notice that the following Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions are now ready-

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 67/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for the City.

The Oral Reply to Paramilitary Question No. 72/1964 asked by the hon., senior member for St. Thomas.

The Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 87/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. James.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 64/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas is now ready.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next sitting in order to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has Just been given except with regard to the two Resolutions of which I have given notice of my intention to proceed with at a later stage today.

QUESTIONS NOT YET READY FOR PRESENTATION

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understand that certain Questions which were given notice of within the prescribed time for today's meeting have not yet been finally channelled, and therefore they are not instantly ripe for presentation to this Chamber. However, I am advised by the Clerk that they will be ready for such presentation at this sitting of the House.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

On behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Pensions Act, 1947, be now read a first time,

Hon. C. E. TALMA; I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS RE LOAN TO THE TRANSPORT BOARD

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the following Statement in connection with the Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of a loan to \$600,000 to the Transport Board-

"On Tuesday, 2nd November, 1965, while dealing with a Resolution seeking the approval of the House of Assembly of a Government guarantee for a loan of \$600,000 to the Transport Board to finance the purchase of new rolling stock, I stated that orders had been placed for 10 complete buses and 20 chassis powered by Bedford engines and that the present indebtedness of the Board was \$162,000.00

2. I should like to make a correction to this part of my speech.

3. The Board at present has a fleet of 97 buses of which 39 have proven uneconomic to operate. These

39 buses comprise 21 gasoline-operated units with wooden bodies and 18 Mercedes-Benz units which are in a poor state of repair. The Board requires a complement of 100 buses in order to fulfil its obligations under the existing concession. Orders have been placed for 10 complete buses powered by Bedford engines at a cost of B.W.I. \$22,445 each and 10 chassis powered by Leyland engines, and not Bedford engines as originally stated, at a cost of \$12,775 each. It is proposed to order 10 more Leyland chassis in due course thus making a total of 30 units to be added to the fleet over the period 1965-67. A contract for the construction of bus bodies to be fitted to the Leyland chassis has been awarded to a local firm, the Acme Engineering Works; the estimated cost of each body is \$10,000.

4.

5. The financial position of the Board as at 31st October, 1965, shows a total indebtedness of \$365,258.71 made up as follows: -

6.

(a) Amount due Sundry Creditors \$140,270.96

(b)

(c) Amount due on outstanding loans from the Royal Bank

(d)

of Canada plus interest thereon 224,987.75

\$386,258.71

5. I should like to assure Honourable Members that these mistakes were inadvertently made.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40, and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

3.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have to inform hon. members that during this week, namely Sunday, Monday and today there have been certain communications in the Press and over the air announcing that a certain Order in Government Business would be dealt with today. There was no authority whatsoever, according to the information available to me or to this House, for such statements to have appeared, either in writing or orally. Much inconvenience has been suffered by members of the Staff of this Chamber, not to speak of myself, as a result of this widely publicised misinformation. Hon. members of this Chamber and members of the public have been inquiring whether the statements so written and so made have a shred of accuracy.

I would, on this occasion, do no more than to remind the media of the Press and the Radio that, by Standing Order No. 70 of this Chamber, the Speaker is empowered to grant a general permission to the representatives of any Journal to attend sittings of the House under such rules as he may make from time to time for that purpose. If such Rules are contravened, or if the Journal publishes a report of the proceedings which the Speaker considers unfair, such permission may be revoked,

I think that I have said enough. I trust there will never again be a recurrence of this misinformation with its attendant publicity. I assume that the Press and the Radio may be deemed to be wise. A word to the wisp should suffice.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, before you proceed there is only one matter which I should like to draw to your attention, and it is that Order No. 2 on the Order Paper is a Resolution requesting Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to convene at the earliest opportunity, a Conference to arrange the Constitutional, financial defence and other details incidental to and arising from, the assumption, by the people of Barbados, of Sovereign Nationhood within the Commonwealth in 1966, and it is not unexpected that the Press or Radio should say that Order No. 2 could be reached today. In view of the fact it is on the Order Paper, it is no infringement on the Chair or the Chamber for the Press or Radio to look at Order No. 2 even in their imprudence, though we do not do the Orders seriatim, and say that it is likely to be debated. I would not therefore like it to go out that there was a unanimous condemnation of what would be an apparent lack of knowledge of what the Government really intends to do in precise form from day to day.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will point out that the references which I made were not in respect of statements that such may be or that such was likely, but emphatically that such would assuredly, undoubtedly and definitely take place today. Certain assurances were given in this Chamber as to notification to the House as to when the particular matter to which the Hon. senior member for St. Peter has referred would be debated.

The Hon. Leader of the House caught my eye,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid you anticipated me. I was Just going to point out that when notice was given of this Resolution, I said then that it was our intention to notify hon. members well in advance as to when we proposed to initiate debate on it, and all the newspapers as well as the other media published my statement then;

so it is, I think, still within their knowledge that an under-taking was given and that that undertaking has not yet been honoured, and consequently there could be no question of initiating the debate suddenly without warning hon. members.

Mr, GODDARD:

Mr. Speaker, I will support the hon. senior member for St. Peter because this Order is No. 2 on the Order Paper, and it is general practice, when we are adjourning the House for the next meeting to put those items which we know we are not going to deal with at the end of the Order Paper, This being Order No, 2, the Reporters could easily have forgotten the assurance given by the Leader of the House that he would specify a date for the debate, which assurance I am glad he has repeated now, because we know that it is confirmed. This is not the first time I have seen this in the Press. They take the first two or three items on the Order Paper and say that they would be dealt with at the next meeting; so the mere fact that this order was not placed at the end of the Order Paper must have reaffirmed their opinion that it would be dealt with today,

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support you one hundred per cent, As a matter of fact I did not think I would have to do so after the Hon. Leader of the House had repeated the fact that he particularly stood in his place and told this House that a date would be fixed, and he would name that day when he would debate this particular Resolution. The mere fact that an item is No, 1 on the Order Paper does not give the right to the Radio or Press to say that this House is going to debate it at any particular time. When it comes to Government Business, the Leader of the House alone, as Government spokesman, has the choice, as he is the Chief collaborator in the original Addendum. He has had to repeat that he would give notice of the particular day on which we would debate this particular Resolution, and when notice was given, I am sure that the members of the Press were in this Gallery; therefore they know. When I heard this thing over the services of Rediffusion and other media, I took it as the usual way of the Press in, as it were, anticipating the business of the House, and therefore I did not take it seriously. You, Mr. Speaker, may have taken it more seriously, and therefore the staff of the House has been inconvenienced, (Interruptions).

Mr, Speaker, I have the right to speak. Other members spoke and I never thought of interrupting them, because I am too well disciplined,

Mr, WALCOTT:

On a point of order, you may not be aware, but what are we debating? Maybe the hon. member is in the wrong place. We do not sell spirits here.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, you need not thank him for the interruption. I will go on to say that I did not think I would have to speak after the Hon. Leader of the House had spoken, but since the hon. Junior member for Christ Church spoke, I think I should speak and that is why I rose to my feet. I support one hundred per cent what you have ruled and what you have expressed, and that is, that particular mention was made that notice would be served by the Leader of the House as to when this thing would be debated, 3.20 p.m.

The mere fact that a thing is No. 1 and No. 2 on the Order Paper is because such things get pushed up. They are not pushed up as a matter of priority, but as a matter of age. That is how this Order has become Order No. 2. That is the point which I am making and that is a point worthy of note.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Speaker, ..

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. senior member for St. Andrew speaking on the same Order?

Mr. CORBIN:

Yes, Sir. I do not think that there should be so much fire on this Order being Order No, 2 on the Order Paper because I understood from Rediffusion as

well as the newspapers that this Order was likely to be debated today because of its priority on the Order Paper. so what the newspapers want to say is that it was likely to be debated today. But what we want to have, we will have.

I do not see the reason why there should be a lot of debate on this. A newspaper can say whatever it likes.

LETTERS FROM H. E. re VISIT OF QUEEN

Mr. SPEAKER:

In connection with the matter to which I wanted to make mention, I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from His Excellency the Governor a letter dated the 11th of this month and it reads as follows -

Dear Mr. Speaker,

Your House has been officially informed, by Message No. 21965, of the visit to Barbados in February, 1965, by Her Majesty The Queen and His Royal Highness The Duke of Edinburgh, but, because approval of the local programme for the visit has not yet been received from the Palace, it was not possible to include the programme in the Message.

I am aware, however, that you personally have been informed of the provisional programme insofar as it affects your House, and that you, in collaboration with the President of the Senate, have agreed on the details of the function in the Senate Chamber. Those details include the presentation of Royal Addresses {from the Senate and the General Assembly by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the General Assembly, and a reply to them by the Queen.

As the Palace authorities have asked for the submission to them by 20th November, 1965, of the drafts of all speeches which will be made locally during the Royal visit, I should be most grateful to receive by Wednesday, 17th November, the draft of the proposed Address from your House.

Yours Sincerely, (Sgd,) JOHN STOW.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Select Committee of this Honourable House be appointed to prepare a Draft Address to present to Her Majesty the Queen in accordance with the request contained in the letter from His Excellency the Governor,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

I shall now proceed to appoint, subject to the approval of hon. members, the following hon. members to serve on this Committee in association with my-self-

The Hon. Leader of the House and Minister of Education (Hon. J. C. Tudor); the hon. junior member for Bridgetown and member of the Majority Opposition (Mr. Lynch); the hon. junior member for St. George and Leader of the Minority Party (Mr. Miller); the hon. junior member for St. Peter (Mr. Husbands).

Those hon. members who have been appointed must bear in mind that in order for this draft Address to be prepared in time, we must meet and complete it and report by tomorrow.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

QUESTION re BROAD STREET A TWO-WAY STREET

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 64 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas

Mr. BATSON:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister

Will Government consider making Broad Street a two-way street to vehicular traffic between the hours of 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. every day in order to reduce to a minimum the chance of accidents occurring on the Wharf Road between the said hours?

Mr. BOXILL:

The reply is as follows-

Statistics have shown that the incidence of accidents occurring on the Wharf Road between the hours of 6 p.m. and 6.00 a.m. is very low and does not justify making Broad Street a two-way street during those hours in order to reduce the chances of accidents occurring on the wharf.

REPLY TO QUESTION No. 67 HELD OVER

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next is Question No. 72 standing in the name of the Hon, Leader of the Opposition who is not instantly in his place; therefore, that Question will be held over.

UNIFORM OF POLICEMEN

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next is Question No. 72 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas

Mr. BATSON:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is Government aware that the Uniform - long blue pants, tunic and helmet - now worn by the Policemen on duty especially during the summer needs changing in this tropical country?

2. Is the Minister also aware that the present uniform now worn by Policemen only suits ceremonial occasions?

3.

4. If the answers to the above are in the affirmative, will the Minister go into the matter with a view to changing the Uniform of the said Policemen having regard to the tropical conditions in this Island?

5.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

The reply is as follows -

1. The Police Association has made such submission to Government.

2.

3. No, Sir.

4.

5. The suitability of various alternatives to the existing uniform is being studied.

6.

QUESTION NO, 87 HELD OVER

Mr. SPEAKER:

The next is Question No. 87 which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. James who, I observe, is not in his place.

Mr. HOLDER:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. James, may I put the Question and get the Reply for him?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am Informed that Mr. Clerk has not got the authority of the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. James to make that request and I would ask the hon. Junior member for St. James despite his gallantry to refrain from attempting to put the Question.

Mr. HOLDER:

I thank yon. Sir. 3.30 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now time for Government Business. The first Order of the Day under this Head stands in the lime of the Hon. Leader of the House, the Hon. Minister of Education- To move the House into Committee of supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the ser-vice of the Island.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that four Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction of the House while in Committee of Supply to deal

with the Resolution for the sum of \$159,768 as well as the Resolution so approve the advance from the Public Treasury of a sum of money not exceeding \$310,000 for the purpose of making an advance of salary of wages to Government employees.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1965-66 No. 25

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution For the sum of \$37,964 under two Heads of the Estimates, namely, Head 13 - Customs and Head 41 -- Ministry of Trade and Labour.

HEAD 13 - CUSTOMS Head 13 - Customs - was called.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. members will see quite clearly why this supplementary provision is required. In connection with this Head --Customs - supplementary provision is required in respect of four items namely, overtimes, water rates, office equipment and furniture. As hon. members will see, as a result of the increase in overtime rates with effect from the 1st April, 1965, which were estimated to cost over \$16,000, an increase in the number of officers required to assist at Seawell after 4 o'clock in the afternoon and an increase in the waiting time of guards, the provision of \$18,500 which was originally made in the Estimates has proved to be inadequate. Therefore/ an additional amount of \$23,000 is required to meet outstanding commitments to the end of the financial year. That is in respect of overtime rates.

In respect of water rates, the provision of \$250 which has been made in this year's Estimates to meet the payment of these rates, has proved to be inadequate and therefore supplementary provision of \$200 is required for the remainder of the financial year. Relative to the item "Office Equipment" the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 6) Order of 1965 provided for an increase of staff at the Customs Department of one Office Superintendent, three Assistant Supervisors and twelve Long Grade Clerks. Of course, as a result of the increased staff, it is necessary to provide furniture and equipment, and the sum of \$2,764 is required to meet that commitment.

As I said, Sir, this supplementary provision is in respect of these four items -- overtime, water rates, office equipment and furniture. I therefore beg to move that Head 13 stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 41 - MINISTRY OF TRADE AND LABOUR Head 41 - Ministry of Trade and Labour - was called

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, in 1962 Mr. H. W. Stockman presented his Report on the proposed Social Security Scheme for Barbados. Subsequent to the presentation of the Report, a working Committee was appointed to study this Report in detail and to make recommendations for the implementation of the Report. This Committee reported on the 14th December, 1964, and since then the Government has been at work on this Scheme for its early implementation. It is planned to make provision under this Social Security Scheme for sickness benefits, maternity benefits, funeral grants, old age pensions, survivors' benefits on invalidity, benefits for employment injury after a year and consideration has been given to the question of public assistance. Now, Sir, we have heard from I.L.O. Advisers and one of them is currently with us, who is an administrator of social security, and these proposals which we have before this Chamber are as a result of the recommendations which he has made. 3.40 p.m.

He advised that it was necessary at this stage to appoint as temporary staff one Director at a salary of \$9,120 per annum, one Assistant Director at a Salary of \$8,160 per annum; one senior Accountant at a salary grade of \$5,328 to \$6,288 per annum; two Senior Executive Officers at \$4,632 to \$5,712 per annum; one Secretary at \$2,016 to \$2,832 per annum; one Stenographer at \$1,440 to \$2,352 per annum; four long Grade Clerks at \$1,200 to \$2,832; and one Messenger at \$1,092 to \$1,704 per annum. This is only a small portion of the number of people who would have to be employed when the Scheme gets along. It is envisaged that the Social Security Scheme will provide employment for no fewer than one hundred people when it is implemented.

In the first instance the Director, the Assistant Director and the Senior Accountant will be appointed, and these appointments will be of people who will be eligible for carrying on when the Social Security Board is appointed and when the Scheme is to be fully implemented, which we hope will be early next year. We should have brought in the Bill dealing with this Scheme before, but I should like to let hon. members know that although I said before that the Bill would have been introduced on or about the beginning of this month, we have had to take the Crown Law Officer who was working on this Bill and ask him to work on the Shops Act which will be introduced in another couple of weeks. We would like the amendments to the Shops Act to be on the Statute Book before the Christmas season, because there are certain amendments to this Act which will have to be implemented during the Christmas season which refer to the opening and closing of shops and providing special extended hours for shopping around Christmas time. That is the reason why the Social Security Bill has not been introduced here before, but I promise hon. members in a few weeks' time to have it introduced in the Legislature.

As I said, the Director, the Assistant Director and the Senior Accountant will be appointed immediately, but the others will be appointed as the occasion warrants it. At present there is a temporary Secretary who is working in conjunction with the Sociologist and the Adviser from I.L.O. Now hon. members may want to know what will be the functions of these Officers whom we are asking permission to employ now and why it is necessary to have them, as well as the work that would have to be done. It is broken down here in certain categories. The work which these Officers will have to do can be summarised as follows:

- (a) planning in detail the organisation of the scheme.

(b) framing of procedural instructions concerning administration of the scheme including -

(1) insurability and compliance; (iii) claims and awards of each type of benefit; (iv) Payment for medical certification;

(v) finance;

(c) framing of provisional instructions covering the initial registration of employers and insured workers;

(d)

(e) drafting of forms;

(f)

(g) designing of stamps;

(h)

(i) designing of payment vouchers;

(j) liaison with Post Office with regard to agency work on behalf of the scheme;

(k) provision of specialised equipment;

(l) preparation of publicity material for dissemination prior to launching of the scheme.

This is the work that has got to be done before the Scheme is implemented, and the staff which we are asking for today is to carry out this work. The two Senior Executive Officers will be Heads of two different Departments in the Social Security section of the Ministry of Labour; one will be looking after the assessment of schemes and the other will be looking after enforcements,

Hon. members may want to question why we need Senior Executive Officers as there are no other Senior Executive Officers on the Civil Establishment of this Country. It is felt that instead of having Executive Officers, we should have Senior Executive Officers because they carry greater responsibility than the post of Executive Officer. I should be pleased to answer any question which is raised by hon. members. At this stage I would prefer hon. members to ask any question they would like me to answer. I repeat that it is hoped that the Bill for implementing the Social Security Scheme will be introduced in a few weeks' time, and after that when we get our Regulations gone through and the technical aspect of the implementation of the scheme threshed out, the scheme will be implemented.

I beg to move that Head 41 - Ministry of Trade and Labour -- stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that,

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, you know that my interest is very deep in this matter, and I am one of the members who served on the Working Party. I will have to ask the Hon. Minister a question without in any way voting against the Resolution, because I am not so clear in my mind. I do not have the report with me, and I did not have the time to do the research that is necessary. It says in the Addendum to the Resolution that it is proposed that the scheme should be administered by a Board, but that the appointment of staff should be made on the advice of the Public Service Commission. I am not opposed to the Public Service Commission doing it, but I do not know what the Board recommended or if the Board wants to take full administration for this matter, because I am convinced that starting a new thing like social Security in Barbados requires an approach that is not necessarily a Civil Service approach. 3.50 p.m.

This routine work done by Civil Servants who go home at 4 o'clock in the evening and come to work at 8.30 in the morning is not the sort of mentality which I regard should be put into work of this kind. I regard the putting into effect of a Social Insurance Scheme as a very important measure. I am afraid to say that I have had a lot of dealings with the Labour Department and the other existing

Departments; and from what I know is required to bring into effect Social Security, I think that you should not have ordinary Civil Servants to do the Job. You take someone who is now in line for another post and you put him in this office to do this Job or it may be because of his age he is put there. Do not make the Social Security Board a haven for those who want to rest in some haven. Do not let this Board become inundated with those who are ready to wish you goodbye, and therefore, you find yourself with what I would call this lot of deadwood in this Department where I think you should have young men who are vibrant. I can speak of this because I have found that the Severance Pay Scheme is a little out of range because of the Civil Servants' mentality. The Minister in charge would be able to help us on that

Sir, only last week we have been discussing the relationship between the existing schemes and what is going to happen with Social Security. This field of Social Security is going to be a vital field for a lot of us. We have to examine it with all the other schemes, and I am very pleased that there are persons from the I.L.O. who are here, and I hope that the new Minister of Labour may do a little differently from his predecessor and not only rely on the I.L.O. to come and give advice, but that he also send Barbadian Civil Servants to the I.L.O. Conferences. I say that to the Minister so that he would know that these sort of things which Civil Servants should be informed of at the horse's mouth, so to speak; so that they can get a better understanding of these matters and that they do not rely on documentation.

I would like in a general way to support this, because, as you are aware, Mr, Chairman, this is one of my own babies and I am very glad that I have lived long enough to see a measure like this come about. We were fortunate in getting some good people to come here and work on this measure and we had a sociologist in the person of Mr. Bishop who did a good job,

Mr. GODDARDs Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Minister, if possible, to give us the date when he hopes that this scheme will be implemented. The reason is this. This matter would be of great concern

to the commercial houses as well as employers. They will have to set up a scheme for the deduction of the wages of employees as well as from their business for this purpose. Because of that, the routine would have to be set up.

The Hon. Minister said that in three or four weeks the Government is going to bring down a Bill to deal with the matter, but they have brought down this measure before so that they can get on with the matter. Let us condition the business housed for this; let them beware that these things will have to be done. The earlier that you can give an indication as to when it is likely that this would start to operate, the better it would be and these people would be able to put their houses in order. It is not going to be the big employers but the small set-ups that would re-quire some system to be able to deal with all the deductions from their employees plus the sum which they will have to pay on behalf of their firms. Therefore, Sir, if you give us your starting date it would be most helpful to employers and commercial houses.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal firstly with the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter when he referred to the appointment of the Board. The appointment of the staff of the Social Security Board will be on the advice of the Public Service Commission, but it does not mean that the Board will not have the authority over the employees,

I said that the staff will be appointed on the advice of the Public Service Commission. The hon. member will also know that what we are asking for today is temporary staff and not permanent staff. If the Board was not (going to have some authority over the staff of the Social Insurance Scheme we would not be coming today and asking for a Director and an Assistant Director. But the fact is that it is our opinion that the Board should have some authority over its employees.

Hence, Sir, we are employing these people temporarily only until the decision is taken. As to what would be the result of our discussion now of the authority which the Board will have, whether it will be completely autonomous or not and whether these people should be completely Civil Servants or not. We cannot wait until this is decided upon and until we bring in the Bill because it would set back our date. We want this scheme to be implemented by next year,

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. senior member for St. Peter should worry himself about the Civil Servants' approach to work because the Board will be the body responsible for the Social Security Scheme, I would also like to point out that most of the recommendations of the Working Committee of which the hon. senior member for St. Peter was a member were accepted by the Government. When I deal with the Bill I would deal with that in greater detail; but of the recommendations which were accepted, such as what rates are payable for the contributions and what benefits will be in some cases, you will find that social security is 60 per cent of the national weekly wage. All this will be dealt with in detail when I deal with the Bill. 4.00 p.m.

I should also like to advise the hon. Junior member for Christ Church that the employers can expect the maximum co-operation from my Ministry in this issue or in any other issue with which we have to deal. We will not be springing overnight any Social Security Scheme on the employers of this country.

We are here to represent all sections of the community and we will give everybody a fair and proper time to know about this scheme and to have the machinery in operation. I cannot give hon. members any undertaking now that we will have the Scheme implemented by the 1st May, or the 1st June, or the 1st July, or by the 1st of any month; but the Scheme will be implemented next year, it all depends upon how quickly this staff can get through with the mechanics of the implementation of this Scheme. A lot of technical work has to be done, and it depends upon how swiftly this work can be done. We hope to go about the matter quickly and to be able to say that we will start this Social Security Scheme by such-and-such a time. We want to be able to say: "We will start this scheme by such-and-such a time, these are the proposals and this is what we expect of the employers. We want you to put your house in order." Mr. Chairman, this Social Security Scheme is one of the most advanced pieces of social legislation which has ever come to this colony and it must not fail.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Hon. Minister for what he has said. I have no objection to the proposal for these Civil Servants, and it may be that at some future date I may be speaking face to face with the Government in negotiating matters on behalf of Civil Servants. In an office like this, or in new things like these, I know that you must have key people. You are going to appoint a Director at a salary of \$9,120 per annum, you are also appointing an Assistant Director at a salary of \$8,160 per annum and you are also appointing a Senior Accountant at a salary of \$5,328 per annum, and so on. I have no objection to that at all. When you speak of a Secretary, what do you mean by a Secretary? You mean that this is a woman, a Secretary in the sense that she is a Secretary to the Director. I want to say quite frankly that whenever you start these new offices this may be a matter of promotion for somebody. I also want to say, Sir, that you are not going to get any top people at this sort of salary any longer. You are paying a Stenographer at \$120 per month to do what? What quality stenographer do you think you will get at this salary? You can say that you are employing a Stenographer and there may be many in the pool, but when you want a Stenographer you must have a good one. These are some of the problems which I see will arise in the administration of these things. As to the work which comes out from a \$120 a month Stenographer, you know what it will be. I wish you all the best. The Government should look at these salaries which they are paying. A Stenographer is a technician; the work of a Stenographer vis-a-vis that of some other person in the Civil Service is more important. You must have a basic education, and that together with being a good typist is something additional.

If people have the basic qualifications, the Government has to pay these people for this additional technical ability which they must possess. You are either a good Stenographer or you are not, and no basic education will make you one. These salaries are not conducive to getting the best people. The Government will realize that they are losing employees who are among the Secretaries at the top. You cannot have a Secretary to a Minister drawing less than \$300 a month. That is where the Government is losing. As I see it, Sir, the Government Service will become poorer and poorer if this matter is not arrested. That is the problem; it may suit some of us outside because we will draw from these people. These people are not coming back to the Government when you take into consideration what the private people have to offer, I sincerely hope that this Department will not suffer. I know quite well that this is not the immediate concern of the Hon. Minister because the salary structure is the salary structure of the Government Service as a whole. It may be a matter for the Hon. Minister of Finance, but it is a problem which deals with efficiency. If you do not have an efficient staff - you cannot have an efficient staff if the salary is not adequate. This Department is going to be a very important one to this island.

I am very pleased to hear what the Hon. Minister has said about the implementation of the Scheme. An expert from our Organization was in Barbados last week. He knows about this scheme and he recognizes that there will be discussion of these matters before they are actually implemented. Under this Scheme the workers will be making contributions, and therefore workers' representatives will have to be in this matter. Mr. Chairman, I have made my criticism already and I hope that I will not have to make this criticism again. I do not believe that the Government will make the error on this occasion of appointing somebody on a Board like this other than a workers' representative. An Agricultural Corporation without a workers* representative on it is something which is fantastic. I see that a member of my Organization went on leave, and in his place a person who was a former President of the Chamber of Commerce was appointed. I am saying, Sir, that it is a peculiar combination when a Trade Unionist is substituted by a former President of the Chamber of Commerce. 4.10 p.m.

I hope that I will not have to come back and make a criticism about the appointments to Boards. We are quite broad-minded; but if we are conceited we are conceited in something we have a right to be conceited about, and we feel that the workers representatives in their own right have a right to sit on these Boards in order that they can give the masses of people they represent the kind of representation they are deserving of, and I hope that that will be borne in mind.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ensure the hon. member that this Board will consist of representatives of the various interests. The employers will be asked to nominate a member to the Board, the workers' representatives will be asked to nominate its member or members to this Social Security Board, and other interests will be represented on the Board such as the Medical interests and other interests which will have to be taken into consideration in the appointment of the nine members of this Board. I can assure hon. members that all sectors of the economy of this country will be considered when this Board is appointed.

On the question of the Civil Service approach to the question of severance pay, I would like to let the hon. member know that currently my Ministry is discussing with other people concerned the question of severance pay for the people whom the hon. member mentioned a few minutes ago.

The question that Head 41 - Ministry of Trade and Labour stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$37,964 do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965-66 No. 26

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks supplementary provision of \$13,750 for the following reasons so that the plans for the erection of the Stadium in our development of the area at Weymouth may proceed. The tenants on Government owned land have been given notice to quit. The date of expiry of these notices was of course 28th February, 1965, but the owners of the various houses and shops have claimed that they are unable to move or get alternate spots, and it is considered too costly for Government to remove and resite buildings. In view of that the Government proposes to purchase the building at the prices valued by the Housing Authority and negotiated between the Crown Solicitor and the owners, and it is for that reason that this amount of \$13,750 is required. It is also proposed that the buildings should be offered for sale to be demolished and removed by a certain date.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, this is a very laudable move, but I hope it would not be regarded as a precedent, I was a member of the Executive Committee when it was agreed that these people should be given seven years' notice, and I do not like pandering to people in matters in which the public is involved. You give notice to some people to move and they refuse to do anything. I could understand not moving on the grounds that there is no title for the place and nobody to move it, but these people have been living in these houses; so we cannot run a country on the basis that you make a decision to clear a site or sites and some people say they are not moving, and then you get political pressures being used and you have to compensate them for any moving. I passed Weymouth some time ago and I said that in any case it was a disgrace to the City, I thought the hon. Junior member for Bridgetown would have spoken, because if the representatives of Bridgetown look around this City, they would see that housing is gradually becoming disgraceful and needs cleaning up. You talk about the tourist industry, but you still find that houses are continuing to become dilapidated and bad.

The stadium will be a very good thing, but I hope, Mr. Chairman, that when the construction is about to take place that, as it is a very important thing to build, they would call in a lot of people and see that it will be a well-built stadium so that it would provide the facilities that the country requires, and then you can set up a business management to run the stadium and make money, because I am sure that it can make money. Barbados needs an excellent stadium to accommodate the various aspects of sports, and I hope it will be well constructed to provide for football, athletics and other things for which people will pay, because these things have to be supported and the Government should be able to get back some of the money it spends.

I do not know what are the underlying reasons, but I do not like this idea that you give people an opportunity to move and then you are compensating somebody for refusing to move. I do not like that, and I hope it would not be regarded that people can stay long enough for their houses to drop to pieces so that they cannot be moved, and then they are compensated for something through being ignorant and stubborn. I know this is a legacy you have taken on, because this has been going on for nearly ten years now. I support the idea of having the site cleared, and if this is the price which you have to pay to proceed with the stadium, it is not anything that will bankrupt the stadium, because to put up a stadium is going to run into a million dollars with all the facilities that you need to provide. 4.20 p.m.

I feel that this would be a small portion of money, but at the same time, the principle of compensating

these

people is not a good one. I hope before it starts we will see the plans so that we can get an idea of the stadium which I hope is one that would provide us with the facilities that are necessary and at the same time one that would build up income to broad communities.

I feel sure that these sporting organization which will use the stadium will be able to lift their heads above water much better than what they are doing now.

Mr. GODDARD:

Mr. Chairman, from the point of view of location, I hardly think that you can get one better than this at Weymouth which is in the heart of the City, but what I would like to question is the suitability. I hope that they will examine the plans thoroughly before Government embarks on building a stadium there. We know that a stadium has to be a very substantial structure because it has to carry thousands of people. It also has to accommodate other facilities; therefore, it has to be built on good foundation.

I wonder if the Government has made investigation into the suitability of that place. As I have said, it is a suitable location, but as regards the foundation there, I do not know if Government has investigated that matter. All the stadia which I have seen are stadia built to carry about 30,000 to 35,000 people and I think that you should build one to carry 10,000 to 15,000 people, It is a lovely open site, but again the structure should be one which we envisage such a stadium should be,

Mr. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I do think it is necessary to address this Chamber on this matter. The Addendum reads \"In order that the plans for the erection of a stadium and other development of the area at Weymouth may proceed, the tenants on Government-owned land were given notices to quit.\" I take it that the plans for the erection of the stadium are in the hands of the Government

It is rather unfortunate that there has been no consultation with the people in sport because they are the ones to advise the Government in the structure for a stadium. It is true to say that when the last Government was in office, I left almost three years of work on that stadium.

However, in any country such as ours there is a central Council of Sport. I see the former Minister of Sport is smiling, but he knows pretty well, if he consulted the files that he would see that I left the plans for two German stadia which are similar to the stadium in the Brooklyn area of New York. Of course, the Government of Barbados does not have to build a stadium of such proportion.

You have the President of the local branch of the Council of Sport inside this Chamber, and all the other organizations and leaders in sport should have been consulted, and I am sure that you would want to discuss sport with them. Again, the Minister will observe in the file that the former Government held discussions with these sports-men as regards the building of a stadium. I remember, in so far as this stadium is concerned, that I got the knowledge on putting a playing field in the same area. We had very many meetings on the suitability of Weymouth. Now I am on this point, I would like to allay the fears of the hon. Junior member for Christ Church as regards building a stadium there because the architects of today are more advanced than those of thirty years ago. When the people constructed the Combermere School on that site, they had no specialised knowledge on foundations. Nowadays, you construct

buildings across a river: therefore, Weymouth is no trouble as regards that. The amount of 50 or 60 feet of silt is by no means a problem. I do not think you should have any fears about putting an engineering structure there.

The Hon. Minister concerned has come to the House and talked about plans and I think that you want to talk to the people who are in sport. It is alright to enjoy sport from the people who are in sport. It is alright to enjoy sport from the pavilion, but you want to talk about sport with the people in sport; and planning a stadium means a great deal more than the structural design. As I have said, you have an Olympic Committee in Barbados and you should consult

that body. I can remember that we had a number of discussions with that body as to whether or not we would be in a position to send some Barbadians to the Olympic Games, You will remember, Sir, that at that time we sent Mr. Farnum, and for a long time we were wondering if we could get enough money to send a weight-lifter who brought back a Bronze Medal.

We have a bubbling, gurgling Council of Sports where all types of sport are represented on this Committee and that should only be regarded as the voice on sport. 4.30 p.m.

The files will tell all about that if you look at them. It slopes down to about 50 feet of silt and that is going down to the Queen's Park boundary. The only area where we have some soft stone is about two to three feet deep. You would have a good deal of rubbish to remove and there would be quite a lot of sacrifice and loss involved. I do not think that an honest attempt has been made to remove these houses. The Addendum to this Resolution states this:-

"In order that the plans for the erection of a stadium and other development of the area at Weymouth may proceed, the tenants on-Government owned land were given notices to quit. The date of expiry was 28th February, 1965, The owners of the houses and shops which are in a very delapidated condition, have claimed that they are unable to move the houses or to get alternate spots and it is considered too costly to the Government to remove and resite the buildings••

I do not think that any discussion has been taken with anybody as to the erection of this stadium. That is not the proper thing to do. You cannot discuss this plan for the erection of this stadium without having those people who deal with sport and who must make the stadium a success. We have suffered for all of these years at Kensington, and if you want to keep pace with modern development in sport you want to have a discussion with the people who deal with sport. If you are dealing with something which is going to be suspended with a hook, that is all right; but when it comes to the question of the erection of a stadium you would have to deal with people who know something about sport. I have no objection to this Resolution, but when it is stated here that plans for the erection of a stadium and other development of the area at Weymouth are to proceed, I am submitting that these plans should be released all over this island for discussion and examination and be shown in theatres and on TV. I think we should have a good deal of discussion in this matter.

You may not accept all the recommendations which are put forward, but you should have a Committee to advise you as to the erection of this stadium. Most of these respectable old gentlemen have played an

active part on these Committees. You have several members of this House who have devoted their years to sport, and when a person without sport he is indeed poor. I am very sorry about that. It appears to me that no further consideration will be given to this matter, that you will just remove these buildings and proceed with the erection of this stadium. I am told that the Jaycees will support the erection of this stadium, but I am saying that the decision of what the stadium should look like is a matter for people who are actively engaged in sport.

Mr. CORBIN:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution which is now before us is a Resolution for the sum of \$13,750 and the Addendum reads as follows -

"In order that the plans for the erection of a Stadium and other development of the area at Weymouth may proceed, the tenants on Government owned land were given notices to quit. The date of expiry was 28th February, 1965. The owners of the houses and shops, which are in a very dilapidated condition, have claimed that they are unable to move the buildings or get alternate spots, and it is considered too costly to Government to remove and resite the buildings.

"As the tenants have done nothing to remove the houses, it is proposed to purchase the buildings at the prices valued by the Housing Authority and negotiated between the Crown Solicitor and the owners, and this amount is required for the purpose. It is also proposed that the buildings should be offered for sale to be demolished and removed by a certain date."

What I want to know is this: The Government owns this land and these buildings are on the land, it is too costly for the Government to remove them. It is not that the Government has land somewhere else which they can offer people to resite their houses at a small cost instead of our having to pay \$13,750 for the very houses and now we have to demolish and remove them? I cannot understand that. I think that the Government could better rent these people spots and let them take their houses there. Why is it that we have to pay this money for these houses and then we have to pay to demolish them? I repeat, Sir, I cannot understand that, if I am wrong I would like to be corrected, but I really believe that the Government should rent these people spots of land, which is something more easily done than what it is proposed to do in this Resolution. The Addendum to the Resolution states that these people cannot find any spots on which to place their houses, and if the Government could find it possible to rent these people spots on which to place their houses the Government would save some money.

Mr. Chairman, if I had land today and I sold it to anyone and I was renting other people spots, by the time that the person to whom I sold the land got the right of way from me, these people would have to be given notice to remove their houses. We know that the Government will not demolish the houses and put them against the street, but the Government has land available which they could rent these people and let them place their houses on these spots on the payment of a small rental. That is what I think the Government should do. We have purchased the land, we have purchased the wooden buildings. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with this Resolution; I shall not vote for it.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution which is for the sum of \$13,750 is in connection with the preparation which is due prior to the erection of a proposed stadium. I am not going to oppose this Resolution and I quite see the predicament which the Government is in. They are valuing these houses and at the same

time they are going to offer the houses for sale to be demolished. 4.40 p.m.

As a matter of fact, in this day and age very little is going to be recoverable by Government from resale of such dilapidated houses, because the habits of the inhabitants of this Island have so changed that there is very little wood used as fuel. Almost everybody uses oil. Fifteen or seventeen years ago the Government would be in a position to recover something from the sale of these houses by demolishing them; people would buy the old lumber and burn some of it; but today you will not get much of it being used as fuel. I do not know how much would be recoverable from people who want to buy and use them as pens and things like that. Maybe some people would buy them for that, because they have to be demolished on the site. These people have refused to move to Government-owned land, but the precedent has been set up by preceding Governments. Governments have in the past been lending money to people who were about to move to Government sites and to effect incidental repairs due to moving. I do not think that the ex-Minister near to me wants to contradict that this has been done over and over again, and the moment we do these things, we will have to continue doing them.

Mr. Chairman, I am not criticising the Government for having to do this sort of thing, and that is why I said I am going to vote for the Resolution I regret they cannot re-cover much from the sale of these buildings by demolishing them on the site, but they realise they are already committed to spending this money, and there is a faint hope that a little may be recovered.

This Resolution, Mr. Chairman, has given us the intimation of the decision to erect a stadium, and I take it it is going to be a national stadium. (Mr. WALCOTT: An international Stadium.) The hon. member says it is going to be an international stadium, which means that it will not only be for sportsmen of your country, but other nationals, and although I used to refer jokingly to the hon. Junior member for St. George as the stadium Minister, it is true to say that the idea of erecting a stadium was in his mind, heart and soul. There are many other individuals in Barbados in prominent positions in the sporting world, and no less an individual than the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who is on my right, and I am rather surprised that he is not so knowledgeable about the intentions to build a national--or international stadium, as someone has referred to it - in the very near future. Maybe they are to be informed. There are those who agitate for international sports and those who organise local sports activities; maybe they are to be informed. At this stage I do not think that an intimation is enough. Maybe somebody would tell me that the engineer has been informed and his advice has been sought and that is enough at this stage. I do not think that this debate in Committee should come to an end without our having the privilege of hearing the hon. junior member for Bridgetown, because I think he is the man of the moment when it comes to talking about sports in this country, being President of the Olympic Association, The hon. junior member for St. George to whom I have made reference has got what he had to say off his chest, but this is really a very innocent, harmless and inoffensive way of introducing this idea to us of erecting a national stadium, I think they should be a little more approbation about this sort of thing and we should be hearing more and more about it. Those interests should have a better intimation before today about the intention by Government to erect a sports stadium.

I have no criticism to make about the spending of \$13,750. I have only made an explanation. I see the Government's predicament and I am in sympathy with them, because a precedent has been established. People have been loaned money to move to Government sites, but have refused to do so, and Government has come in and bought the places and is going to sell them on the site to be demolished. I regret that little or nothing will be recovered from such a sale.

Mr, LYNCH:

Mr, Chairman, I for one have no quarrel about the choice of the site for the proposed stadium as it is bound inevitably to carry up the value of land on its periphery; so I would not want to quarrel with it. What I would like to ask, however, of the Minister responsible is that before plans for the proposed stadium be finalised, he should consult people who have to do with the organisation and running of sports in this Island, I am not making any reference to myself, because I do not look about for work to do, but there are several people who will feel considerably and deeply offended if the Government does not consult them, if even it does not care to heed their advice, as to the plans for this proposed stadium. I would also like to sound a warning note as to the construction of this stadium, because I can well remember one particular moment, when they had a jerry-built school on the particular site, the masters and boys left through windows not caring where they landed, and wicked people went about saying that this thing had been erected with sand which was innocent of any admixture of cement; so it would seem as if the site is one where considerable care has to be taken in the construction of the proposed stadium which will hold several thousands of people.

Time was when there was a Council of sport in the Is-land; there were two representatives from each of the major sports which are engaged in in this Island, but for some strange reason the present Government did not care to continue with the idea, because they were not the initiators of it; but it was a good thing, as I have pointed out to the Minister previously. People who are engaged in the organisation of sports should have some say whenever Government proposes in its wisdom to assist sporting bodies in this Island. 4.50 p.m.

It is passing strange that there is not one sporting organization in this Island which so far has been consulted with by the Government as to the drawing out of the plans of this sports stadium. Rumour has gone around that a man who was passing through the Island peeped in at a wicket gate and ever since then, he has been an authority on the stadium, I do not know if this is so or not.

Mr, Chairman, I would make an appeal that the sport-ing body should be consulted as to the allocation of space for the various games, as to the configuration of the grounds for physical sport, as to the consultation on technical matters on which the Minister may not be too familiar and to which the engineer who is appointed to build the stadium may not be altogether quite aware of and so on,

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that we in Barbados consider ourselves the best architects. We are also our own doctors and like members of the Party on the opposite side, we are even our own executioners; but when we get allegedly responsible persons, such as the hon. junior member for St. George getting up and suggesting and giving Government all sorts of advice as to soil structure and the hon. junior member for the City of Bridge-town informing us that one Minister passed through a wicket gate on his way to Florida and ever since then he has been an authority on sport, it takes the cake. The Minister is myself and I would like to inform the hon. member that I saw stadia long before he passed the streets of Rome on the occasion of the last Olympic Games. I would like to assure the hon. member that if he can prevail upon the members of his Association to re-elect him as president, he will be appointed to the Advisory Committee,

Mr. LYNCH:

Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. There is no fear of my being re-elected to office in any of the organizations to which I belong.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I doubt whether the hon. member is on a point of order or a point of explanation. Anyhow, I gave way to him.

Firstly, I would like to deal with the frustrated engineers. When I say frustrated, I use that word for want of a more apt term, I refer to the engineers who wanted to give out so much advice. Long before we began to build a stadium we had a soil-bearing test carried out by the same firm which has carried out soil bearing tests for the Financial Building next door and the Hilton Hotel at Greavesend which are the two heaviest and tallest buildings in Barbados. The site on which the Financial Building on the opposite site is being built is one on which a previous building fell down, and in the case of the Hilton Hotel site, we had a shooting range there where middle-aged gentlemen prostrated themselves on Saturday afternoons. It was also a cholera ground.

Combermere school which was at Weymouth has been shifted to Waterford, and the predicament of the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown is that after he was pressed for accommodation in his own school, he had access to the Weymouth playing ground and now finds himself deprived of the free access to the Government playing ground.

Sometime ago, the hon. member introduced a Bill for aid to Private Secondary Schools and I can tell him now that we are providing him with a playing field so long as he is able to get the children there. The Sports Officer has been in the habit of using Weymouth grounds for sport. I do not think any mention has been made today of the plans which we have for the displaced clubs which were in the habit of using Weymouth. However, the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown can allay himself of any fears which he holds about being deprived of the use of Weymouth so long as he can provide transportation for the children.

I am not of the opinion that a busy thoroughfare is suitable for this kind of activity. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that you have taken your school to more sequestered quarters. However, Sir, we are providing playing fields at Blenheim My Lords Hill, where the Government has acquired 14 acres of land. It is about twice the space of Weymouth and we are providing four full-sized football grounds and two cricket pitches there. Only two days ago I issued instructions for the purchase of two acres of land so as to provide more land in case we are pressed for space for car parking. Therefore, the hon. Junior member for Bridgetown will have considerable more space for a playing field than what he had at Weymouth,

The plans for this national stadium have been drawn up and the model has actually been built in consultation with persons whose acquaintance with stadium construction is a little less vocal than those who enjoy the right to attend the Olympic Games, We have obtained advice from qualified engineers and from Venezuelan experts and we have got some time- saving and money- saving advice from Venezuela. The Director of Highways and Transport is coordinating in this work. I, myself, have visited every stadium in Puerto Rico And the one in Jamaica and His Excellency the High Commissioner for Jamaica in the neighboring colony of Trinidad, has visited the site on Saturday and has also rendered us free, valuable advice.

This is the first Government in this Island that did not arrogate to itself the technical knowledge and wisdom which have caused the collapse of so many Government edifices. We have used structural engineers and we have also employed an engineer to carry out soil-bearing tests. We have used to the fullest extent our own local overseas trained people who are highly qualified and highly dedicated engineering staff in the Public Works Department and elsewhere. 5.00 p.m.

I am satisfied, therefore, that we do not really need the advice of the unlicensed experts on the other side of the House. I regret that they consider that the Government can only function when the initiative is handed over to those people whose only propensity is to advertise themselves in the daily columns of the Press which they control. I will give you an example of what happened fifteen months ago when we were dealing with this matter. This was on the 21st January, 1964. This is not any new scheme which has been hatched, and it is true to say that it did not take seven years to see the light of day like the scheme which was postulated by the hon. junior member for St. George. On the 21st January we set up a Central Planning Committee, and we had several discussions and it was considered that this whole area should be used for a stadium. We made our plans for the Halls Road Corner, and the Crown Solicitor was given instructions to negotiate for the purchase of the properties at the Gully House Corner. The Town and Country Planning Officer was to make use of the adjoining properties. We have acquired that property which was owned by a cabinet maker. The tenants would be required to give up possession of the land in accordance with the notices which had received several years ago. All of this has been done; we have not only acquired the properties around the Gully House Corner but we have demolished them. We have acquired property to the Southern end of Weymouth, and we have made arrangements for the Transport Board to occupy the premises now occupied by the Housing Authority. We have had consultation with those persons whom we consider to be fit and proper persons to advise us in the Government of Barbados, and not the people who volunteer to give their unlicensed advice.

In answer to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, it is clear to us that the hon. member came in here to go against something which he cannot decide and he has to find out what it is he wants to go against. He has gone out-side to find out what it is that he wants to go against. If the hon. member had only read the Addendum to the Resolution, he would have been able to see what is set out there. The hon. member has suggested that we should find spots on which to place these people's houses not realising that the Government was purchasing the buildings from the owners. There are only two of the buildings at Weymouth which are occupied at the present moment; all the other buildings are rather dilapidated. Because of the land tenure system in Barbados - I may say that these people have had notices

to quit for about ten consecutive years and these buildings were owned by landlords who do not live on the premises and most of these places were business premises. You cannot remove dilapidated buildings and put them in our housing estates. What we did say sometime ago was that we were not prepared to eject these tenants through the Court. Further-more, we ourselves intended to introduce legislation to prevent these tenants from being ejected. That was done sixteen months afterwards and therefore we cannot pass this legislation and then immediately afterwards eject these tenants. There is no place for resiting these dilapidated buildings on Government lands or at all. It is a costly business at Delamere Land. We have not been able to estimate the cost of this because the owners of land have not agreed with the Government on a price. This is one of the iniquities of the mal-distribution of land in Barbados.

Mr, Chairman, we have had a survey carried out to find out exactly the kind of people who live on the land and what the value of the houses will be. I have also directed that those who claim that they cannot afford to remove their houses or find spots on which to place them, should be paid for the houses and then the houses should be demolished and sold, and no accommodation would be provided for shops or business places. Those who were unable to find spots for their houses should be offered new houses for rental or houses should be purchased by the Housing Authority. What I am pointing out to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is this; we cannot buy houses for persons; we cannot recommend that these houses which are on Government land should be bought for houses to occupy these spots again. The amount of money which has been set out here is slightly more than the aggregate of the prices quoted by the owners of these buildings so that in no case is any one being under-paid for his home.

Last year I gave instructions to the effect that these people should be given a year's notice to quit again, and that is the reason why our stadium has not yet been erected. However, Sir, we must get on with the erection of our stadium because we hope to celebrate our National Independence in this country and this has got to be done in a very short time. 5.10 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you cannot invite people and then take them to Carlton Club at Black Rock because that is not indicative of our status. We should not be looking for a lodging from Pickwick Club, Wanderers, Empire or Spartans at Queens Park. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew was not aware that we have actually offered new dwelling houses to those displaced tenants. They will have money in their pockets which I suggest they pay down as a deposit under our new housing policy of not creating tenancies, but of selling houses to householders, and they need only pay about \$300. As far as I can remember, there is one person with a shop who is supposed to be getting \$300 and another lady who has two places, one worth \$700 and the other \$200, but all the rest are getting over \$750; so they are in an excellent position to go in and pay a substantial deposit; Those who live in their own houses can pay a sub-stantial deposit to the Housing Authority and we have given them priority; so there is no question of any one being displaced, because they can move right away into premises which are far more presentable than the ones they would be leaving; so they would be getting the best of both worlds. I can only say that the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is susceptible of probably two hypotheses, the first one is that he has not read the Addendum and the other one is that he has come in here and does not know what the Resolution says. If in this day and age we are still going to have people who do not take a more active interest in the affairs which they are sent here to conduct, it is no fault of ours. As far as the hon. Junior member for St. Peter who has spoken is concerned, he has talked about an international stadium.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order, when I used the word "International", I was simply reflecting on what I heard in an aside. I was sticking to the word "National" and I adopted it, though not seriously; but I still say that it could be called an international stadium since there will be athletes from other countries.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I see that the hon. junior member for St. Peter has taken unto himself a new colleague.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

On a point of order, the hon. member who made the aside was not the hon. member on my immediate

left, but the hon. senior member for St. Peter,

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member in his national aspirations was quite justified, As far as the size of the swimming pool which will be built south of the stadium is concerned, it will be a full-sized Olympic pool, and therefore international competitions can be held there. As far as the running track and the cycling track are concerned, they would also conform with international standards, but they cycling track, the swimming pool and the running track conforming to international standards would no more make the stadium qualify as an international stadium than Cave Hill would qualify as the site for a World Fair, for the simple reason that you will have to have the physical accommodation if you are going to stage international sports. We must provide facilities for the athletes and those taking part, and then we can extend and improve the facilities for spectators and the other people like the President of the Olympic Association and myself ,because the athletes must come first, and therefore you must give them all the facilities which are conducive to proper training for competition outside.

This is the main object of erecting a national stadium; so the hon. member must be gratified to learn that we have provided alternative accommodation in the first instance at My Lords Hill. We have already paid for it and I do not understand why it has not come to the notice of the House before. We have purchased additional land at Weymouth for car parking facilities and we have recently given instructions for the purchase of additional land at My Lords Hill I understand from the Minister of Community Development that the land at Blenheim is actually being prepared. The canes have been cut and used as fodder for the Livestock Station at the Pine, so that sometime early in January or February the schools and others will be able to make use of the playing field up there, I cannot remember whether there were other points raised by hon. members, so that if I have not answered them, it is not an act of discourtesy, but merely forgetfulness on my part,

Mr. LYNCH:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to set the re-cord straight. The last speaker made great play of saying that they had provided me with a play ground for my school, but I think that the former Ministry of Community Development can inform him that I applied on several occasions to use Weymouth, and on each occasion I have been denied. A school established long years afterwards uses Weymouth as a play ground; so that is a blatant case of nepotism to which I have never made unofficial or official complaint, I could not let him get away with that, which, you know, is very far from the truth.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should also mention that his school still has got play grounds and therefore the facilities at Weymouth had to be granted not on grounds of nepotism at all, but to those institutions which have attributed to the national sport that has made Barbados famous, and not to the indoor recreational exercises which only enrich the promoters.

Mr. LYNCH:

Mr. chairman I would have the last speaker know that all who represent Barbados come from the school to which he is referring. I do not know if he calls it indoor recreational exercises, but every Barbados representative barring two have come from that school. It is impossible to play cricket on the grounds that we have, and so we applied for permission to play cricket at Weymouth. This was denied, but it was granted to another school which also had no grounds to play cricket. If that is not nepotism I

do not know what it is.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$13,750 do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

\$.20 p.m.

On motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported according

STATEMENT BY PREMIER ON THE SOUTHERN RHODESIAN SITUATION

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Minister of Finance who wants to receive leave of the House to make a statement.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the Statement is as follows- Consequent on the Unilateral Declaration of Independence by the former Government of Southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom Government has condemned the act as illegal and has declared that it will have no dealings with the rebel Southern Rhodesian regime.

2. The United Kingdom Government early this morning imposed economic sanctions on Rhodesia and has invited parallel action by dependent territories on the various measures initiated by the United Kingdom,

3.

4. These measures include:-

5.

(1)a ban on the export of arms including spares; (2) the cessation of all British aid;

(3) the removal of Southern Rhodesia from the Sterling area,

(4)

(5) the application of exchange control restrictions;

(6)

(7) a ban on the export of United Kingdom capital to Rhodesia;

(8)

(9) withdrawal of access to the London Capital market;

(10)

(7) withdrawal of the facilities of the Export Credit Guarantee;

(8) suspension, of the Ottawa Agreement of 1932 which governs British trading relations with Southern Rhodesia;

(9)

(10) suspension from the Commonwealth Preference Area and the withdrawal of preferential treatment to her goods;

(11)

(12) a ban on purchases of tobacco;

(13)

(11)suspension from the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement and a ban on purchases of sugar;

(12) non- recognition of passports issued or renewed by the illegal Rhodesian regime.

4. Barbados has little trade with Southern Rhodesia the most significant item during the last four years being unmanufactured tobacco. The Government proposes, subject to the necessary Orders being made to introduce a ban on all trade with Rhodesia including transhipment trade.

5.

6. From the Ministry of Finance I have today issued directives to the commercial Bulks regarding exchange control measures which have the following consequences:-

7.

(1) Rhodesian £s become a foreign currency and dealings are restricted;

(2)

(3) Accounts of residents of Rhodesia become Rhodesian accounts and all credits and debits are subject to permission of the Ministry of Finance;

(4)

0) Securities payable in Rhodesia £s become foreign currency securities unless they are also payable

in a currency of the Scheduled Territories in which case they remain sterling securities;

(4) Transactions in securities payable in Rhodesian £s are restricted;

(5)

(6) Transactions in gold and treasury bills are restricted;

(7)

(8) Loan and overdraft facilities to residents of Rhodesia are withdrawn.

(9)

6. This Government Joins with the rest of the civilised world in condemning the recalcitrant racist Rhodesian regime in their denial of basic human rights to the indigenous African population of Rhodesia and is confident that it has the full support of this Honourable House and the community in imposing the restrictions outlined above. (Cheers),

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, --

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I was about to move the suspension of the Sitting and I now beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. Mr. CRAWFORD Mr. Speaker, as regards -

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member referring to the motion \"That the sitting of this House be suspended for half an hour?\"

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Sir, Normally, a Minister has the right to make a Statement at anytime during the sitting of the House under rules of the House.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On what basis is the hon. member proceeding to say that? Before us is a motion to suspend the Sitting of the House and if no objection is taken, the Sitting is

automatically suspended. There is no debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not debating the motion. All that I am observing is this.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, a motion for the suspension is automatic; a motion for the adjournment is different. A motion for the adjournment is moved for you to meet at a certain date. We are only suspending the sitting now because we intend to continue and there must be an objection to the suspension, If there is no objection, you do not debate the motion for the suspension.

May I remind Your Honour that in some cases you do not put the suspension of the sitting as a motion. You automatically suspend the sitting. 5.30 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is a motion before the House that this sitting be now suspended. It is a matter to be voted on but, it is not a motion which - in this Chamber - I have ever known to be debated. There may be, or there may not be, a debate on this motion and a vote taken on it. The purpose of this motion at this time is to enable hon. members to have a break, Standing Orders have been suspended. That as I understand it, is the only reason for the motion which is now before the House; it is for the purpose of accomodating hon. members and the Staff of the House. I would be quite willing to give the matter further consideration for the future, and to rule whether there can or cannot be a debate on a motion for the suspension of the sitting. As the position is now, I propose to put the motion that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour. Hon. members in favour of that will please say \"Aye\", hon. members against will please say \"No\". I think the \"Ayes\" have it. Accordingly, I declare this sitting to be now suspended for half an hour from now.

This sitting now stands suspended.

On reassembling,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the fact that there is the absence of a quo-rum and I request that the bell be rung,

Mr. SPEAKER:

I thank the Hon. Minister for drawing that matter to my attention. Let the bell be rung.

On the bell being rung, a quorum was obtained. LEAVE TO GIVE NOTICE OF A RESOLUTION

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, earlier today you intimated that you would allow some hon. members, subject to the leave of the House being granted, to proceed with some other matters and there was a Resolution which

I had drafted to deal with a matter and, subsequently, a Statement was made by the Hon. Premier. I am asking leave of the House to give notice of the Resolution which I have submitted, and owing to the emergency and nature of the matter of the Resolution, I am asking leave that it be dealt with today. This Resolution deals with the unilateral declaration of Independence which the Government of Rhodesia has illegally made. I am asking leave to give notice of this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking leave of the House to give notice of this Resolution, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted, (After a pause) There being no objection, leave is granted Let the hon. member proceed to give notice of the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution reads as follows -

WHEREAS the Government of Rhodesia has illegally made a unilateral declaration of Independence:

AND WHERE AS the said declaration in effect establishes the rule of a minority of 220,000 white people over a majority of over 4 million Africans, expressly violating the Democratic principle of one man vote;

AND WHEREAS the said declaration is repugnant to the principle of democracy as laid down in the charter of the United Nations and the declaration of human rights;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to forward an immediate protest through Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Government of Rhodesia condemning its illegal action, and con-firming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government as a penalty,

Mr. Speaker, as I have already intimated, in view of the urgency of this matter, I am asking leave to deal with this Resolution at a later stage today,

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

I assured the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that at a later stage in today's sitting I would give him the opportunity to give notice of his question.

Mr. BATSON:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is Government aware that the beaches around the Island require Beach Inspectors if proper sanitation and decency are to be maintained?

(2) Is Government also aware that by so doing a better attraction will be established for the Tourists and others frequenting the said beaches?

(3)

(4) If the answers to the above are in the affirmative, will the Minister explore the possibility of going into the matter with a view to putting the request into effect in the not too distant future?

(5)

Mr. SPEAKER; The hon. senior member for St. Joseph may now put his Questions:-

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister-

Is Government aware of the hardships, experienced by young women in the parish of Saint Joseph who would like to be trained as domestics owing to the fact that there is no training centre in the said Parish?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative will Government consider the possibility of operating a Centre at one of the Schools in the said Parish?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Left the hon. member proceed to give notice of his other question.

Mr. COWARD:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Appropriate Minister-

Is Government aware of the difficulties experienced by the people in the Orange Hill - Braggs Hill area there being no water main between Clement Rock-Braggs Hill?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider the question of extending the water main from Clement Rock to Braggs Hill?

PROPOSED RULING re SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, may I remind Your Honour of the Ruling which you proposed to give In relation to the motion for the suspension of the sitting?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am grateful to me hon. member for reminding me of that. I will give that ruling at the next meeting of the House when I will have an opportunity to give the matter my fullest consideration. I will acquaint the House of the result of my researches.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

6.15 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1965-66 No. 28

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Chairman, I think that hart members of this Committee will recall that early in this calendar year the House was made aware of certain policy decisions which had been taken with respect to the conditions of work of certain categories of teachers. Among those decisions was of course the decision about vacation pay for acting teachers, a policy which we instituted after considerable attention had been given to the problem, representations made and discussions held with the Teachers' Association. When the Estimates were made up, an amount of \$119,944 was provided under Head 35 (5) to pay salaries of acting teachers, but this amount proved inadequate for several reasons. In the first instance the amount provided to pay salaries and vacation pay to 1st April was at that time under estimated, and secondly since the beginning of the current school year, September 1965, there has been an increase on the roll of pupils into primary schools; consequently additional teachers were required. The House will be glad to know that 94 per cent of the persons employed as acting teachers are those who attended the induction course which we held in July and August this year.

I think it is a good thing, Mr. Chairman, that Government has been able to offer such large scale employment to 250 or nearly 300 young people who have been recruited into the teaching service, and it is our hope that it may stay there. There is an increase in the number of teachers granted various forms of leave for whom substitutes are required, For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, it is esti-mated that an additional amount of \$159,768 would be adequate to pay salaries to the end of the financial year, and it is for mat reason that supplementary provision under Head 35 (5) Item 4 is being sought.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy about this Resolution. I was in no doubt that adequate pro vision would be made early for teachers as outlined in this Resolution. It is for that reason that not long ago I asked a question in respect of some of them. This Resolution shows clearly that the Government, unlike what some per-sons think, regards teachers as a professional body; and though I am not in any way attempting to make any excuse for anyone, it is sometimes a question of administrative omission that certain provisions or certain tilings are not done at the moment when most persons would look forward to seeing them done. When I asked the question concerning those teachers who had attended the induction classes and had not been getting their salaries, there was a general feeling that these teachers were put on and they was no money for them. I asked the question, knowing that the matter might not

have been brought to the attention of the appropriate authorities. When I discovered that last Tues-day was a holiday, I fel that this Resolution would have been a week late. I had confidence that the teachers would not have been put to any undue suffering, and it was not a matter of not regarding the services of the teachers. I made no apology for raising matters of such nature, especially if they are not brought to the Minister\'s attention, and I am very glad that at an early time the teacher\'s fears have been allayed, and they are not, as people regard them, the lowest type of workers.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$159,768 do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirma-tive without division.

RESOLUTION re CHRISTMAS LOANS TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, this is now the fifth year that the Government will be making provision for the advance of salary or wages to persons employed in the Government service in this Island before the Christmas season. The amount of money involved is \$310,000 which would be recoverable by 31st March, the end of the financial year. All members of the established staff and casual employees who would normally continue to be employed by Government to the end of the financial year on 31st March, 1966, and other Government employees who receive month-ly salaries shall be eligible for advances of wages and or salaries at Christmas time, 1965, in addition to wages and or salaries normally receivable by them for the appropriate period on the following basis

In the case of the unestablished and casual staff an advance equivalent to twice the net weekly earnings receivable by them during any average week in the period of eight weeks immediately preceding the date of payment 6.25 p.m.

In the case of other Government employees an advance equivalent to 50% of the net salary receivable by them for the month of December, 1965 where the salary does not exceed \$150 per month; and where the salary exceeds \$150 per month, an advance of 25% of the net salary receivable by them for the month of December, 1965 or \$75 whichever is greater. Therefore, in the case of monthly paid workers in no case will the amount advanced be more than \$75.

There is very good reason for this. For those people receiving more than \$400 per month, it would mean that a considerable amount of their salary would have to be taken out in repaying the amount borrowed in me short period of three months before the end of the financial year. No deductions will be made from the salary of Government employees before Christmas.

We have made provision this year that the advances made may be payable at any time before the 15th December.

It is possible that some people would receive their advance from the first week in December, but nobody should be paid later then 15th December. In no case shall any deductions be made before January 1966.

This is now the fifth anniversary of the introduction of Christmas loans to Government employees and I therefore beg to move that this Resolution for the sum not exceeding \$310,000 be now passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CARMICHAEL:

Sir, there is no doubt that this is a very laudable matter, and I am sure that many persons in the Government Service will avail themselves of this privilege. I can assure the Hon. Minister in charge that the added convenience this year, by making it possible for such persons to get the loan any time up to the 15th December, as outlined by the Hon. Premier, would be very much appreciated.

I hope one of these days that it will not be necessary at this time of the year for the House to be passing this money and that provision would be made where a certain sum of money would be put into the Estimates so that such persons who avail themselves of this opportunity will have a somewhat longer period to repay the loan.

The question that the Resolution for a sum not exceeding \$310,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

RESOLUTION re THE BARBADOS HARBOURS ACT; 1960

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the day under Government Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

This Order stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, The Hon. Minister of Communications, and it is to move the passing of the following Resolution Resolution to approve, under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960, the sum of \$11,427 required to supplement the Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1965-66 as shown in the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL:

Mr. Speaker, at the time when the Deep Water Harbour was completed, it was intended that camera facilities should be provided for the workers, but it was not found possible to do so at the time. The Port

Department has agreed to meet the cost and a watchman is paid from the funds of the Port Department.
6.35 p.m.

It is now proposed that the compound including the Kitchen and other facilities should be rented to the Barbados Workers' Union. The Union proposes to operate a can-teen. It is proposed that the conditions of the rental of the compound will be as follows:- The cost of electricity, water, gas, telephone etc., is to be met by the tenant. The cleanliness of the area, including the toilets, shall be the responsibility of the tenant; the structural maintenance of the building shall be the responsibility of the Port Department, The furniture for the canteen in the workers hall is to be provided by the Barbados Workers' Union and the Employers' Federation through an arrangement made by

them. The cost of the renovation of the building to provide for the kitchen with basic fittings, additional toilet facilities; and any attendant alterations is to be met from Port Funds.

Mr. Speaker, this is something which has been long overdue. This sum of \$11,427 is for the purpose already mentioned. Additional toilet facilities will cost \$1,670; sliding door and partition wall will cost \$1,260; tiling or floor \$3,000.00; installing windows \$690; installing ceiling fans, \"\$350; kitchen fittings, \$1,787; septic tank, \$2,400. It will be necessary, therefore, to seek supplementary provision for the purpose of carrying out this work, and for this purpose funds will be made available from the Development Fund which at the 1st April, 1965, stood at \$278,356.48.

In view of what I have stated here today and in view of the necessity for the provision of this Workers' canteen, the Harbour Advisory Board has approved of the expenditure for this project. With those remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$11,427 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that every one will expect me to say how glad I am that we have reached an agreement on this very long outstanding issue. I think this matter has passed through the hands of all the Ministers of the Government and now it has finally wended its way into this Chamber by my good friend and colleague, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. The matter started with the first Minister of Communications and Works, then it went into the hands of the second Minister of Communications and Works and now it is before us. This will help the facilities at the Port. It was intended at the very beginning that these Port Workers should have this compound because we want to raise the standard of living of the workers of this colony generally, and not to be peddling in the old days where the Port Workers had their metal cans, and so on, with their meals. The days of the skillet will have become a memory. We feel that this sort of facility will enable the Port Workers to be provided with decent facilities for eating, and it will also enable the taxi drivers and the employers as well as the Union Jointly to come together. As a matter of fact, it has enabled them to come together. This is the sort of effort which I would like to see in more of our economic and official endeavours.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest pleasure in supporting the motion for the passing of this Resolution, and more so in being able to speak on it as having been introduced by my honourable friend and colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas who was an erstwhile Trade Unionist.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that. The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION re UNILATERAL DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF RHODESIA

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr, Speaker, earlier today I gave notice that it was my intention to move the passing of a Resolution of which I gave notice earlier in the day, and I shall now proceed to read it for the benefit of hon. members. The Resolution is not in the same text as when I gave notice of it today. It now reads thus-

WHEREAS the former Government of Rhodesia has il-legally made a unilateral declaration of Independence;

AND WHEREAS the said declaration in effect established the rule of a minority of 220,000 white people over a majority of 4 million Africans, expressly violating the principles laid down in the charter of the United Nations and the declaration of human rights;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to forward an immediate protest through Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies condemning the illegal action and racial policy of the former Government and confirming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government as a penalty.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Does the Hon. member propose after the second "AND WHEREAS" to go on

Mr. WALCOTT:

There will not be any second "AND WHERE AS". 6.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the second paragraph of the Resolution will be deleted and then it will go on to read:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to forward an immediate protest through Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies condemning the illegal action and racial policy of the former Government and confirming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government as a penalty."

Mr. Speaker, I regret that hon. members have had to be subjected to these corrections because we did not have time to have it done before, and we have had to do the drafting on our feet. The important thing

however, Mr. Speaker, is not so much the text of the Resolution, but the feelings we want to express following what has taken place in Southern Rhodesia, and this follows the statement made by the Hon. Premier earlier today. Several international organisations have taken this action, and the I.C.F.T.U., on which I have the honour to represent the West Indies, made a statement condemning this unilateral declaration of independence in Southern Rhodesia.

Those of us who have visited Africa and have seen at first hand the condition of the Africans living in their own country, know what it is like. When I speak on these matters, I am not speaking on matters which have been drawn to my attention by someone else or by reading; I saw the stark situation quite vividly.

I remember some years ago I said there were three places I did not want to go or even land there in an aero-plane; one was Miami, one was Bermuda and the other was Johannesburg, because for me to go to these places, I might as well not be going anywhere.

For some time this question in Rhodesia has been looming, and the British Government should come out quite clearly and boldly. I introduce this Resolution with some reservation, because I feel that a Prime Minister is forced at times to make a compromise. I had the good fortune to be in London on the 1st and 2nd of this month on the return of Mr. Wilson from Rhodesia. I went into the House of Commons on the day he made the Statement, and heard the full Statement made by him. It was a very forceful Statement, also made on television, which reminded me very much of our own Premier in fighting what appears to be a very difficult battle, and he had the unanimous support of the House of Commons. But running through the Statement and through Britain was this feeling - after the Archbishop of Canterbury made his speech with regard to using force in Rhodesia if it were necessary that it was to some people unthinkable to use force in Southern Rhodesia against the whites in defence of the Africans. I was glad I was there, but I was amazed to hear some people in Britain trying to castigate the Archbishop for making such a statement. It is this sort of outrageous behaviour - where the white settlers living in Black Africa are treating the Africans in the manner that the Southern Rhodesians want to treat the Africans -- that has caused many people to have reservations in supporting the British action. I believe it is true to

say that the powers of the world are, in the majority of cases, white powers, and in order for the British Government to get the support of many of these other Governments, it is necessary for them to be cautious and not use force in this matter; but there are those of us who remember that force was used in Kenya to suppress what was known as the Mau Mau and there was the suspension of British Guiana's Constitution, while here in Southern Rhodesia it looked at one time as if the British Government was going very softly with Mr. Ian Smith. To any political thinker it would be regarded that the British Government played with the situation, because the man was determined to do this unless they took a strong hand. The British Government did not intend to take a strong hand; they were just like a case where you feel a man can beat you, but you are going to let him hit you first in order that you can get a chance to defend yourself. They knew he was going to do it.

Mr, Speaker, Governments sometimes find themselves in these unfortunate positions. We live in a plural society too; we have a white minority in Barbados, one that has economic and financial power; but there is one good thing, and it is that that minority can demonstrate in Barbados that we have a clear manifestation that we can have these differences, but we can live together; and we have shown that we

have lived together for many years and will continue to do so.

There is this superficial objection to people based on colour, and I will say this to members of this Chamber: I was very alarmed when I heard that Mr. Wilson has no intention of giving Africans the vote. He says he does not see that he can give every man \"one man one vote\" in Southern Rhodesia now. He may have very good reasons. He has been there and has seen the backwardness of the country where you still have people living in slavery, and you have to appreciate that uneducated people cannot run a Government. It has to be run by educated people. You cannot have a Government run by idiots; you cannot have a Civil Service run by people who cannot read or write. 6.55 p.m.

We have to admit that uneducated people cannot run a government; a government has to be run by educated people. You cannot have a legal service run by people who are not legally trained; you must have people who are trained in these things. These are some of the problems which they have created for themselves in Africa. I have heard all of these reservations from the horse's mouth,

I understand that Mr. Harold Wilson is not going to use force, and that the only way you are going to see force used in Southern Rhodesia is when the whites begin to shoot the blacks and when the blacks begin to eat the whites. For that reason it looks as if the battle is going to be a long one because we do not know the amount of reserves that the Rhodesians have.

Then again, next door to them they have the next political criminal in Portuguese East Africa. He is Premier Salazar. We have this projective situation in the world and there are those of us who are involved in these things at the national level. To me, it is very distressing because each time I go to Britain, I am more convinced that these territories must be put in a position to defend themselves. This is a classic example of a territory which was in the hands of the British for many years in which the only defence of the Africans of that territory has been the defence against the rapacious attitude of Mr. Ian Smith, not so much the racial policy that was perpetuated. The 217,000 white people of that territory feel that they own the country and they can punish the other people. That is purely based on the concept of the attitude of the British Government. Fortunately, I would say that the present Prime Minister of England is a man with strong views, and where the Government under him says that they are going to do something where principle is involved, they are going to do it.

The statement made by the Hon. Premier will give hon. members the opportunity of dealing with this matter, and I am very pleased to learn that the Government of Barbados

intends to support this. I regard this as a manifestation and demonstration for our support for democracy and fundamental human rights, I regard the advance of our African brothers as something which is necessary for human beings. We have in this Chamber the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Minister of Education who have given service. Sometimes people who have given service feel very grieved indeed when they see things like this happening. I remember some time in 1940 we were told so much of democracy and what we were fighting for. However, Sir, I feel on this question of racial segregation and racial objection that that is something which we have to fight. We are fighting it in this Island, and I think that I can say quite safely without hurting anyone that we still have a few remnants and pockets of stupidity, but on the whole, Barbados is a classic example of how people of different colour can live together.

In supporting this Resolution we are joining others of like mind to let people of the mind of Mr. Ian Smith and such persons in Africa know that their views and behaviour are not going to be tolerated by many of us.

I have much pleasure in moving the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. BOXDLL:

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Resolution, I notice that my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, was a bit mild in the course of his speech, I start off by saying that the blame for Mr. Ian Smith and the Rhodesian settlers taking the country is purely the fault of Mr. Harold Wilson. He is me Prime Minister of the British Commonwealth of over 700 million people, of which approximately 80 million are of European descent. With all that, yet still he found it necessary to leave England to go to Rhodesia to appeal to the White Southern Rhodesians. On the other hand, the British people did not find it convenient to go to British Guiana to appeal to Dr. Jagan, and they have not found it convenient to go to Aden to appeal to the Adenese, but they dragged their feet to what was so quite obvious to everyone. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, it was most appalling that the Archbishop of England said that if it were necessary, they should use force. As can be remembered, a high Cabinet Minister reiterated that this is a fine time to say "Onward Christian Soldiers" to kill your kith and kin; but the same high ranking officers, when the British were bombing the Mau-Mau and when the British set up a gallows in Kenya where they caught hold of two negroes daily and hanged them said nothing about that. The gallows was built right inside that place and two negroes were hanged every day, and this was quite all well and good for those people; but I am sure that if the 220,000 European settlers were being suppressed by the four mil-lion Africans, Britain would have no other redress but to go and bomb those people relentlessly. It is quite easy because the negroes are separated from the European settlers; therefore, if the Britishers wanted to do something, instead of wasting time at United Nations, they could certainly do something. As I have said, imagine Britain with a Commonwealth of 700 million people now finds it expedient to go to United Nations to get the support to join the Americans in South Vietnam!

The whole gist of this thing, Mr; Speaker, is that the British have found themselves the victim of their own surroundings. You will remember that five or six years ago the British were selling arms and ammunition and certain modern equipment to South Africa which has caused South Africa to be one of the greatest armed nations on the earth. When I heard that other colonies were amassing themselves to invade Southern Rhodesia I shuddered to think of what would happen. 7.05 p.m.

We do not mind Salazar very much, although he is a crook who wants removing, but the one malignant force which we have and which Britain has kow-towed to all the years is that of South Africa. Britain today is afraid of putting her soldiers in South Africa because she will think of what will happen to them. Let us go back to history 75 years ago. There was a great leader in Southern Rhodesia and a gentleman called Cecil Rhodes, who found himself in the

African Colony, told this African Leader that he would give this leader all the protection he needs if the African Leader would agree to allow him to prospect for gold diamonds. The African Leader did not only agree but gave Mr. Rhodes the right to prospect for gold and diamonds and, as a result of that, Mr. Rhodes went back to England and amassed an army of murderers and henchmen whom he took back to Africa to massacre the Africans. Nothing was done then, and nothing is going to be done now, not by the

British people at least. When you see these things going on, sometimes we have to ask ourselves what we fought for in 1918 and 1945. The statesman said that we were fighting so that men would be free, but they did not say what type of men would be free. Apparently they did not mean the black man because up to today's date Great Britain, who has ruled the waves and has a great Commonwealth, has sat idly by and allowed Southern Rhodesia to seize Independence and make a lot of high-faluting speeches.

In 1935 at the League of Nations the English people told Emperor Haile Selassie this: "If you fire the first shot we will consider you as the aggressor, "Mr. Speaker, that is just like somebody throwing bottles and stones at your premises with the intention of knocking you down and the Police telling you that if you were to defend yourself, you would be the aggressor. We sat by because we were helpless and poor Selassie relied on the League of Nations; but do not let us forget that a leading Cabinet member in 1935 said that anybody who thought that Great Britain would spill one drop of European blood or fire one shot would be making a sad mistake. I think that history is repeating itself. Anybody who thinks that Great Britain will fire one shot or spill one drop of blood now is having an idle dream. I am pleased to see that the hon. senior member for St. Peter has had the courage to bring forward a Resolution of this sort because it gives some of us the chance of venting our spleen. I have heard people talking about British justice I have served under the British Government and I was also looking for British justice and it has eluded me. It was clear that Britain with a population and Commonwealth of 700 million with only 80% Europeans would pass restrictions against people of our origin going into their country, but at the same time they allowed the Europeans to go in freely. That is proof that they never intended to do anything and will never do anything to help us. Mr. Speaker, I am not in any way anti-British, but I am certain it is about time that we, in the West Indies, stop fooling ourselves that all is well and good in the Mother Country towards us.

Mr. HUSBANDS:

Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to be able to speak on a Resolution which is one which affects many Africans in Southern Rhodesia. I have never had any misgivings or misunderstandings about Rhodesians. As a matter of fact, I have met Mr. Ian Smith as a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association; I have had many conversations with South Africans and some people look on South Africans as those who hate black people more than any other people in this world. But that is not true; the South Africans believe that whatever they are doing is right; they are convinced that they are right. There is no fooling about that. A South African has even tried to convert me to his belief. On the other hand, the Rhodesian is different. I have met them as a politician, A South African has been in my room from 12 o'clock midnight until 4 o'clock in the morning in trying to convince me that he is right. On the other hand, a Rhodesian has never even looked at me straight in the eyes. Mr. Smith simply impersonates the Rhodesian white man's order.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening now was in the offing years and years ago and the position of Mr. Wilson, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, is that he is just another Englishman, as far as I know. 7.15 p.m.

Mr. Wilson is just another Englishman as far as I am concerned, no matter what his brand of politics; whether it be Labour or Conservative, I am not dealing with that. Like the hon. member Who has just sat down, I never expected that one single shot would be fired in South Africa to shoot down one white African for the sake of what we all believe is fighting for the principle of human rights. Look

you, Sir, whenever things like these happen, whenever there is a culmination of something that people have always been saying meets the test, people resort to methods of expediency. Look you, Sir, the Hon. Premier not so long ago, as I suppose in duty bound, delivered a Statement in this House, and this Statement is followed by a very commendable action on the part of the Government as to what we really can do. As a matter of fact, he has told us what he really had done in the name of the people of Barbados,

Today there are many African countries that have reached national sovereignty, and they are sitting in the United Nations which is supposed to be a body of peace-loving nations. The qualification for having Independence is to be a peace-loving country, and in that peace-loving Assembly already there are two Resolutions, one by the African countries and another, I think, by Great Britain, and already the United Kingdom delegates have been told that if the United Nations Council resort to any Resolution that means the using of force, they are to give it the veto. It is plain and simple, and we do not have to guess. One thing it tells us is that we must never lose sight of the fact that until we are strong enough and work together for a common good, we will be reduced to pulp.

Now I pay attention to the background of the country. I am not suggesting that I have ever been to Rhodesia, nor am I comparing Rhodesia with the educational developments we have in the West Indies, because I had to tell a South African one day who said that our Africans did not look like theirs that he was not paying me any compliment, I told him that if in the West Indies our people of African descent had been denied the facilities of education, we would be treated Just like the Africans in South Africa. Mr. Ian Smith has failed to agree on any time limit when universal franchise will be granted to the people of Southern Rhodesia. Now we are faced with a unilateral declaration. We as re-presentatives of the people of Barbados, agreeing and assenting to this Resolution in this manner, show our protest against Mr. Smith's act of rebellion. Just fancy, I am not an international lawyer, and those who know better than I do call it an act of rebellion. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the people of Barbados committing such an act of rebellion on the Government of Barbados and sanctions like these being imposed! It would not be so.

British Guiana not so very long ago had some visitors in the form of British expeditionary forces waiting in battle ships. It is nothing like that this time. Are we ever to deceive ourselves again? Never ever! History changes people. One hundred years ago this Assembly did not look as it looks today. No man, no matter how powerful he thinks he is in his day, time and generation, controls destiny for all time.

Mr. Speaker, in our humble way we protest, I am sorry there is not another greater united body where such a protest could be made more tangible. As the Premier has said we import Just a little raw tobacco from Rhodesia; there-fore we cannot hurt them much. They export sugar and we too. I can only hope that we benefit from such.

This may sound rather mean, Mr. Speaker, but do 220,000 people believe that they can definitely control the manhood of four million people? As I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I have met Rhodesians, and I have met South African who have talked with me and tried to convince me to their way of thinking; they had to be in defence of some-thing. They did not convince me, but the Rhodesians

I have met ,including Mr. Ian Smith, would not even as much as look at me; I look like an object. Very few West Indians know that; yet they see what is happening now in the face of Great Britain, Is she really still great? In what sense? As the Hon. Minister has said, what we regarded as being the head of Justice is now spineless, not against Nazism or Communism, but spineless against really coming strongly and firmly to the rescue of four million of my Black brothers in Rhodesia, men much more unfortunate than we have been. 7.25 p.m.

There was a time when the United Nations Organizations was a place where people tried to restore peace, but

a few efforts of United Nations to keep the peace have been a failure. They are not fooling people with that today.

What I cannot hope to understand is this. How can you educate a man and think that he is a fool? You take material you cook and refine it; therefore, it is not the same material which you began with. That is the whole trouble today. The Africans of Southern Rhodesia have been denied the facilities of better education. There are few who are franchised Mr. Speaker, this House of Assembly has been for 300 years a law-making body, and we in the Opposition, though in a small way, ought to let the people of Rhodesia know through this meeting that we are absolutely against what they have done, and we depreciate the timidity of the Brit-ish Government rushing into a position which they themselves have called it an act of rebellion. We think that if you are the Queen\'s representative that you should tell Mr. Smith he cannot make certain laws when there is an act of rebellion and you should then try every expediency to solve the issue. Time is going to make Mr. Smith a little harder and tougher to deal with.

In conclusion, I must say that the hon. mover of this address has done his Job, and I feel very certain that tills House of Assembly will willingly adopt the Resolution; my only regret is that we cannot do more in these circum-stances.

Mr, MILLER:

Mr, Speaker, I support this Resolution unanimously and do say that I have very strong feeling about it. However, Sir, I request the hon. mover to accept what I regard as a simple amendment to his Resolution. There are a number of things in this Resolution which are written between the lines and which are not expressed or spelt out. For instance, there is the paragraph-

\'AND WHEREAS the said declaration is repugnant to the principle of democracy as laid down in the charter of the United Nations and the declaration of human rights;

In that organization a number of nations work together. This is a vast world organization and it can never accept what Rhodesia wants to do. Although Rhodesia happens to be one, it is a question of the charter of United Nations and whether or not Southern Rhodesia has failed to acknowledge the declaration of human rights.

The Resolution further states:

\'BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to forward an immediate protest through Her Majesty\'s Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Government of Rhodesia condemning

its illegal action, and confirming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government as a penalty."

Incidentally, the Government happens to be part of this House and I do not think it is necessary to say "request the Government". It is inconsistent with practice.

What I would like to do is to ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter to accept a simple amendment. I have a tremendous respect for Mr. Harold Wilson and his decision against the use of force. As he has openly said, he is afraid of war and if it is declared, where it would spread and end, heaven knows. It is on these remarks that I have tremendous confidence in the British Government and in the British Labour Party. There is no question about this. If there are any people who are really capable of governing, it is the British, and they will remain forever so. There will always be an England.

We know that for more than ten years this Southern Rhodesian colony has been pressing the British Government for Independence, but in the wisdom of the British Government -- and that includes the Conservative Government - they have denied Independence to Rhodesia. All that is clear. Mr. Smith and his colleague have reached the stage where they are not going any further, and are not rendering more allegiance to the Queen in spite of the fact that Southern Rhodesia happens to be a British Colony,

What I would like to ask In this Resolution is the simple amendment that if it becomes necessary for the United Kingdom Government to use force that one should be given the opportunity to serve side by side with the armed forces. If the whites are in the minority and are 220,000 against 4 million blacks, we understand the pressure. There is no problem in this. You have been reading of the feeling of nations in the world on the matter, and there is no doubt that this is a race issue, Mr. Smith and his colleagues would have to ignore the British Government and the Governments of the entire world on this issue if he continues to subjugate four million souls in a form of slavery. 7.35 p.m.

Now, Mr. Smith and his colleagues hope to ignore the feelings of the whole world in this issue and to continue to subject four million souls to the ugly form of slavery. I am supporting this Resolution. It is true that history can repeat itself. If you were to reflect for one hundred years When the United States of America wrenched itself free by a war, she was ably supported by the French people; and because she was able to remove what was the stringent economic question then, the United States of America has had the opportunity to become possibly the greatest country in the world for its resources and the exploitation of the resources of that great country. We only need to remember the Statute of Liberty, the symbol of freedom in the United States of America, which was given by the French Government, when the French Soldiers served with the Americans in America and succeeded in overthrowing things. Let us look at the French colonies which are mere departments of the French Government; they have never been released. Against the pressure of Russia and the forward nations of the world, there are many things which have been taking place. There are colonies which have had to be educated and taught in the technique of government. The Roman yoke has been overthrown and we are now emergent souls; we can run our country and we want to do that. Without a solitary exception, that is the truth and it is because Great Britain has the technique and the knowledge of Governing people that we were able and will continue to lend our support in body and soul to the country with which we shall forever continue to have deep feelings in our allegiance to the Queen.

Mr. Speaker, what on earth do you expect? Do you think that there is any group other than South Africans who would act in this way? And I doubt that they will attempt to go to the Commonwealth of Nations and have an expression of the people who really make the country; the people who own lands and who provide the country with its wealth, as against the 220,000 people of South Africa. There is an un-written law which is accepted by all breathing people in this world that no people will ever be taken against at a conquest. That is the reason why Hitler failed miserably and Mussolini perished upside down. A great part of the British taxpayers' money was poured into Germany and then Germany was back on her feet and assisted by the nations. That was the idea of the League of Nations which came into being immediately after the war. They had to come together in order to share what was left of it. With all that I am capable of, and all the endearment that my should would continue to know and feel to be bound up in the declaration of human rights, I will continue to share this view and I want to confirm the sanctions imposed; but what I feel is that that Great Britain and the United Kingdom have not gone far enough in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I will not have to say more when we are debating this Statement which has been laid by the Hon. Premier. The strife in the world today is on account of race. Today they are appealing on the radio and Rediffusion to Air Force men who survive and live and die because of the unswerving allegiance to the Queen and to the organization which is now undermining what is left in Rhodesia. I am sorry that the honourable mover of the passing of this Resolution has not gone a step further in this matter. The British Prime Minister, Mr. Wilson, will wait for the economic sanctions to have their effect on Rhodesia; but how long that will take I am not in a position to say. As a matter of fact, we do not know how long that will take. Many of the countries of the world are disturbed about

what is taking place in Rhodesia. You will find that there are countries which are not only supporting South Africa, but they are back to their normal level in economic outlook. We hope that the same thing will not take place when we put an end to this phase of democratic affairs in that country.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, the Minister of Communications and Works, said that he wanted to thank the hon. mover for his courage in bringing forward this Resolution. However, Sir, I do not see that it takes any special courage to do so. As a matter of fact, the only reason why I did not table a Resolution myself today was because the hon. Junior member for St. Philip, my colleague, told me earlier today that he had heard over the radio that the Government intended to take some similar action. Therefore, I did not see that there was any point in having two Resolutions of the same nature. The hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution has said that the text of the Resolution in itself did not matter. What really did matter was the expression of our feeling in this important issue. I think that we all know why the Rhodesian Government has declared its Independence Unilaterally. There were two basic reasons contributing to that step. The first was that they had the declaration of the British Prime Minister that he would not use any force if Rhodesia had seised Independence unilaterally and they knew that he would not go back on his word. In the second case, the geographical location of Rhodesia, situated as it is, adjacent to South Africa and Portuguese Angola, supported the Rhodesian Government in its conviction that it was safe from military attack and the knowledge that Great Britain would have with its neighbours, successfully repelled any invasion on the part of the Independent African territories. 7.46 p.m.

As a matter of fact, as the hon. member for St. Thomas recalled, none of the recently liberated African

territories is a military match for the combination of Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal, and even the whole of independent Kenya, Liberia and Ethiopia are also themselves incompetent to deal militarily with the white enclave which controls Rhodesia, South Africa and Portuguese Angola. Whatever the facts may be. Sir, I want to state that we are not here to endorse what the British Government may have done or how they feel on this matter. We are here to express what we feel and whether or not any notice is taken of it, this is our obligation.

When the American colonies rebelled, the British did not impose sanctions; she went to war. When the Grenada Government under Mr. Gairy was charged with mispending of public funds, the Grenadian constitution was suspended immediately and the British Pro-Consul on the spot took over the administration of the country. At the slightest sign of disturbance in Aden, the British Government took over the country, and this has always been apparent; but now, Sir, in the case of Rhodesia, all we are told the British Government is going to do is to impose sanctions. Every single member of this House knows that sanctions are not enough; they are an absolute waste of time. We imposed certain sanctions against South Africa some years ago; we are not trading with them now at all; but that does not prevent the South Africa regime from flourishing. The classic case of the failure of the imposition of sanctions was of course the imposition of sanctions by the League of Nations under the direction of Great Britain on Italy during the Ethiopian war. It did not matter at all and it did not amount to a row of pins, because even the countries which agreed at that forum to impose sanctions against Italy went on trading with Italy, and you can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that even the number of countries at present in the United Nations will continue to trade with Rhodesia now, even after formally agreeing at the United Nations to the imposition of sanctions against Rhodesia.

The Statement read here by the Government today says in effect that Rhodesia has declared independence unilaterally. The United Kingdom Government has imposed economic sanctions on Southern Rhodesia and has invited parallel action from dependent territories. As a dependent territory of Great Britain, we have been asked to follow suit with Great Britain, and declared sanctions against Rhodesia-

and the Government Statement concludes that the Government joins with the rest of the civilised world in condemning the Rhodesia Government, and supports the imposition of restrictions as outlined above and requested by the United Kingdom Government. Then the Resolution moved by the Hon. senior member for St. Peter which we are now debating also condemns the illegality of the action by the Rhodesia Government, and goes on to say that this House requests the Government to forward an immediate protest through Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies condemning the Rhodesian Government for its policy and confirming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government as a penalty.

Now it has already been pointed out that there is no single colony in this part of the world or Africa for that matter under a Government such as ours which would have been allowed to get away with what the Rhodesian Government has done, and to talk about sanctions in a case like this is sheer pussy-footing, absolute tommy rot. Certainly as a dependent territory we can endorse what the British Government has done, but we are not here to rubber stamp what the British Government has done or what they propose to do. At least we should have some say of our own, and I agree with the hon. Junior member for St. George. As a matter of fact I had a similar amendment drafted which included Barbadians being allowed to serve, because this is a matter which can easily be taken up when the time comes; but my amendment

said:

\\"BE IT RESOLVED that since sanctions have been proven in the past••

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member making an amendment to this Resolution?

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Not at this stage because the hon. Junior member for St. George has already moved one,

Mr. SPEAKER:

Not that I am aware of. He referred to some discussion which he alleged he had with the hon. senior member for St. Peter,

Mr. CRAWFORD:

He said he had an amendment which he had mentioned in an aside to the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER:

But he has not moved any amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

He also said that he proposed to move it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

But the hon. Junior member for St. George has not moved the amendment.

Mr, CRAWFORD:

He read it out. His amendment read

\\"BE IT RESOLVED that the United Kingdom Government resort to force, if necessary, and that Barbadians should be allowed if they desire, to serve alongside the British Forces.\"

Mr. SPEAKER:

I did not understand that to be mention-ed as part of the amendment. I certainly heard the hon. Junior member for St. George speak of that as his point of view. I will have a word with the Clerk to discover if there is any amendment on record by the hon. Junior member for St George.

1 am informed that there is no amendment on record, and the hon. member has handed in no copy of an amendment, and he is not understood to have made it

Mr. CRAWFORD:

If it was not understood, I am absolutely certain he intended it, because that is what he said, and if he is recalled, Sir, he will say so, He also said he had mentioned it in an aside to the hon. senior member. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is in his place. As a matter of fact, I heard the hon. Junior member for St. George ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter whether he would accept a small amendment,

and he told him what the amendment was. I do not know whether he agreed or not.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Anyhow, there is no such amendment. Will the hon. member supply a copy of his amendment or read it at dictation speed?

Mr, CRAWFORD:

The normal thing is to read it at dictation speed. It reads as follows 7,55 p.m.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that since sanctions have been proven in the past completely to be ineffective, that the use of force be resorted to, if necessary, to remove the illegally constituted government of Southern Rhodesia."

I shall show from that that I have never, with all my reading of history, before have heard of a case in which there was an act of outright rebellion on the part of a colony of the Imperial power and the Imperial power has resorted merely to sanctions.

At the time of the Ethiopian war with Italy, the League of Nations was not prepared to go further than condemning Mussolini's Italy for the invasion of Abyssinia, The League of Nations -- Sir Samuel Hoare was then the British Foreign Minister - resorted to this fallacy of resorting to sanctions. The British Government never blocked the Mediterranean, and all the supplies from Italy went flowing freely through the Mediterranean from the beginning until the end of the war. But there again it was at an entirely different level. It was a case of an independent nation attacking another independent nation, and the British and French knew very well that they themselves agreed twenty years earlier, when they sat around and carved up Africa, to give a free hand to Italy in Ethiopia. Therefore, when they tried to present a front that they were helping Ethiopia, they were doing nothing.

This is not an independent nation attacking another independent nation. This is a British colony treasonably, according to the British themselves, and illegally seizing the Government and telling the Governor that he is no longer Governor and to get out. All that was done in defiance of the Imperial power. Can you tell me any colony in the West Indies or any African Government in any part of Africa which would be allowed to do this? I am not for a moment saying that any action on our part could have the effect of forcing the British Government to go to war with Southern Rhodesia, They will laugh at this but,

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When the hon. senior member for St. Philip was referring to the amendment made by the hon. junior member for St. George in the course of his speech, the hon. junior member for St. George suggested that Barbadians go alongside the British Government if the British Government use force against Rhodesia because of the action of the Government of Rhodesia, I am wondering if this is to be included in the hon. member's amendment,

Mr, SPEAKER:

I think the hon. senior member for St. Philip declared his amendment to the House of Assembly, I will ask the Clerk to read it.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I was wondering if that was part of his amendment,

Mr, SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order. Let the hon. senior member for St. Philip proceed with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I know, Sir, that the hon, senior member for St. Andrew is such a mighty man of valour

Mr, SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is referring to the junior member,

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Sir, I am sorry, I take it that the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is a mighty man of valour, I am sore that he is eagerly awaiting the opportunity to and fight in Rhodesia; therefore, all he has to do is this. If he wants Barbadians to go, get up and add another amendment.

Hon. A. D. C. EDWARDS:

It is not that I want Barbadians to go and fight alongside the British, but it is what the hon. junior member for St. George was asking to be embodied in the Resolution. I only want to know if the hon. member wanted to send Barbadians to the slaughter in Rhodesia.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That does not arise,

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I said what I wanted to say and I said it very simply so that any little child could understand. I said that the hon. Junior member for St. George had moved an amendment and I quoted the text because it appeared that it was not introduced when he read it. Therefore, anybody who wants to include Barbadian guerillas or mercenaries, they can include them, even school children.

it is a matter of this sort, knowing from our experience the inefficiency of sanctions in a matter like this and knowing from our knowledge of history what has been the case of any British colony which even gave an indication of subversive activity, much less treason, that we must realise that the British Government is merely playing the fool when it comes to imposing sanctions, because sanctions would take a very long time to be effective. In so far as we are concerned the measures which we have taken here have as much weight against the continuance of the Smith regime as a fly is on the hind of a rhinoceros. Therefore, the Rhodesian Government would continue for ever in so far as our measures would have any effect on them,

I say, furthermore, even in the case of some of the countries of the United Nations which would agree formally to the imposition of sanctions, many of them are not really going to carry out these sanctions.

The hon. junior member for St. George is back in his place now and he says that he is under the

impression that he moved the amendment; so I knew that I could not have been mistaken. 8.05 p.m.

There are countries in Africa like Ethiopia, Nigeria and Kenya and even Jamaica in the West Indies who have been very outspoken in their protest of the British Government in relation to the action of the Rhodesian Government, and they have not hesitated to tell the British Government that it should revise its action in imposing these sanctions. Each and every Government has gone further than this Government has gone, and suggested the use of force. The Jamaican Government was one of the first Governments to do that. We all know that there was this racial question involved in Rhodesia; as a matter of fact, Great Britain owes much of her prestige as an Imperial power to her own self-respect and national pride not to be kicked in the pants and knocked about by a little colony like Rhodesia. It is because the minority rich Governments are of British stock that the labour Government boss has taken the action indicated in a matter of this sort. I do not see why we should not let it be known beyond the slightest shadow of doubt that we do not regard the British action as being as forthright as it should be. It may be that, by such a Statement, the Government wishes to condemn the recalcitrant regime and to offer full support of the economic sanctions, but that is not enough for a Government comprised such as this is in a community comprised as this one is.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I should like to ask the hon. member not to appear to be debating this Statement.

Hon. E. w. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This Resolution has been moved by the hon. senior member for St. Peter and we all know, having been informed, that the Statement which I have made on behalf of the Government is not being debated at the present moment.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have already pointed that out. Let the hon. senior member for St. Philip proceed with his speech.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

I do not understand what Your Honour means.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The position is that the Statement is not being debated now. The Resolution which has been moved by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is being debated now.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

If I wanted to get to England to study and I thought that the best way to do that was to get in the Royal Navy or the Air Force, I would have done it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member did not have to go there either in the Navy or the Air Force; he eventually got there when I took him in 1960.

Mr, SPEAKER:

I do not see the point of order, nor do I see the relevance of this debate in relation to Rhodesia to what took place in 1960.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

The hon. member eventually got in this Assembly after he had failed to get in twice. I got him in.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will both hon. members please keep that discussion for a different forum than in here?

Mr. CRAWFORD:

All the hon. member has to do is to enquire

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member should be able to keep to this debate and to deal with the subject which is before us.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD:

When the hon. member said that he took me to England.,,,.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have already pointed out to the hon. member that that is not the matter with which we are now dealing, that what was being said had no relevance to the matter which is before us. I ask the hon. member to deal with the Resolution in relation to the unilateral declaration of Independence by the Government of Rhodesia.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I was dealing with that, Sir, but I was interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member ignore the interruption and continue with this discussion.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I quite agree, Sir, that the hon. member should be ignored. What I was saying, Sir, is that the Government itself feels that a mere infantile support of the imposition of sanctions is enough. The Resolution which is now before the House agrees with the imposition of sanctions and it stops there. It may well be that the hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution has asked himself "What is the use of my going further in this matter?" However, Sir, I am of the opinion that a Resolution coming from the Barbados House of Assembly constituted as it is at present, should not stop at confirming the imposition of sanctions on the Government of Rhodesia, because the mere imposition of sanctions does not mean anything. If it were left to the imposition of sanctions alone, Mr. Smith will be to power ten years from now. The British Government will trade with Rhodesia as they did with Italy during the Ethiopian war, they even got supplies in Italy through other channels. There is nothing in the world to prevent some neutral country whether it be Spain, Portugal or any other neutral country from doing what the Rhodesian Government wants done in Great Britain and tranship it to Rhodesia. Therefore, Sir, what I am saying is that the imposition of sanctions as a penalty finally and effectively dealing with Mr. Smith's regime and removing it is just a matter of a dream. If we are going to admit that, despite the illegality of the Government, Mr. Smith should be allowed to remain there, well, then, let us say so. 8.15 p.m.

Let us realise that the British Government itself will feel: \"After all in Barbados they agree with us about the sanctions; they do not think we should go any further?\" and if, Mr. Speaker, all the colonies in the Commonwealth merely support the imposition of sanctions, what will be the fate of the four million Rhodesians in this case? The British Government will feel emboldened and hearkened in its policy merely to stop at imposing sanctions. But if, on the other hand, Commonwealth countries came out boldly and say that \"this is the first precedent you are establishing in the case of open rebellion,\" and that\" to talk about economic sanctions and not military force you are merely playing the fool.\" it is the easiest thing in the world for Great Britain with all the might at her disposal to restore legal rule in Rhodesia.

There are differences of opinion between some of the Rhodesian whites themselves, because the last Premier of Rhodesia does not agree with this unilateral declaration, and he must have a following in the country when Mr. Smith declared his unilateral declaration of independence. Don't you see, Mr. Speaker, that if the British Government had really moved as it should have moved, moved as it did in Kenya, moved as it did in Aden, moved as it did in Cyprus where there was no open rebellion, but where British troops were flown in overnight, moved as it did right here in British Guiana where up to now there are British Armed Forces when they suspended the Guiana Constitution, this situation would have been averted? Long before anything was done in British Guiana, the British Armed Forces were on their way to that unfortunate country to protect the Governor and to give him the appropriate armed force to maintain British rule. But these people in a flagrant violation of the Rhodesian Constitution, in outright condemnation of the principles of the United Nations and in outright defiance of even the pledge of the British Government itself to see to it that all African colonies advance to Independence under the democratic process, in defiance of all these things, they are sitting happily tonight in Salisbury running the country and laughing at the British Government, and we in a West Indian country, in a Government run by Africans or descendants of Africans, are going on record as saying that we agree to the imposition of sanctions. This is by no means enough, and if I support my amendment alone, I am going to add it. I am not fooling myself that it means you are going to have the British Army and Navy going into Rhodesia tomorrow morning, but at least the outside world, the Rhodesian Government, the Caribbean Governments and everybody else would know how some of us feel in Barbados about this matter.

Were it a question of Civil war in the country and a question of the pros and cons to be debated as to who is right and who is wrong, naturally I would expect divisions here and elsewhere over this matter, but when you get the British Government itself calling this an act of treason, calling it illegal and everything else, I do not know why we should not make our voices undeniably clear as to how we feel about it and what our reaction is.

Mr, CORBIN:

Mr. Speaker, it is sad to have a Resolution of this nature before us, but I have never seen so much argument over a Resolution such as this. The seizure of unilateral declaration of independence by Mr. Smith has absolutely violated the laws of the Crown, and such an act is one of sedition. A man who has committed sedition in any colony should be arrested and put in some detention camp or in prison for some time; so I do not see how such a man could be free and causing the people of Rhodesia to be living in fear and dread tonight. If it were \"Hbmie\" Corbin to-night, I would be arrested and placed in prison, not knowing when I would come out. I have great love for the British Government, but I hate to know that any Government is trying to use partiality with colour. Brown and yellow, black and white should

all be subject to Her Majesty's Government and obey Her Majesty. There are laws to be carried out whether by black or white, and if you violate the laws of the Crown, you should be punished. Since there are four million coloured Rhodesians and 220,000 white Rhodesians and the majority does not have power and authority, there must be some negligence, because you will never see that happen in Barbados again. There was a time when the

whites ruled in Barbados and the coloured were suffering, but today the coloured and white are united and can both be in Parliament at any time. Why should we believe that some of us are Kings, some are Queens and the others are filth? Fancy 225,000 white Rhodesians must hold the reins and have authority over four million coloured Rhodesians! 8.25 p.m.

Why not divide it up and unite together, reason together and live together in peace and harmony? The only possible means for our future existence is to live together in peace and harmony and tranquility.

I heard some hon. members say that Selassie asked for help at the time when Ethiopia was at war with Italy, and the British Government did not send him help; but I remember, when Selassie put his feet on the shores of Great Britain, that these were his words: "My tears are wet to death, but the time will come when my tears would be dry and their tears will be flowing." You will find that when certain nations are thirsty for blood and they try to do the other nations wrong, they come to a sad end. Think of Mussolini and all of those tyrants! Where are all of them today? Let us do good and good will attend us. This time we will have more experience.

Mr. Ian Smith is not the great man whom we expect him to be. He has declared an illegal independence in the country of Rhodesia instead of waiting on the British Government to compromise. There are many countries which have gained independence but have waited their time, and they have gone through the right channels - and I am sure that they have adopted the right attitude, I am sure if you wait, you would get it. I am sure that when we have independence, we shall have the same peace and we will live in unity as we are living now. I want nations to realise this. Nations may go to war and fight for Government, but the Kingdom of the earth is in the hands of God and He searches the heart of man. If we intend to do good, good will follow us and the hands of God will lead us. He knows all of our future. We do not know what will happen tomorrow, but God knows our end. Therefore, no one should sit down and draw out plans to destroy a nation.

Sir, I will not ask that Britain declare war against Rhodesia because many Rhodesians would lose their lives. If Britain can get them to submit and come to an agreement by the use of sanctions, I am sure that sanctions would save many lives. I would like to see them come together and reason with one another. Let love and tranquility reign together; let both live together and at the end of time have no fear for one another.

We have a duty to perform towards all men, that is to to both white, black, brown or yellow, because all are precious in God's sight. There are laws to govern us, and every citizen should submit to the law and no individual should try to commit treason or sedition because if he does so, he is doomed to death.

I wholeheartedly support this Resolution and trust that every good thing would happen for the Rhodesian people.

Mr. LYNCH:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the amendment which has been moved by the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

The Resolution which was brought in by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, in my opinion, does not go far enough. It is not that if we recommend a certain course of action in this House, any notice would be taken of it by the British Government* but for our own self-respect we should see to it that they should be some consensus among the Governments of the West Indian area, so I think that we should all support this amendment It reads as follows:-

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that since sanctions have been proven in the past completely to be ineffective, that the use of force be resorted to, if necessary, to re-move the illegal constituted government of Southern Rhodesia."

It has been pointed out quite well that we are aware of the fact that economic sanctions are particularly Ineffective. Surrounded as Southern Rhodesia is by countries with similar thinking, such as Mozambique, South Africa and Angola, the imposition of economic sanctions would do Rhodesia little harm. It is true to say that our adopting parallel actions with the Government of Great Britain and imposing sanctions would do little, but these growing feathers from sympathy's wings would not let Mr, Ian Smith fly lower,

I must therefore make a further request for our own self-respect We ought to put some teeth in this Resolution find let it be known that not only other West Indians. but all the Governments of Great Britain and the world at large know that we feel that the use of force should be sup-ported by this Assembly.

It has been mentioned that the action of the British Government in parallel situations which were not as grave have received more severe actions and troops have been flown into Kenya, into Aden and thy have also been landed in the neighbouring territory of British Guiana. None of these were situations of that import which is attached to Rhodesia. Why then should we support a Resolution such as this without carrying it further and let it be known that we would support the use of force?

As to whether Barbadians would Join the Forces, that is a moot point. As to our aiding by subscribing to the war, I do not think that we can do much. In neither of these two materials are Barbadians particularly rich: but if it were known in Great Britain that territory after territory passed Resolutions in their Assemblies that they would support the use of force, it must have a cogent effect upon the thinking of the English people.

Sir, I must say that I am sorry that the hon. mover of the Resolution is not in his place. He is always sniping at Conservative Governments, but here it is that a Socialist Government is in power in Great Britain and I am sure that if the late Sir Winston Churchill who was a Conservative was Prime Minister, such rebellious action on the part of Mr, Ian Smith would never have been attempted.

I beg to second the amendment. 8.35 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD:

Mr. Speaker, the world has heard with horror the unilateral declaration of Independence by Mr. Smith, the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, I warn to say, Sir, that the way of thinking of the white man in Africa is strange to our way of thinking. We have been through much of that in the past but, from my memory, I have seen gradual changes taking place and giving more and more power to the masses until today we can see what the complexion of this House is. When I came into this House some years ago there was a majority of white members and it became less and less all the way until I am the only white one today. Mr. Speaker, that is the sign of the times and we in the West Indies, not in Barbados alone, have accepted the rule of democracy; that is to say, \"one man. one vote\". That has gone down with all classes and all races, There are still small groups in our midst who will remember the past and hanker over it; but those of us who have a more liberal way of thinking know that that has been the past and if we are to be happy in the West Indies we have to live together. The way of thinking of the white man in Africa is foreign to me, and we do deplore the action of the present Rhodesian Government in the manner and in their rule which is develop-ing, and we all know that it is developing into a police state. We do not say that they are black or white we deplore the fact that the Mack states in a democracy overnight has been turned into a police state. The people who are active in that matter are the people who had hoped that they would have had their freedom from the white masters, but now they have turned to another story.

We, on this side of the Atlantic, have been able to follow a more democratic form of Government. I do not entirely see the fears of sanctions which some other hon. member fears. I do believe that the British Government

knows better than we know here of what they are after. I do believe that by the imposition of sanctions the British Government will fully bring Mr. Ian Smith and his Government to heel. It is not a matter of Ethiopia all over again; there was a different setting there. There was a war brew-ing and although they gave lip service to the matter of sanctions, very few people did apply it. In this case Ian Smith has two friends - South Africa and the Portuguese colony of Angola. This is original by world standards. Ian Smith perhaps has his sugar, tobacco and minerals and they have to be sold. The men of the world today know as much that they will not trade with him, and this is what the British Government is placing their faith in. If, by this example, the British Government can bring this matter to a halt within six months, then that is better than the use of force. If they fail in that, then the other alternative is still there. I am sure that the British Government is deter-mined in this matter because it is both the Conservative Government and the Labour Government in England who are united in this issue. Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that I am supporting this Resolution. This Resolution comes from Barbados with the feeling of the people here. We were horrified that Mr. Smith should have taken that action after having been pleaded with by the British Prime Minister, Mr. Wilson, and the rest of the world. I take my stand in that, and I am happy to know that we, on this side of the Atlantic where we have people of mixed colours, can say to the world that we can live together in peace, and the racial hatred which may have existed in the past will not be dominating in here today.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, no one can doubt that this House is unanimous in its expressions of feeling as to the recent turn of events in Rhodesia. Indeed anybody who lives in Africa, in Asia or in any other part of the civilised world, and particularly anybody who lives in these emergent territories, cannot fail to place himself unreservedly on the side of those who oppose what Mr. Smith and his colleagues have done. However, Sir, I think that no matter how indignant we feel in this matter, we will reserve our sense of

proportion. While it is true that this matter has engaged the attention of the whole world, and while it is also true that the concern for the plight and the position of the African majority in Southern Rhodesia is great, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we must reflect that this is a matter which immediately involves the United Kingdom Government. That is not to say that the independent States in Africa and members of the United Nations and other countries should not maintain a vital interest in this matter and should not be determined today to do all in their power to destroy the Smith regime. Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is this While it is right, it is a purely personal point of view to feel that the United Kingdom Government should resort to the force of arms. The moment you say that, you have at the same time, to give the British Government the full freedom of manoeuvring and trying all the expedients which they think they should try before they take such a step. 8.45 p.m.

If you agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is British Colonial policy which now stands to be badly Judged in the light of these events, you have to place the responsibility fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the United Kingdom Government, and I think that they will realise this. They have acted, in my opinion and in the opinion of most people, very negligently, and certainly the hon. Junior member for Bridgetown who pretends that if a Conservative Government were in power the results would have been different is very naive and does not really understand the nature of British Colonial policy in Africa. Mr. Churchill would, so far as we know, have been no different from Mr. Wilson in this respect, "because Mr. Churchill when he was Prime Minister was fully aware of what had been allowed by preceding British Governments to take place in Rhodesia.

Few people seem to remember that the Central African Federation was set up in 1953 consisting of this same colony of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and of Nyassaland

for the express purpose of preserving white supremacy in a large track of Central Africa, This was die whole reason for the establishment of that Federation, and it Just happened as a matter of coincidence that the white people in Southern Rhodesia were more firmly entrenched in their part of the Federation than the white settler element in the other two parts, and it was because of the relative weak-ness of the white settler element in the other two parts that Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia were able through their Nationalist movement to break away from the Federation and set up eventually independent states on the good fortune or the strength of the African population. But the strength and significance of the African populations in Northern Rhodesia and in Nyasaland were not matched in Southern Rhodesia by any comparable strength of the African population there; so that when the Central African Federation broke up, it was relatively easy for the African population in Northern Rhodesia which is now Zambia, and Nyasaland which is now Malawi, to proceed to independence, because they had had for historical reasons a head start on the others.

We must also remember, Mr. Speaker, that long be-fore this situation came to pass, the succeeding British Government had always maintained and supported white supremacy in Southern Rhodesia even more so than anywhere else. Years ago -- I must go back now twenty years, Mr. Speaker --the Premier of Southern Rhodesia was always invited to attend meetings of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers whenever they were held. It was always represented, that not only was Souther Rhodesia a self-governing territory of a certain type with a special relation to Britain, and with special reasons why it should be treated differently from the others, it was therefore known at the time when people like Sir

Godfrey Huggins was Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia - and this is going back the last two decades when the African population was oppressed - that there was no intention on the part of the white settler Government to do anything to alleviate the situation of the Africans, and they were determined even more so than their counterparts in the Union of South Africa to maintain white supremacy.

All this was known then--and I speak under correction -- but there is no evidence anywhere that any British Government at any time sought to use the restraining hand on the succeeding Governments of Southern Rhodesia.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 9.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly. 8.44 p.m.

On resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended, the Hon. Leader of the Houe was about to address the Chair.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, I left off at \that point at which I was drawing to the attention of the House the fact that the prime responsibility in this matter rests on the Government of the United Kingdom for this reason. Long before this state of affairs had come to pass, the British Government - either Conservative or Labour, it does not matter - had always made out a special case for the Government of Rhodesia and if hon. members will re-member, Sir Godfrey Huggins\' name is better remembered as Governor of Southern Rhodesia. He was always invited to meetings of the Commonwealth the Heads of State and it was only since the large number of African states were against the giving of Independence to Southern Rhodesia that eyebrows were raised at die attendance of Rhodesia, which was not an independent state at these conferences. Mr. Nehru, President Nkrumah and the Prime Minister of Nigeria insisted and stated their views that they would not participate in any conference with the Government of Rhodesia, But even while that was going on, the Government of Great Britain! although it knew that the pol-icy of South Africa was one of racist supremacy, did not think of changing the course of things in Southern Rhodesia. As a matter of fact, the British Government made it quite sure, both in the full constitution and otherwise, that the supremacy of the white settlers in Rhodesia should be guar-anteed.

If you read the recent history of the Central African Federation you would see that for the same reason the United Kingdom Government had always safeguarded the position of the white settlers in Southern Rhodesia, and you will find that after the Central African Federation was broken up by the African Nationalist Movement, Nyasa-land and Northern Rhodesia were able to proceed to Independence with little trouble.

It is all very well, as some hon. members on the other side seem to suggest, to say the British Government ought to do this and do the other and to advocate that the British Government should use force. It may well be that the United Kingdom thinks that its decision is all that is necessary and that military action is not called for at this stage. At the same time, it is their prime responsibility to settle this matter.

This House is not called upon to nudge the elbow of the United Kingdom Government because that Government knows better than anybody else that it has to proceed in this matter in the full glare of public opinion, and certainly it knows that if it does not do what is expected of it, it stands for the break-up of the whole Commonwealth, I do not think Mr. Wilson is in any way in doubt of the whole situation. I do not think that the United Kingdom Government is unaware of all that is involved. Because sanctions imposed against Mussolini in 1935 did not amount to any-thing, you cannot say, therefore, by the same tone, the pressure of world opinion is powerless to impose sanctions on this recalcitrant regime.

When the Italian Government attacked the Government of Ethiopia in 1935, there was a completely different public opinion. It was only sympathy. In Africa, you have over thirty independent countries who took their stand against Colonialism. As I have said, the British Government has to carry out all their policies in the full knowledge that the African nation is a militant force to be reckoned with, and it is not a divided and weak force which it was thirty years ago. Therefore, it is perfectly true, judging from experience in that context of the last thirty years by the Abyssinian war, the imposition of sanctions now is a very different matter; and certainly no matter how emotional we may feel and how glad we may wish to see the Smith regime overthrown tomorrow, at the same time, we must realise that to plunge Central Africa into a halocaust without exploring other possibilities, would not be in the best interest of Southern Rhodesia. If the British Government find it necessary to resort to military action, well then, they will do so, but since this thing happened no more than a week ago and since the United Kingdom Government has acted with a commendable promptitude with grappling the matter by its action and policies, it ought to be given credit for what it is doing.

The Resolution by the hon. senior member for St. Peter as it stands meets the support of this side of the House and should commend itself to all sides of the House. But to ask the House from this distance to go further than the plain facts of the matter indicate, would serve no useful purpose in my opinion because it cannot strengthen the hands of the United Kingdom Government at this stage and it is not based on that wide knowledge of the situation as it exists. You would have to be in a position to say that military intervention is here and now called for.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Nobody has said up to now that military intervention is here and now called for. All the amendment says is that force be resorted to, if necessary, in order to restore a legally constituted government.

Hon. S. C. TUDOR:

Sir, by the very qualification of the words "if necessary" shows that such amendment is not necessary, because who is to judge in a case like this? Surely the Government which has the prime responsibility in restoring the constituted government in Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom

Government, since it has assumed its obligations, would certainly know if and when it is necessary to apply military sanctions.

Before I sit I would like to offer on behalf of this side of the House another amendment to the Resolution.

In the last paragraph, after the words \"imposed by Her Majesty's Government\" there are three words \"as a penalty\", and I am asking that those three words be deleted and substituted by the words \"and the Government of Barbados.\" The last sentence would read \"and confirming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Barbados,\"

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to second the amendment to the Resolution moved by my colleague, the Minister of National Instruction. (A VOICE What reference is that?) 9.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution reads as follows:-

\"WHEREAS the former Government of Rhodesia has illegally made a unilateral declaration of Independence;

AND WHEREAS the said declaration in effect established the rule of a minority of 220,000 white people over a majority of over 4 million Africans, expressly violating the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights;

HE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to forward an immediate protest through Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to the former Government of Rhodesia condemning the illegal action, and racial policy of the former Government, and confirming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Barbados.\"

That is the Resolution which we on, the Government side, will support. Early today, Sir, as you are aware, I informed hon. members of us House that I had seen a communication from Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to the effect that in the early hours of that morning both Houses of Parliament in the United Kingdom had assented to the imposition of sanctions which were detailed by me in the directions which I issued to the commercial banks of this country as soon as possible. The proposals were read to both members. Her Majesty's Government invited the Governments of kindred countries to ourselves to follow suit in the action which Her Majesty's Government had taken. There are parts of this Resolution which we have before us which might, by implication, in years to come be matters of great constitutional moment. I am not prepared at this stage to give a dissertation as to whether the action of an elected Government is a legal or an illegal one. We in Government have the right, so long as it is a duly constituted Government, to say what should be done in a country. I am not dealing with those aspects of the Resolution at this stage. As to the statement, if I may refer to it without debiting it insofar as its contents may be compared with this Resolution, at the end of that statement I said that this Government joins with the rest of the civilised world in condemning the recalcitrant racist Rhodesian regime in their denial of basic human rights to the indigenous African population of Rhodesia and is confident that it has the full support of this Honourable House and the community in imposing the restrictions outlined above.

Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to become emotional in these matters. As to many of those persons who have spoken here today, if you were to ask them by what is Southern Rhodesia bounded in the South, the East, the West or the North

they would score nought out of four. If you were to ask them what is the capital of Southern Rhodesia, they would also score nought. If you were to ask them what the strength of the armed forces might happen to be in the next twelve months they will be equally oblivious; but when you are running a Government you have to be aware of the realities of the situation of which some people may remain blissfully unaware. Apart from the Hon. Ministers on this side of the House and the hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution, there is not a single member who can tell me what is the school population and the average wage of Rhodesia and what is the capital of the Central African Federation. The hon. senior member for St. Philip went so far as to suggest that a gentleman called Mr. Todd was the last Premier of Southern Rhodesia. That is the kind of thing which we have.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, no intelligent person who has been listening to me has heard me call the name of the last Premier of Southern Rhodesia. What I said was that even the former Premier of Southern Rhodesia objected to the unilateral declaration of Independence by Ian Smith.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Well, Sir, if the hon. member did not say that, we heard him wrongly over here and there must be something wrong with the electronics. I am now asking the hon. member to tell me who was the last Premier of Southern Rhodesia.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I made a speech and I have finished with my speech. Let the hon. member go and read the newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There cannot be question and answer like that in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, in this country we have a lot of newspapers feeding people with pure and unadulterated balderdash, if you read the newspaper as to the whole population of Africa, there are only the rhinoceros and those remnants of the animal kingdom today; how-ever. Sir, I do not want to go into that. We see that in Barbados today hon. members on the opposite side of the House, because the hon. senior member for St. Peter has introduced this Resolution here today endorsing the action taken by the British Government, talk all around the clock and try to give the impression that whoever introduces a Resolution like this is supporting Mr. Ian Smith who was the last duly elected Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia. I say that Mr. Smith was here in Barbados from 2nd January until the 11th January, 1959, and I was reminded today that the party to which I have the honour to belong, had boycotted functions because of the camaraderie which seemed to exist between people like Mr. Smith and the last Government, and not one single member of this Party attended the formal dinner which was given on the occasion when Mr. Smith was in Barbados. Mr. Speaker, none of this has been mentioned at all. 9.50 p.m.

Now I am not saying that Barbados should not be host to Mr. Smith or anybody else, but the kind of newspaper coverage and ignorance we would get is that the Bajan boys are marching into Rhodesia, they would be singing calypso with their paw-paw guns and the seeds of the evergreen tree and the same people who are talking about that have never seen a shot fired, have not studied the military implications of the geographical position of Southern Rhodesia. They have never studied the implication of why Nyasaland...

Mr. CRAWFORD:

On a point of order, the hon. member is not correct. I began by referring to the geographical location of Southern Rhodesia, as Your Honour is aware.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member is not innocent of the geographical location, but I want to tell him a few facts. If he wants to take everything personally, he will get it personally. The position today, Sir, is that Mr. Smith, the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, would never have taken the action which he has taken unless he had the assurance that he was going to be hacked up by the full

military might of the Union of South Africa, (Interruptions,) Why don't you shut up and learn Parliamentary decency?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member referring to the Chair?

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Let the hon. member continue his ignorance,

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

No Chief Justice ever told me I could not speak the truth by accident.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

None ever told me so either,

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member continue the debate on Rhodesia?

Mr. MILLER:

On a point of order, let us have the debate conducted with decorum.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

This is the first time I have heard a point of order being a point of order. Let us proceed. What the hon. junior member for St. Philip is doing is accusing the British Government and this Government of ours. The South African Government has a common frontier with the Government of Southern Rhodesia. The South African Government is a racialist Government, and South Africa has the best

equipped Air Force and Army in the world. I am not saying this from the point of view of numerical strength, but in first line and second line troops, and it has the most educated Army from the point of view of technical efficiency, in the world.

Although Barbados enjoys a status which was not inferior to that of Southern Rhodesia, the British Government gave special grants to the Government of Rhodesia to build up a super-efficient Air Force and a large Army with several different corps and divisions. At the same time there are 500,000 Rhodesians of African descent in schools, 3,290 schools with over 1,200 teachers, and this kind of condescension we have in the West Indies towards Africans has resulted in every single country in Africa, barring Southern Rhodesia and one or two other small places, being independent, and those who are suggesting that West Indians should go in there and save the four million Africans are still against the political emancipation of the people in Barbados. This is the kind of nonsense that is going on; and so every time the Government gets up even to support action which it considers in the pure light of reason to be in the best interest of mankind or to condemn action which it considers inimical, you will get hon. members on the other side who are prepared to get up and make it appear that the Government is not doing enough.

Now I came in here today with a Statement, having issued instructions to the Banks of this Island which they must carry out. It is true that we only import perhaps about \$130,000 worth of goods from Rhodesia, but it is not Barbados' little futile gesture when it comes to economic sanctions. There is no point today in drawing a parallel or analogy between the situation which exploded into the Ethiopian/Italian War and the situation today when you have an Organisation known as the United Nations. It is not the \$130,000 which we may have spent with Rhodesia which is important; it is the accumulative effect of the \$130,000, the \$1,300,000 and the \$13 million to which we are contributing our weight, however slight that weight may be. But both the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for St. Philip, both of whom were under forty in 1940, and neither of whom has seen a shot fired in anger, want to spur on the youth of Barbados that the youth of Barbados must get permission to fight. I did not ask for permission. We did not ask for permission to go and fight alongside the British; we volunteered. Let him volunteer.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

I never said anything about spurring on the youth of Barbados to fight anywhere, and in 1940 no African country was involved. If people for their own personal reasons went and fought for Europeans in Germany, Britain and elsewhere, that is their business. I never said one single word about spurring on the youth of Barbados to go and fight elsewhere. Barbados has not been attacked.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. member is saying that Barbados has not been attacked, but by the same analogy he should wait for Barbados to be attacked before he and the hon. Junior member for St. George advocate in an aside amendment introduced by the hon. Junior member for St. George that Barbadians should be allowed to go and use force against Rhodesia. I did not ask anybody's permission,

Mr. MILLER:

On a point of order, we are now debating the statement, and I will say on a point of order

Mr. SPEAKER:

We cannot debate the statement.

Mr. MILLER:

That is what we are doing. The amendment which I made has nothing at all to do with what the hon. member has just expressed, but we are accustomed to that. The country generally understands there is no faith in a statement made like this. I said if it were necessary that Barbadians should be allowed to go abroad and serve side by side with the United Kingdom Forces. There are ; some people who served in Forces and got an education and talk about it all the time. These people serve on Forces in exchange for a price; it is not a question of a War Scholarship or otherwise, but a reward.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I now understand the hon. member and I apologise to the hon. member for not having understood his interpreter when he was absent, because he has made it clear that we are not to serve as waiters or butlers, but side by side for reward. 10.00 p.m.

Mr. MILLER:

I did not say 'reward*. Reward is in your mind. The Hon. Premier must not misquote me for the sake of reference. It has happened three or four times.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

Mr. MILLER:

I simply said in case it becomes necessary that Barbadians be given an opportunity - and that is my belief and my feeling.

Mr. SPEAKER; The hon. member has made his point of order, it is not necessary for it to be repeated.

Mr. MILLER:

This is cheap; as cheap as dirt; it is something which we can lavish.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The point of order on which the hon. Junior member for St. George rose has been made.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

As I understand it. Sir, the hon. member said that Barbadians should be allowed to fight alongside the United Kingdom troops. When he said "for reward". he did not mean that Barbadians should go as mercenaries but that they should go freely and without hope of getting any pay. I now understand the hon. member, I thought he had said that they should be allowed to serve for reward.

No doubt, since the debates are not under the surveillance of the former Minister of Trade in the former Government, when they took two and a half years to be published, the Reporters may be able to give us soofi a corrected version of what the hon. member said.

Be that as it may, as regards to the situation in Rhodesia, no one has alleged - and this is not in defence of Rhodesia - that Africans are being slaughtered by the illegal Government of Rhodesia; what is agreed

to is that the British offered assistance to the Government of Rhodesia whereby the franchise was limited. The Government which is there under Sir Humphrey Gibbs was there as far back as 1959, and they instituted the system of white rule after having taken over the territory in 1923, after it was expropriated from the Africans and was handed over by the commercial Party that run the whole territory from 1891 until 1923; so there you have an area of land which was run by Company Police and which was turned over to Her Majesty the Queen in 1923, Some system of Parliamentary Government was instituted in 1923, but from 1923 until 1965

the British Government did absolutely nothing to protest over the lack of the enfranchisement of the four million Africans who were there.

Furthermore, prominence was given the Government of Rhodesia in that, as the Minister of National Instruction has said, not only Sir Godfrey Huggins, but Mr. Whithead and Mr. Todd were given the status of Prime Minister from time immemorial to attend the Prime Ministers' Conferences which was only enjoyed by Prime Ministers of Independent countries.

That Mr. Smith was denied that privilege was largely due to myself and the Prime Minister of Mauritius because when in 1963 it was fitting that the West African and East African Prime Ministers would not attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference if Mr. Smith was invited, I personally told the Permanent Secretary of Colonial Office that the Prime Minister of Mauritius and I agreed with them and that it would be a blessing in disguise if they insisted on that. I am speaking from personal knowledge, The position today is that although Southern Rhodesia is not Alabama, I am not saying that the Government of Southern Rhodesia is any better.

The action which we are protesting against is not the independence of Southern Rhodesia. I want to get that clear. This Government has gone on record as proclaiming to the world that we would like to see the emancipation-- social and political -- of all the territories of the British Commonwealth. We are not protesting against independence for Southern Rhodesia: what we are protesting against is the recalcitrant racist regime in South Africa and their denial of basic human rights to the indigenous African population.

I am in some doubt, as I may have expressed to you, Mr. Speaker, as to whether one can say that a Government which is legally elected is an illegal Government. Of course I am not making any pronouncement; I am saying that Jurists and people who deal with these type of questions on constitutional law will years from now still be debating this question. It is not a popular point: it is historic and I am not prepared to stand up here and say that this is an illegal act. 10.10 p.m.

I will go down on record as saying this; I am not prepared to say whether this was something - or rather let me put it in this way. if the four million Black Africans were the majority Government in Southern Rhodesia, and the 220,000 white settlers were the minority - if the four million Black Africans had declared Southern Rhodesia to be independent unilaterally, would we be prepared to say that that was an illegal act?

Mr. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I will give way to the hon, mem-ber,

Mr. SPEAKER:

May I Just say this? The Hon. Premier can only pose that question rhetorically; but the ton, senior member for St. Philip has risen on a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

The hon. senior member for St. John has asked if the four million Black Africans were the majority Government in Southern Rhodesia.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Is that a point of order, Mr. Speaker? Can you fall through grace and say that that is a point of order ?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I must hear the hon. member\'s point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD:

The illegality of the unilateral declaration of Independence is based on the fact that the elected Government bad their own loyalties under the Crown. Their own action of disloyalty to the Crown makes the action an illegal one.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order. I could only decide that after hearing the ton. member.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am not surprised at this at all. The question which I have posed will always be debated. I was asking if the picture were in the reverse and the four million Black Africans had made a unilateral declaration of Independence, whether they would or should be duly considered for the grant of Independence, I would like to know whether we, in the Caribbean area, would say that that action taken by the four million Africans would be illegal. Of course, I am not now discussing the question of the legality or the illegality of the action. If you talk about the illegality of the action and you had a majority under the franchise of four million Africans as against a minority of 220,000 White settlers, and those four million Africans had made a unilateral declaration of Independence, I am saying that not one mumbling word would have been heard. What we are primarily concerned about is the question of the uni-lateral declaration of Independence to be dealt with under universal adult suffrage and, as the position now is, there is no hope in this world for the Africans to have any say in the Government of the country.

In all Africa, there is no country except in South Africa where the Africans are more educated than in Southern Rhodesia, In Kenya the people had to pay in order to go to the primary and elementary schools. They were only a few secondary schools for the population of some 8 million peo-ple. On the otter hand, in this island we have free education. It is not a question of anybody being shot down; it is a question of the fundamental and basic rights, and the Justi-fication for the postponement of Independence by the British Government against the Rhodesian Government is not based on legalistic arguments, but purely on the question that Great Britain will have to face the rest of mankind in justifying her action in not giving the African universal adult suffrage before the year 1965. They had

hoped that this whole matter would have been dealt with sub rosa, and that the whole matter would be swept under the carpet and we would try to bring it from under the carpet without accusing them of everything. All that has happened now is that the British Government, having sown with the wind, is reaping with the whirlwind. The exploitation force in Rhodesia would cause the annihilation of the four million Africans in Rhodesia whom we want to protect.

Mr. Ian Smith was a guest in Barbados and he was impressed to some extent with the absence of the Opposition in those days and by the harmony which existed in this Island at that time. He never would have taken the trouble to do what he did unless he had had the assurance that the most efficient army in the world was behind him. This will mean that anybody who tried to cross the frontier or came through Northern Rhodesia, not only will they be annihilated by the Rhodesians inside the country, but the guns will be fired from the most efficient Air Force. I will give you an example of what I mean. A young man called Group Captain Cheshire in 1945 piloted an American plane across the Northern Pacific. Let us leave out the fact that he spent the rest of his years in a state of mental upset. They also dropped a bomb on the Japanese people. Shortly after that another British American dropped a bomb on Hiroshima; and therefore the justification was that there was sure to be war. What I felt was that they should have dropped a bomb on Germany. The Germans, the British and the Americans were not prepared to drop a bomb on the European nation; they dropped them on the Japanese because that would be a different region. What the hon. member said in here tonight is quite correct. 10.20 p.m.

The British Government does not intend to use force; so why is the hon. senior member for St. Philip asking them to use force? It is impractical for them to use force. It is not going into British Guiana; it is not going to Kenya and putting Nkrumah in jail or putting Mr. Kenyatta in detention for a period of eight years and hoping that he would die, or banishing Seretse Khama for marrying a woman of the wrong race. It is not a question of that at all.

because opinion in the United Nations is so powerful that they have to be careful how they do these things, Opinion in the House of Commons and the House of Lords is divided, Mr. Wilson will go down to Salisbury, but you will never see one Jet plane down there or have the Royal Air Force in all its splendour; and because of the policy which has been laid down by the British Government in surrendering their supremacy to other people, I am saying as a positive fact that not only would any expeditionary force comprised of the Commonwealth have been wiped out, but the people in the country, and that is what the South Africans would want.

The only force you can use against Rhodesia would be two small atomic bombs in South Africa, because you have to hit the heart of the source of Military supply. There is no point in going to Salisbury where there are tobacco sheds and bombing Salisbury. You have to decide that you are going to risk an open conflagration which is going to end in a racial war for the whole world, because once you drop one atomic bomb on South Africa, even if it is a small baby atomic bomb to put them in their place, you are going to split the Commonwealth straight away; so all these military experts can talk about allowing Barbadians to go alongside the British. The Barbadian does not have to be allowed. If he has any courage or conviction, he does not sit behind a desk or anything like that; he goes ahead and decides what he wants to do, and you cannot stop from generation to generation people from doing that in any country of the world. You do not wait until your country is attacked before you make up your mind to defend your own country from somebody else's tyranny. This is the first lesson of strategy; but some people do not understand the strategy of freedom; therefore they say we should be-making a futile

gesture in this Resolution. We are not making a futile gesture as a Government in following along with other countries in imposing sanctions on Rhodesia. When we imposed economic sanctions on the Portuguese for their actions in Angola, I never heard an argument from the members who are seated on the other side that it was a futile gesture. When we imposed a complete ban on South African goods, some of which may still be coming into the country, nobody suggested that that ban would be futile, although as the hon. junior member for Christ Church can inform his colleagues over there, South African foodstuffs landed in this country were cheaper by 30% or 40% than their equivalent products brought from the United Kingdom and the same Caribbean territories; but to Barbadians there are things of the spirit which are more important than the material comforts that some hon. members may not understand; it is the moral support you give to the people. The ironic thing is that you come to a situation in which Mr. Sittola and the other African leaders of the four million people themselves may not understand the issues. There may be people who are prepared to go and clean Mr. Smith's shoes every morning and bring the newspaper to him, and take a piece of change from him and tell him not to mind the British people, they are all Rhodesians together although his skin is different from theirs; but they gang up on a platform together. You have fifteen African Chiefs in the Legislature in Rhodesia, hand-picked by Mr. Smith, and they have influence with their community; and here we are in Barbados probably 7,000 or 8,000 miles away getting a Paper in this Island with the widest circulation coming out one day two years ago and saying that the British Government had decided to grant Independence to Lusaka. The people in Barbados have to put up with that kind of thing,

Mr. Speaker, we do not even know where Southern Rhodesia is, and the people inside Southern Rhodesia may not understand what the arguments are about, but you have people in this country criticising the hon. senior member for St. Peter and stating that this is a lot of poppy-cock and nonsense, which is only fit for the comic strips. The type of language that is used in here is the kind of language which is permitted in the comic strips from abroad re-produced in the paper. They say it is balderdash and nonsense and criticise and ridicule the hon. member for saying he supports sanctions. The sanctions on Ethiopia did not work so why don't we take off the ban on South African goods? It is very simple. Why doesn't some member of the

Opposition come in here and say he wants to remove the ban on South African goods? South Africa was buying \$3.60 a year from us, and at one stage when Mr. Hull was there we had gone up \$700,000 in goods from Africa. We heard on the radio that the Government of Rhodesia was doing so-and-so, but the Hon. senior member for St. Philip or the hon. junior member for St. George who is usually better informed and more analytical did not come in with a Resolution. The Government came in with a Statement on its policy- they came in here empty handed. Over here we have collective responsibility; a Statement by one is a Statement by all. You touch a man, you move a man over here; therefore each of us does not have to bring a Statement into this Chamber. It is true that many of us get up and make a contribution, but we do not each of us have to bring in a Statement, because we are aware of who is going to be responsible for the delivering of the Statement or its presentation in this Chamber; but over there with so many Independents, and nondescript people who have not yet come to terms with themselves in any sense of the term pursuing Us independent line, when they introduce an amendment, it is only in an aside. 10.30 p.m.

That is what the Legislature has been reduced to in this year of grace. Therefore, let us on this Resolution be entirely realistic. This Government is not going to prevent any Barbadian, if there was a war against Southern Rhodesia, from going there. This Government is not going to pick up any money to

send anybody there, nor is it going to discourage anybody who is fed up with his surroundings in Barbados and who feels that he cannot stomach independence under a black government from going to Southern Rhodesia. Backed up by the Government of South Africa and with the highly trained and well equipped military strength of Southern Rhodesia itself financed by the British Government, that Government knows full well that the British Government is not going to send any troops there.

Sir, you should read the book by President Kaunda on "Zambia should be Free" and you will understand the position. Not one single West Indian Leader has written a book on freedom. Mr. Kaunda deplored all the machinations of Mr. Smith and regretably, Dr. Hastings Banda may find himself in a similar position; but at the same time they are not prepared to send their people to the slaughter. Therefore, let us be realistic. There are people who are beating a drum and talking all this nonsense about fighting alongside the British. Have the British people said to you yet that they want to fight anybody?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Anyhow, I will ask the hon. member to stick to the Resolution,

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am merely drawing an analogy of the situation in which you were saying that you want an amendment put in the Resolution to allow Barbadians to fight alongside the British. There is a Lord Delamere in Rhodesia, and I believe that his family is responsible for the swamp at Constitution Road. Lord Delamere headed a delegation that went to England to protect against independence of Kenya. Lord Delamere did not tell the British people of the cruelties which the Kenya settlers had inflicted on the Mau-Mau. Lord Delamere protested because Kenya was gaining independence under a son of an African, Jomo Kenyatta. They did not tell the people of Britain at the time, nor did you see it in any of the enlightened newspapers of Barbados that for the whole period of fighting against the Mau-Mau which was about two and a half years that only 29 white Anglo-Saxons lost their lives and for that 31,000 Africans had to be sacrificed. They did not tell you that for those 29 white people, 31,000 members of the Kikuyu were lined up to be hanged, castrated and shot. For all we know, it must have been 66,000.

The British has sent people and arms into Rhodesia to try to maintain the wealth for themselves. They have not provided us with one rifle for our Police Force. For years they have armed the Rhodesian Police Force against whom? Not against the 220,000 white settlers but against the four million Africans. That is what they have done; so to get up now and say that this Resolution does not go far enough.

that you must use force, if necessary, when you know to yourself that they are not going to use force is something to which I cannot agree. I am not going to countenance force being used against the country unless that country attacks my country. The British people had a wonderful opportunity, not only in Southern Rhodesia to help the Africans, but all the time they were talking about attacking the indigenous people. The situation is such in Southern Rhodesia that it cannot be assessed in simple terms. We have no affinity with the people who are involved. Another thing, you are not going to start a war knowing full well that the people whom you send to that war are going to be annihilated. You are not going to send them to Africa and ask the British Government for permission for somebody to fight

alongside you. As a matter of fact, they do not want the Barbadians alongside them in the buses. (AVO1CE: But how we got in the last war?) They have closed the doors to immigration and we are asking to be allowed a space there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this in conclusion. The majority of people in Southern Rhodesia are much closer to their own brethern who are not ashamed to fight and who are born warriors. 10.40 p.m.

At this stage, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot support any Resolution which is bombastic, insincere and inspired by people who would not fight in order to defend their own country if we happened to be invaded in Barbados, There are those who are advocating that our people should get permission to fight alongside the people who are dissatisfied. That sounds all right for the kind of newspapers which we get in Barbados. I could go further than anybody in this Chamber has gone in his attempt to do or in attempting what he wants to do. I know that there are enough people both inside and outside who would be able to counsel us and say what more we can do in this matter. I have declared that the Rhodesia pound is no longer legal tender in this country and I have frozen the assets of Rhodesia. I have mentioned that you have people who will use the protection of this country to represent South Africa and Rhodesia against the interest of the working-class man in this island. That is the kind of hypocrisy which you will get. In conclusion I am merely asking the hon. mover of the passing of this Resolution to accept the deletion of the words \"As a penalty\" at the end of the Resolution and to insert the words \"and the Government of Barbados\". so that the Resolution as amended will now read as follows.

WHEREAS the former Government of Rhodesia has illegally made a unilateral declaration of Independence;

AND WHEREAS the said declaration in effect establishes the rule of a minority of 220,000 white people over a majority of over four million Africans, expressly violating the principles laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to forward an immediate protest through Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to the former Government of Rhodesia condemning the illegal action, and racial policy of the former Government, and con-firming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Barbados.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was not my intention that this kind of debate would have been caused when I introduced this Resolution. I merely introduced this Resolution as a demonstration of my feeling in this matter. I was in the House of Commons when Mr. Wilson came hack from Rhodesia, and I was quite aware of his problems. When the hon. junior member for St. George spoke about this idea of the use of force, I told him that he could do what ever he felt like doing. This is nothing to be emotional about. I do not accept the manner of the hon. senior member for St. Philip because he is completely insincere in what he is preaching. He is a man whose sincerity I do not

accept in matters like this; he really does not believe in what he is preaching. I regard his attitude as

one of plagiarism he is like a school boy who is a dunce. He is not prepared to do any homework, but just to go to school and copy, and therefore he is a complete political conundrum, he knows what is happening, he does nothing, but comes in here with his pick-pocket style and accuses somebody. I am saying that the hon. senior member for St. Philip is a fundamental coward. He will urge people on to a fight, and when the fight comes down and some credit is given to that fight, then he appears on the scene and says that if it had not been for him you would not have done. He will wash his hands like Pilate. He is the biggest political pilate that I have ever come across.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a question of fundamental honesty. Something has taken place in Southern Rhodesia of which you do not approve, and how can you suggest the use of force which the British Government is not using? He had it at the United Nations and the United Nations quash the Resolution which was dealing with force, because it was realised that this is the responsibility of the British Government, and not the responsibility of the United Nations. You can completely put it out of your mind that any member of the Royal Air Force will appear in Rhodesia for the purpose of settling this issue. I heard that while sitting in a front seat in the House of Commons in November and the man who said it was accorded by the British people for saying it. What is the use of saying that we are going to use force? In the 1914-18 War you heard the saying "Go on, Great Britain, Barbados is behind you!" Today the Hon. Premier brought forward a statement and I brought forward this Resolution. I was not at all aware of the fact that the Hon. Premier was making a Statement, but I brought forward my Resolution because I feel that I must be on the ball. I know that the hon. Junior member for St. George feels very strongly about these tilings which are taking place in Africa, but I will say that it is a question of being realistic. It is not Just a question of passing a Resolution asking people to resort to the use of force. I am aware of the problems of the British people. I have walked up and down Oxford Street, and I know that the whole basis of things in Britain is the question of colour. I know that because I have lived in it. I have been at a hotel and everybody is Irish or Italian. Before the hon. member left London we stood in the same hotel and we refused drinks which were being served. 10.50 p.m.

Are we going to pass a Resolution asking the British Government to use force when we realise that at the United Nations they had to drop this idea of using force? The United States and France as well as the big powers of the world are supporting Britain and are against Mr. Ian Smith and his policy in Rhodesia, but the use of force is one thing you are not going to get because it is unsuitable. The British Government has propped up and built up the Southern Rhodesia regime. Why do we not talk about using force in South Africa, Mozambique, Angola or other parts of Africa where there is slavery? I know that emotionally and at the first blush we will talk about using force; but if I had to deal with Mr. Smith as a person, I would use force against him as man to man, because I believe sometimes that killing is divine; therefore it would be a question of who has the right to die or who has the right to pay the final price for killing.

I do not like the idea of taking a Resolution like this and making it into a local political whip.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have amended the Resolution, but what the Hon. Premier read out at the end is really not the text of my Resolution, and I would like the Clerk to show me the real text of the last part of the Resolution which is not printed, so that we would be better able to know how it will read when printed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I find out from the hon. member if the Chair has a copy of the Resolution?

Mr. WALCOTT:

I will ask the Clerk for the copy and read it back. It reads as follows

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to forward an immediate protest through Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to be former Government of Rhodesia condemning the illegal action and racial policy of the former Government, and confirming the sanctions imposed by Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Barbados

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will ask the Clerk to have . copy prepared.

Mr. WALCOTT:

We will have a copy made, but that was read before Your Honour went to the Chair, and a copy was made by the Clerk. I do not see that it would necessitate my using that against any person locally because it is not of local significance. We are not behaving like that and hope it will never happen in Barbados, I am not going to pass a Resolution saying we should use force, because this s a Legislature, and sentiment is beyond the point,

The question that the amendment moved by the hon. senior member for St. Philip, stand part of the Resolution, was put and resolved in the negative.

The question that the Resolution moved by the hon. senior .member for St. Peter with amendment, do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:*

AYES:

Mr. BATSON; Hon, J. C. TUDOR; Hon. E. W. 3ARR0W; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. N. W. BOX1LL; Mr. LOWE, Mr. CORB!N; Mr. WALCOTT Mr. COWARD and Mr. GODDARD -12.

NOES:

Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH; Mr. MILLER and Mr. LYNCH- 4. 1.00 p.m.

AMENDMENT TO TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING BILL BY OTHER PLACE

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Other Place the return of a Bill to this Chamber with certain amendments. This is the Bill to make provision for the development of land in certain areas.

The amendments appear to me to be small {typographical errors but I would be glad if Mr. Clerk would pass them over to the Hon. Leader of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Bill which has been returned from the other place contain amendments which are simply verbal and syntactical.

The first amendment is on page 36 in clause 25 (5) (b). The word \"been\" has been inserted in the paragraph which would now read:

\"To include in the order any grant of planning per-mission which might have been included in the order as submitted to the Minister.\"

The word \"been\" was inadvertently left out.

On page 71 under section 52, the words \"the provisions of\" have been inserted twice so that the Clause reads - \"under this Part may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964. The words \"the provision of\" have been taken out, so that the Clause now reads as follows:-

\"Any land acquired by the Crown (whether compulsorily or by agreement) under this Part may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964 to any local authority, statutory undertakers or other body or person for development in accordance with planning permission granted under Part III,\"

I beg to move that the amendments be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Hon. J. C TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

THE ADJOURNMENT The Order Paper having been fixed,

Mr. MILLER:

Mr, Speaker, I am seeking leave of the House to give notice of a Resolution to debate the Statement made by the Hon, Premier earlier today.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. junior member for St. George is asking leave of the House to give notice of a Resolution with reference to the Statement laid by the Hon. Premier today. If there is no objection, leave will be granted,

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Objection taken.

Mr. MILLER:

The Opposition cannot be denied the right to debate this Statement,

Mr. SPEAKER:

Perhaps, I should explain to the hon. junior member for St. George this. He is asking for leave now to give notice of a Resolution and he can only give notice of it now. However objectionable or otherwise it may be, he may only give notice of it now, if leave is granted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, may I say some-thing on a point of order. The grounds of the Government's objections are strictly in accordance with the rules of the House. The moment the hon. senior member for St. Peter accepted an amendment to his Resolution which dealt with the imposition of sanctions on the Southern Rhodesian Government, any Resolution which is brought here can only be reflecting on a vote of this House unless it was approving the Resolution which was passed today. That is the grounds of my objection. They cannot have two bites at the same thing.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understand the Hon. Premier has explained the reasons why he objects to leave being granted today. Hon, members will quite appreciate that I am grateful for any advice and any counsel given me at any time and there is possibility that it may be accepted by me,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR:

I beg to move that this House be now adjourned until Tuesday next 23rd November, 1965 at 12 o'clock (noon).

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 11.10 p.m.