THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961—66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th January, 1966.

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 1.00 o'clock p.m. today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker)* Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., *(Minister of Education);* Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries)* Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour E. L. CARMICHAEL, J.P., *(Deputy Speaker);* Mr. L. A. LYNCH. J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees);* 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 meeting of 14th December, 1965, have been duly circulated and unless there is any objection, they will be confirmed. *(A Pause)*

There being no objection, I declare the Minutes of that meeting duly to be confirmed.

SPECIAL MEETING

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that in accordance with a notice which was sent out with reference to representations made to me by the Minister of Education that the Public Business requires that the House meet on a date earlier than the date to which it was adjourned, this Special Meeting has been called whereat will be considered the one and only Item on the Agenda.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report of the Public Assistance Board for the period April, 1964 — March, 1965.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Statement showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 31st October, 1965.

NOTICE OF REPLY

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 90/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, is ready.

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

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

WHEREAS the last salaries revision for Civil Servants and Public Employees in this Island came into effect on 1st April, 1961;

AND WHEREAS the cost of living in this Island has increased immeasurably since that date;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request Government
(a) to appoint without undue delay a Commission to report on and revise the Salaries of Civil Servants and Public Employees and to increase the allowance to Old Age Pensioners; and
(b) pending the submission of the said Report, immediately to grant an allowance to all Civil Servants and Public Employees to cushion the shock in the increase in the cost of living.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER RE STATEMENT IN THE PRESS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to draw to the attention of this Honourable House an article appearing in a newspaper entitled "The Daily News", dated today, Tuesday, January 4, 1966 on the front page of which there is stated in black, bold type "MILLER WILL BE ABSENT" "Independence debate gets underway in House today" (News Political Reporter).

"Mr. FREDDIE MILLER, Parliamentary Leader of the Minority Opposition Barbados Labour Party, will not be in his seat today when debate begins in the House of Assembly at 1 p.m. on the Premier's resolution seeking independence alone for Barbados.

"Mr. Miller was suspended by Speaker, Mr. J. E. T. Brancker, during a meeting of the Assembly last month for five sittings. So far, three sittings of the House have passed since the suspension which means Mr. Miller cannot return for another two.

"However, in addition to the suspension, Mr. Miller is also a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and it is not known whether he will be able to attend the debate even after his suspension period is up."

I am drawing this article to the attention of hon. members because it contains two gross and grave misstate-

ments, utterly and completely misleading as each of them is, and I take a very grave view of the passage which I have just read to the Chamber, I would let it be known that unless prompt action is taken to have this corrected — and I would like to have the same publicity accorded to this correction and apology as has been given to the misleading article — I shall take such steps as lie in my power by virtue of Standing Order No. 70 and otherwise.

I do say this in respect of the statement that so far as three sittings of the House have passed since the suspension, the facts are as follows:-

The hon. junior member for St. George was suspended at a Special Meeting on the 25th November, 1965. The following meetings of the House have taken place since then:- 1.20 p.m.

I must add that I do not regard an abortive meeting as a meeting, but on the following dates, meetings of this Chamber have taken place since the 25th November, namely 30th November, 7th December, 14th December 17th December and 21st December. On those dates meetings of this Chamber were held, which means that the sittings have passed in respect of which the suspension of that member was effective. Secondly, I will add this which, I thought was so commonly known, that there was no suspension of Mr. Miller by the Speaker; the suspension was by virtue of Standing Order 36 of this Chamber and it was on a motion which was duly carried. That Standing Order is Standing Order 36 Section 3. I have nothing more to say about this matter at this stage, but I direct the Clerk to make this newspaper a document of the House.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that this side of the House fully supports Your Honour's views in this matter and therefore regard it as gross contempt of this House. We on this side are content to leave to your direction the way this offending newspaper may be purged of this contempt. When we realised that the hon. junior member for St. George had fallen under the discipline of the House, we were more than careful to see to it that meetings of this House were arranged so as to accommodate the hon. member, and that when we came to this matter on which we are engaged today, the hon. member, as the Leader of the Minority Party in this House, should be quite ready and willing to resume his place in this Chamber. I therefore wish to exonerate the Government Party of the charge which was laid upon it, namely, that we had done this thing in order to prevent the hon. member from exercising his right in this Chamber. The matter of punishment for this contempt is left entirely to Your Honour's discretion.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 for the remainder of this debate. I should like to give the House some idea of the times at which we should have the debate suspended in order to facilitate meal times. I should ask for the suspension of the sitting at 2.30 o'clock p.m. to resume at 3 o'clock, and again at 7 o'clock p.m. I am asking hon. members who are speaking, when the appropriate time arrives for the suspension of the sitting for meals, that they give way.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the Table would like to know a little more detail. Can you tell us when we propose to close today's sitting?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member is quite right because that has slipped me. I propose that we work until 10 o'clock tonight, and tomorrow until 6 o'clock, and on the last day until we are finished.

The question that Standing Orders 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of this debate was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION re SOVEREIGN NATIONHOOD WITHIN THE COMMONWEALTH

Mr. SPEAKER: The first, and in fact, the only Order of the Day stands in the name of the Honourable and Learned senior member for St. John and it is to move the passing of the following Resolution:-

"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."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, there is in the constituency of His Honour the Deputy Speaker a monument which commemorates the landing of the settlers in Barbados in 1605. People who are more accurate in their historical facts believe that the settlers came to this island from the United Kingdom in the year 1625. This Parliament was first instituted in 1639.

There are many people, even the Editors of Halsbury's Laws of England, who are not fully cognizant of the nature of the relationship which exists between the dependent countries in the Commonwealth and the metropolitan country.
1.30 p.m.

We have in this Island a flexible constitution in the full and truest sense of the term. Unlike the inflexible constitution of the neighbouring country of Trinidad and Tobago and the constitution of the United States of America, our constitution bears similarity only to the constitution of the United Kingdom, in that it is partly founded on convention and usage, and partly contained in written statutes and constitutional documents known to us in this Parliament as the Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions.

When the settlers landed in 1625, they brought the laws of the United Kingdom with them; so that all the laws, customs and usages of Parliament were imported into this Chamber on its foundation in 1639. You may wonder, Mr. Speaker, why it is necessary for me to make this excursion into the dim recesses of the constitutional history of this Island. It is precisely because there are so many people in this island who are unaware of the long, slow process of constitutional evolution of which the Resolution which we are discussing today is the apotheosis that it is necessary for me to have this debate conducted on a level where the people whom we are addressing will understand the premises from which we speak and the premises on which we stand.

When the Parliament convened in 1639 it was convened under the Lords of the Council of this island — this was the correct Parliamentary description — the Lord Lieutenant General of the Island, the Lords of the Council and the General Assembly of this Island — to make laws for the better government of the territory under a franchise granted by the Sovereign of the United Kingdom. These Territories were run as plantations. We have not fully got rid of the plantation mentality. A franchise was granted to Sir William Courteen, the Earl of Carlisle, who appointed as Governor the Eighth Lord Willoughby, and in exchange for this franchise a certain tribute was exacted by the Imperial Government in the form of taxation which was levied on the people of this country by a process of sub infeudation from the Lord Lieutenant-General himself on to the lesser, may I call them, barons and on to the lower order of plantation chivalry that existed in those days, if there is any chivalry in the plantation system. In the year 1651 — this was a considerable time before the American Declaration of Independence, precisely perhaps 125 years before the famous Declaration in what is now known as the United States of America by the thirteen British Colonies which we have helped to populate and to develop from these shores in Bar-

bados -- the Lords in Council and the General Assembly of this Island in protest against the Navigation Laws, the same type of Navigation Laws that the thirteen Colonies rebelled against 125 years later, they were a bit slower than the people of Barbados — issued their famous Declaration of Independence, not from this Chamber, because as far as I can discover, this Chamber had not been built, but certainly the Lords of the Council and the General Assembly of this Island declared themselves an independent nation. The significant thing about this is that I have not been able to discover anywhere in the records of this House that the Unilateral Declaration of Independence which was made in 1651 has ever been repealed by this House or by any other person. May I just digress here one moment to say that I do not think there is any such thing as a Unilateral Declaration of Independence? You either make a Declaration of Independence, or you agree mutually to sever the bonds which bind you to the metropolitan country. I will deal with the Unilateral Declaration of Independence at a later stage.

Shortly after this Declaration, in those days they used to have a General in charge of fleets -- the Barbados Landship is not singular -- General Sir George Ayscue bombarded the township of Oistins, and after two days' fighting a long boat was launched with a white flag and a treaty was signed between the people of Barbados and the United Kingdom Government at a place called the *Mermaid Tavern* in the Township of Oistins on the southern coast of this island. The *Mermaid Tavern* is no more. The treaty I have not been able to find. It is probably in the British Museum or in the vaults of Somerset House in London; but it is a fact that the treaty was signed. In that treaty the people of Barbados agreed to pay 4 1/2% in exchange for the repeal of the Navigation Laws *vis-a-vis* the merchants and colonists of this country. Our relationship therefore with Great Britain has never been a "status" relation from the very early days which existed in places more properly described as Crown Colonies and which achieved internal self-Government only in the 1950s -- territories like Trinidad and Tobago, the Lesser Antilles, Mauritius and all the other island territories over which Britain held sway.

Right from the beginning and long before some of these territories were discovered or settled, the relationship between the people of this country and the Government of the United Kingdom had been a relationship of contract and not a relationship of status. That is what has probably distinguished Barbados from any other West Indian island. Its approach has always been a contractual approach and not an approach of status. We continued to make laws. You will find the very earliest Act we have on the Statute Book is, as far as I can remember, in 1667, a law against forcible entry into any lands or tenements. I have unsuccessfully invoked the provisions of this ancient law on two or three occasions, but it is still enshrined in the Statute Book of this island, and it appears that in those days such a law was necessary because of the rebellious nature of some of the inhabitants.

1.40 p.m.

When the restoration of the monarchy took place recognition was given to the loyalty of Barbados which is now proverbial — and to me sometimes is questionable in the sense that Barbadians hold loyalty to things which they know nothing about. They do not understand their duty of loyalty to their own country under the Constitution, but this loyalty to the British Government was acknowledged. This means that this Island was treated with a certain amount of deference to the extent that the island has been left to manage its own affairs. Far from the British Government either contributing one penny to the support of the general revenue of this Island in a direct manner — and I go as far as to say even in an indirect manner — from that time until today, all the Pro-consular officials have been paid by the people of Barbados although they had no say in their nomination. The Chief Secretaries not only have been paid, and continue to be paid, but the people of Barbados also provided them with living accommodation and with luxuries which are not even vouchsafed to Ministers of Government today, although we are responsible for running the Government today. All of these things Barbadians have accepted. It has been accepted that the Colonial Secretary should have a Policeman to guard his residence, and it has been accepted that the Governor should have three motor cars and police escort. It is not even thought that a Minister is even entitled to the courtesy of a messenger in his office, standing up when he comes to a room, although Ministers rise to their feet and stand when any visitor approaches. As I have said, from that day right on to this, the British Government has not contributed one penny towards the general revenue of this island.

We have always had a non-elected second Chamber, a situation not dissimilar to that ich exists in the United Kingdom today. Other territories, on the other hand, received and are still receiving substantial annual grants-in-aid, not of development, but in aid of administration and to pay the same Pro-consular officers, the same Civil Servants, and to pay for the keeping of law and order. As I have said, they are not for the purpose of paying for the carrying out of development programmes, but paying for administration; and unless one appreciates that there are territories who have lived on the "hand-outs" of the Colonial Office from time immemorial and that Barbados has never been in this invidious position, you cannot understand how difficult it is for us in the West Indies to come together under constitutional arrangements.

In the last Federation the grant-aided territories were subjected to discourteous treatment by the Federal Minister of Finance. In Port-of-Spain the Chief Minister of Antigua had to stand waiting for his Estimates to be approved by the Federal Minister of Finance, and eleven months later the Chief Minister had to borrow money from private sources to pay the Police. He was humiliated and kept waiting in the corridors of the Federal House at Port-of-Spain. We in Barbados have never found ourselves in this position where we had to ask for financial aid from what is fondly — and I say "fondly" advisedly -- described as the Mother Country. We have never been in this unhappy situation. As a matter of fact, I can recount where we have contributed towards the revenues of the United Kingdom.

We have a long history of constitutional Government which ante-dates the constitutional history of the United States, which ante-dates the constitutional history of any of the West Indian territories, which ante-dates the constitutional history of the South American countries. It should be that when the Leader of the House rises to his feet and says "Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass", if the Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition fully understood the nature of his functions, he should say "I take great pleasure in seconding this motion on behalf of the people whom we represent" and this should be the end of the debate.

But since this Resolution is momentous in the history of the Island and since we have our ignoramuses, our criminals and our cut-throats — we do have our politically ambitious people of flexible views — it is necessary for me to make abundantly clear and have recorded for all time the reasons behind the Government of this country bringing forward this resolution at this momentous stage.

Mr. Speaker, in 1862, the territory of Jamaica enjoyed a constitution similar to ours in which there were two Houses of the Legislature, in which they exercised full control over their internal affairs, but their Constitution was taken away. It was taken away, I believe, at the invitation of large numbers of the articulate citizens of Jamaica because there had been certain abuses of the Constitution. Because of that, Jamaica had to revert to the position of a Crown Colony.

Mr. Speaker, you will be surprised to know that as recently as 1939, the leader of one of the parties on the other side, supported by a former Minister of this Government, suggested to the Royal Commission after the disturbances in 1937 that Barbados should revert to a Crown Colony status when Jamaica had regained her original status. It is there in the records where Sir Grantley Adams suggested that as a solution to the constitutional and economic problems of this country.

1.50 p.m.

You will find during the course of this debate that I am going to make a very serious attempt to be restrained. Today, those of us on this side of the House have every cause, reason and justification to be angry at those people who would pull this Island down for their own personal ambitions; we would have every reason to be angry at those people who do not even take time off to think who they are, where they have come from and where they are going. When the Royal Commission came down here in 1939, exactly 300 years of the date when we began to run our own affairs, it was suggested seriously and supported by people who are in this House today and who are sitting on the opposite side of the Table, that Barbados should revert to Crown Colony status. The economic solution of the island's ills was that the island of Barbados should be developed into half-acre lots and a half-acre lot should be given to each family. That is again the Prime Minister of the late Federation. He did not elucidate on a point raised by Mr. Morgan Jones as to whether his half an acre would be in Broad Street and my half an acre would be in Grave Yard, St. Lucy; but the arithmetic was interesting because, at the end of his proposal, Mr. Morgan Jones asked Sir Grantley Adams what he was going to do with the other 60,000 people, who would be left over. From his arithmetic there would be 60,000 people left over even after his proposal. The reply was to "Get rid of them." I am not trying to stir up any animosity against anyone. I am saying what is on the record and what I heard with my own ears. I am trying to illustrate that 300 years after the establishment of this ancient Legislature, you still have people in Barbados who are incapable of thinking rightly either for themselves or for the people whom they unfortunately represent. I have the honour to be the Leader of a Party which is the first Party in the history of the West Indies, the first Party in the history of the Island which has ever published and made clear in its programme before an Election, that the Party sought independence for the people of this Island. I have been a member of two political parties in this island; I have been affiliated with another. I was affiliated with the British Labour Party. I was a member of the Barbados Labour Party and I am Chairman of the Democratic Labour Party. I am ashamed of, but I do not regret my association with the party which was the former Government Party because I used to think I knew everything about human behaviour. Terms like 'good' and 'evil' were abstractions as far as I was concerned. I did not understand the full import and meaning of the terms 'good' and 'evil' until I was associated with the Barbados Labour Party. Like I discovered of so many other people on the other side, I found that they had an inexhaustible potential for wrong doing. There are people on the other side who have such an inexhaustible potential for wrong doing that they are prepared to sell their country for half a pound of Mello-Kreem or Velvo Kris. Both of those cooking fats, I understand, are products, the raw material of which is imported from the Lesser Antilles, manufactured in Barbados and re-exported to the Lesser Antilles, just one hundred miles away, at prices which are not afforded the housewives of Barbados. There are people who may read this debate and who may not understand the allusion.

Mr. Speaker, despite my former association with that Party, the people of Barbados forgave me as they forgave you, and re-elected us in 1961 as the constitutional Government of this country. We are now witnessing another unsuccessful attempt to take over the running of the country. We are still the constitutional Government of this country and, as such, the people have put us here to implement a certain programme, a programme which was put before the electorate in 1961. You can compare the constitutional practice here in Barbados today with the practice in a neighbouring territory, where without any recourse to the Legislature, without any public debate whatsoever, without any warning or discussion even with the closest confidants of the Leader of the Government himself, or people who considered themselves to be close to the Government, it was announced that Trinidad and Tobago sought their Independence. Up to today there has been no debate in Trinidad or Tobago about Independence. There was a debate subsequent to the announcement of Independence. Criticism of the draft constitution was sought from the Boys' Scouts and Girl Guides, the Dorcas League, the Odd Fellows, and such groups. That was the exercise in democracy that they went through. The exercise in democracy that we have gone through is that we stated our intention before an election. We faltered by the wayside to see if we could collect some of our lesser brethren — in the sense of more unfortunate brethren — together along the road to Independence with us, that is where we wasted three and one half years in this exercise. Having been diverted from our main objective, we have merely returned to the mandate of the people and the expression of our intentions as demonstrated in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party.

2.00 p.m.

These are the facts. In 1961 on the 4th December when this Government was returned, there was a Federation of the West Indies. That Federation was not dissolved until May 1962 by the West Indies Federation Dissolution Act of April of that year, and the West Indies Dissolution Act made provision by Order in Council to take away, to confer, and otherwise to deal with the constitutions of all territories in this area; and it is rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the Federation should have broken up on the very day on which by the recommendation of the 1961 Conference in London it was supposed to have become independent. The two richest territories seceded with the consent and approval, and I will go so far as to say, with the connivance of Her Majesty's Government. Shortly thereafter we journeyed to London, and the result of our labours was a Command Paper laid before Parliament, and also laid in this Legislature, No. 1746 which sets out certain proposals for a Federation.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that when you hear the talk mooted about in the atmosphere about Independence in a Federation, I want to know what Federation they are talking about. It could not be an existing Federation, because there is no West Indies Federation existing today, and there has not been a Federation of the West Indies since 1962; and the remarkable thing is that although one speaker was able to boast that he had held 60 meetings himself on this Federation that we were turning our backs on in Barbados, a Federation does not exist in fact or in law between us and the other seven territories in the Eastern Caribbean — I am talking about one speaker, not of the mushroom rebel organisations spawned by the machinations of the other side which sprung up during the period between August and now; I am talking about a single speaker who claims holding sixty meetings, not of the professional mercenaries. We have no money over this side. Whether he was a mercenary or not is not for me to say, because it would be invidious since he is a member of the Other Place; but if he were not a member of the Other Place, I would go further; however, I do not want to introduce an acrimonious atmosphere into the debate, although I am an angry man today. Not one single meeting has been held in any territory in the Eastern Caribbean since the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers, but certainly no meeting at all suggesting that the Government of Barbados should not proceed to Independence now, although in order to attract attendance to several of their meetings the Opposition announced that there would be speakers from the other islands who have not materialised and who are in a state of spiritualistic ectoplasm.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will remind persons outside this Chamber proper that there is a Standing Order which says that if behaviour is disorderly, a question can be forthwith put that strangers do withdraw. Strangers must be seen but not heard.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, not one speaker has emerged. I remember the quotation "Eight times emerging from the flood she mewed to every watery god some speedy aid to send; No Dolphin came, no Nereid stirred, Nor cruel Tom or Susan heard, A favourite has no friend." The people on the other side are the cats who were drowning in a tub of goldfish.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said the people on the other side; a bunch of mangy cats drowning in a tub of gold fish,

and no Dolphins from the other seas appeared, no Nereid stirred, no cruel Tom or Susan heard; these favourites appeared to have no friends at all. But in order to attract attention — and this would not normally be in the debates of the House, and I am making sure it goes in — they advertised they were having speakers from the other islands. Nobody has appeared; no materialisation has taken place; so one would have to ask oneself what Federation they were fighting for, because it was clear from 1963 to all of us who were engaged almost in mortal combat with Her Majesty's Secretary of State and his legal advisers that the British Government had no confidence in any Federation of the Eastern Caribbean, and no intention to make any capital or other contribution to a Federation. The British Government is now prepared to make contributions to individual territories, provided they can keep their eyes on their money; and when you consider the context in which the Constitution of Grenada was taken away, and what was happening in other Windward and Leeward Island territories in financial mismanagement, you cannot blame the British Government for keeping a careful eye on the taxpayers money.

I remember I woke up one morning earlier this year in a cold sweat; I do not know what was agitating my mind, and at the first light of dawn, I telephoned the Hon. Minister of Education and told him my experience a couple of hours before and I said these four words: "They nearly had us." It was because I had been working over the draft Federal Scheme in preparation for a document which was subsequently published and laid in this House on 17th August, 1965. When I used those words, "they nearly had us", we were going into this exercise in all good faith with our eyes shut, because like in so many other departments of life, we assumed that what we are accustomed to prevails in other places and will continue to be so for evermore hereafter.
2.10 p.m.

We assumed that we were going into a federation and that there would be the same degree of financial integrity, the same respect for constitutional propriety as exists in this Island. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am a West Indian, and there is no one who is more West Indian either by birth or by inclination or otherwise than I am. I always refrain from disclosing any legislative matters which I know about which would be detrimental to the successful carrying out of the federal exercise. Probably, I have done an injustice to the people of Barbados. Anyhow, I did nothing that an atmosphere of recrimination should be introduced at any stage, and so I suppressed matters which should have better seen the light of day. I do not think by doing so I betrayed the trust of hon. members of the House because my motives were altruistic.

No one can accuse me of doing what the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago did of pointing out at any stage of our deliberations that there were 1,000 people from one Island alone coming into this territory and remaining each year. Our natural growth of population, distinct from immigration, represents between 3,000 and 4,000 annually, and you have 25% of people in the lowest strata coming into the country and contributing to the delinquency of the country. That is not being personal to anybody. That has been quoted by the Police every week, and, therefore, I was not taking my duty as seriously as I should have been by coming in and telling this Assembly what was the increase in crime as the result of the immigration situation. I have said that we had a policy that as long as we were engaged in this federal exercise we were not going to discriminate against anybody coming from the Eastern Caribbean. People from the other Islands have come and landed in Barbados without visas, money and everything. The country in the Commonwealth which could least afford to have any kind of immigration, this Island of Barbados, is the country which has kept its doors opened. They have contributed to our delinquency. Some people wonder why is it that we accept one thousand of them in addition to our natural population growth. But there is a time when things have to be said and I have been holding my peace for too long; therefore, I am going to make a positive statement that 50% of the crime in this Island has been perpetrated by people outside of Barbados. I speak of the crime discovered. We cannot increase the Police Force from month to month to accommodate the delinquency of people from outside.

Dr. Williams of Trinidad pointed out these things in 1962. He published a lengthy preamble of his Unilateral Declaration of Independence, and it was certainly a shock to Mr. Reginald Maudling who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies because it was not anticipated by Mr. Maudling until he arrived in Trinidad. The preamble by Dr. Williams pointed out the economic and social effects of immigration of people from the Eastern Caribbean into Trinidad and what it would mean in terms of school places, housing, health standards and jobs.

We live in a country which has unemployment. Our latest survey shows that twelve to thirteen per cent of the people of working age are unemployed; yet we accommodate 1,000 more people who are not Barbadians to come to the country and stay. I said that this has been condoned because of the political association which every one expected; but even the Opposition parties are now convinced that that is an empty dream for the moment. It is still a dream for some of us on this side.

Let us put aside the increase in crime. I understand that it is being said that I have abused the Chief Ministers. I have not abused any Chief Minister; all of them are my friends. Of the five Chief Ministers, three of them are my former clients. Do you want a better record than that? I have no reason to doubt that they will be again my clients one of these days when I begin to work for a competent living rather than existing on the political pittance which is handed out to Government Ministers as a sop for their services.

I receive letters from all of them—one quite recently; so if I make a statement of fact about our statistics on crime, this is not anything to be annoyed about. If I say that Dr. Williams said that the proposal to have freedom of movement would create serious problems which Trinidad could not support and did not intend to support even after the end of ten years, is this supposed to be abuse of your neighbours? These are unfortunate factors of colonialism. There are some people in Barbados who would want to tell you that there is no such thing as colonialism and that we are British subjects and that we are happy to be called British subjects. But the worst thing about colonialism is this. These Islands in the Eastern Caribbean only began to get off the ground since they were taken over by democratic governments in their Islands which were responsible to the people. Of course, the last Government of this Island was made up of a bunch of non-performers and they are out of office. This Government is performing and that is why it will continue in office. No one is going to be content to be treated as second class citizens in perpetuity. No one is going to be content to sit down indefinitely and watch places like Gambia, Togoland, Malta with only 95 square miles and even the Cooke Islands that no school child has heard about, islands with a total population of 11,000 and 12,000 and with populations smaller than many constituencies of ours, being represented and sitting around the United Nations table.
2.20 p.m.

Nobody in this Party wants a seat in the United Nations for prestige purposes. Our stand is for the people of Barbados in perpetuity; it is the only state which the Almighty God has ordained. On the 12th October last I tabled a Resolution and this is the Resolution, the main part of which I have recited. This has to go on the record and since Your Honour has only recited the last paragraph, it is appropriate that I should read the whole Resolution so that the premises from which we are arguing will be appreciated. The Resolution which was tabled on the 12th October, 1965, reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the pre-election Manifesto of this Government issued in November, 1961 stated *inter alia:*

> "The road to destiny is the road to Independence. Towards this goal the country must press on.

As the island has never been a grant-aided territory is no reason why within or without a Federation Barbados should not attain the full stature of *independence now* within the British Commonwealth.";

You will remember, Sir, I said earlier about this statement that it is the first time in the history of the Caribbean that any political party has made such a statement in its programme and published it to the people in booklet form, printed and paid for by the members of the Party and not by the merchants. I will continue, Sir. The Resolution goes on to state this:-

"AND WHEREAS a Federation of ten British Caribbean territories then existed, and continued to exist until its dissolution on 31st May, 1962;

AND WHEREAS this Government has, from January, 1962, to April 1965, engaged in discussions with the Governments of the Windward and Leeward Islands on the establishment of a new Federation;

AND WHEREAS these discussions were carried on without hindrance to the constitutional and economic development of Barbados, which attained full internal self-government in May, 1964;

AND WHEREAS these discussions have proved fruitless for several reasons, among which are --

(a) the failure of the Government of the United Kingdom to indicate the quantum of development finance which would be available to the new Federation;"

We have been requesting them to do this from 1963. In fact, we were asking them to do it from 1962. In the White Paper which was laid on the Table of this House on the 17th August, 1965, you will see from that that no less a person than the Officer administering the Government of this island – of course we are administering the Government, but the Pro-consular Official who is much appreciated by members on every side of the House – you will see that Sir John Stow himself – I think I can call his name – wrote to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and informed him that "there was no prospect or little prospect of the discussions coming to a satisfactory conclusion unless Her Majesty's Government made a clear and unequivocal statement on the quantum and duration of financial assistance which would be provided for the Federation." They were not making any money available for Barbados because we foolishly made money available for them in 1941, by giving them £100,000 out of the Hurricane Emergency Fund which is now dissolved. The War was costing something like $13 million a day and the £100,000 we gave them probably went down the drain every day in the potato peelings which were used.

I am referring to the White Paper. I should like to back up my statement by the actual quotations because what I said just now was only a paraphrase of what His Excellency the Governor said to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. You will find it in paragraph 23 on page 10 of the Federal Negotiations 1962-65 which appears as the White Paper. It is the only White Paper which has been published in the history of this island. We have had people who claim that they are Barbadians writing all sorts of things in newspapers, but this is what is stated in this paragraph 23 of the Federal Negotiations published as a White Paper:-

"The Seventh Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers was held in Antigua between the 9th and 11th of September, 1963. And on the 14th September, the Secretary of State was informed that the Conference unanimously endorsed a request that financial assistance on the scale envisaged in Dr. O'Loughlin's survey be made available and that no Conference to settle the details of a Constitution for an Independent Federation be held until satisfactory assurances about the quantum and duration of assistance by Her Majesty's Government had been obtained."

This is now published in Barbados as the Seventh Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. This is not a meeting of the Ministers of this Government; it is a meeting of the Premier of Barbados and the Chief Ministers of the various islands.

2.30 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am drawing to your attention and that of the Hon. Leader of the House the promises made to us when we suspended the Standing Orders.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member always has food on his mind. This is a serious discussion and he is getting up talking about food.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order, I never mentioned anything about food, and I feel it is rude of the Hon. Premier to be telling me about food. If he tells me about food, I will tell him about Cox.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: When the hon. member went to eat in the House of Commons, I understand he clapped his hands with glee and said "Coxie, food! food!"

No reply from the Secretary of State was received for a period of several months, and on 23rd January, 1964, the Chairman of the Regional Council of Ministers indicated to the Secretary of State that there was mounting frustration and criticism in the delay which, if allowed to continue, could wreck any hope of ever forming a Federation. That is the Governor of the Island writing to the Secretary of State, and I had permission to publish it.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult in the middle of a paragraph on a quotation, because the Public Buildings clock has chimed, to immediately assuage and allay the pangs of hunger of members on the other side. I will give way to the Hon. Leader of the House and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

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.

On Resumption:

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the Hon. Premier was addressing the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the suspension, I was reading the Preamble to the Resolution which was tabled on the 17th August, 1965. I should like to continue with your permission, since it is already a document of the House, to read the Preamble to this Resolution which we consider part and parcel of the Resolution itself, although it might not be the substantive part which will be sent to the Other Place. I had got to the stage, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where I was reciting that part of the Preamble which dealt with the failure of the discussions which had continued for the space of three and a half years fruitlessly. I had read the first part where in some paragraph it was stated that one of the reasons was the failure of the Government of the United Kingdom to indicate the quantum of development finance which would be available to the new Federation.

I should like to make the position of my Government abundantly clear. When we decided unilaterally — and I say unilaterally because without any reference to the people of Barbados I took independent members of the House, the Leader of the Opposition and others to conferences to see if we could patch together the wreckage of the former Federation; I think that we were overly ambitious, but no one can blame us for trying. What I find strange is that having confessed that we are not the creators of mankind and that we could not succeed in doing what the Almighty did not do when he brought certain people into this world, that is to put sense into their heads, I do not think that this Government should be vilified for taking the people of Barbados on the road to independence that we had digressed from in 1962 and thereafter. To me this is the strangest situation that could exist in any country with ancient traditions like this one. We have witnessed the most sordid exercise of political vilification that has ever taken place in any place outside Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. We have seen people with strong Marxist leanings coming together and being political bed-fellows with the Capitalists of this country. We have seen thugs and criminals; we have seen attacks on people's homes, assassination of their characters and the ruthless exploitation of the people of this country over a period of three or four months; and for what reason, one may ask? Because the duly constituted and duly elected Government of Barbados made an admission, an admission which had been made by the Government of Antigua, by the Government of Jamaica, by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and by the Government of Montserrat.
3.10 p.m.

All of them realise the impracticability — and, I go so far as to say, the impossibility of making any progress along lines of associations which have been contrived by a Government, far removed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the day to day battle for existence that goes on in these colonial territories. The kind of contrivance, as I pointed out in the White Paper only two days before the calamity, the kind of contrivance which is likely to prove disastrous in Nigeria; the kind of contrivance which has not succeeded in any colonial territory in the Commonwealth.

Sir, I should like to quote — and I make no apology for quoting — from the White Paper the various alternatives which today confront the people of Barbados. I came straight down from Sherbourne and conferred with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the 28th April, 1965. I came down and conferred with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the former Minister of Trade and the Speaker himself. I would say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, more than anybody else in Barbados, was somewhat skeptical of the success of any Federation and he continues to be skeptical. If I had listened to the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, I would never have had to be addressing you on this today. He is a man possessed with a great understanding of the baseness of human nature. I pay him this compliment although I am not quite sure it is a compliment.

You would not expect, Sir, after discussing this matter for three and a half years, how surprised we were to hear all of a sudden that members on the other side were championing the pursuit of the Federal dream. For three and a half years, Chief Ministers of the other colonies were coming up here discussing, not only problems relating to the Federation, but we were giving them advice and encouraging their people to come to Barbados to work to the detriment of the people of this country. In the meantime, not one of them on the opposite side had the decency to ask a Chief Minister to come to his home and have a cup of tea. There are some members over there who would not even ask some members of the House to come to their homes and have a cup of tea. We are living in a country in which you can be sitting next to a boy in Harrison College and in the evening after school he passes you by as if you never existed. That is the kind of people which you find in these islands. We in Barbados, more than any other people in any part of the world, have exhibited how not to live together in unity. We have mastered the art of how not to live together in unity, and there are no greater practitioners of this than the hon. members on the other side who now claim to be the champions of the people from the other islands.

I can tell you that there are some of them who if they are having a political meeting in somebody's house, you will find one not inviting the other person because that person is not acceptable in that house; therefore, what are the ties that bind together? There is no philosophy or ideology among the political mercenaries on the other side; therefore, it is not passing strange that they are not fighting for the independence of their country.

I was dealing with this kind of association that the British Government contrived. We would never get together in the West Indies until we fashion something of our own. We have a peculiar situation in the West Indies. There is no political formula that you can translate from Europe or America that can have application to a situation such as what we have inherited here in the West Indies.

In the White Paper, in paragraph 77 on page 39 — Mr. Joshua of St. Vincent has said that this paper is a most accurate document. This is what has been stated:-

"Wherever two or three territories could be gathered together, the contrivance of federal constitutions has been for the past one hundred years an inevitable act of final absolution performed by departing British officialdom.

78. "No other colonial power has pursued the goal of federalism with such zeal and religious fervour and none has left behind such a spectacular record of divided communities and absolute failures. The Confederation of Canada was created by the British North America Act of 1867. Ninety eight years later there is a strong clamour for separation of the province of Quebec.

79. "Australian states have been engaged in squabbles with the Federal Government which have ended up in the highest courts in the Commonwealth.

80. "The Nigerian Federation is very tenuously held together but considerable friction exists between the four regions and no one can guarantee its survival. The Central African Federation was dissolved to avert bloodshed on 31st December, 1963, after ten short years of existence.

81. "The West Indies Federation floundered after three purposeless years and the Malaysia Federation, established as recently as September, 1963, has had its communal difficulties and is held together only by the threat of Indonesian aggression. Since no such threat or inducement exists in the Eastern Caribbean, any movement towards integration of the people of the area must spring not only from a natural desire for independence but primarily from a reasonable expectation, if not a certainty of economic advantage. The movement must be sustained by a full appreciation and understanding of its implications and by mutual respect and sincerity of purpose."

Three days after I tabled the White Paper, from the Malaysian Federation it was announced that the Prime Minister of Singapore had withdrawn his country from it. This is the only Government that you will find that predicted it. Who are these people that are trying to dictate to the elected representatives of the people? Whence came they? They have never faced a general election; they have never made a political decision; they have never seen a single document from the Regional Council of Ministers; yet they have arrogated to themselves to dictate to the elected representatives of the people to say that they are right and we are wrong.
3.20 p.m.

That is proved. I continue with my apologies for the digression. The only threat of aggression I would use is because there are those disgruntled politicians who are willing to pay money in order to assassinate people. Well, let them assassinate the Cabinet of Barbados. If they consider that their political philosophy is so important, well,

let them do that. They can do it; but they will be swept away in a torrent of bloodshed if they touch one hair of the head of any of the Ministers. There are those for whom the bell tolls; you can listen to it tolling. This is the sordid state to which we have degenerated in this island. We started this in 1651. I have Schomburg's History of Barbados, and we commited an act of sequestration then. I should like to apologise for saying that I have not found a rescission of this act of sequestration. I have found that we had to sign a request of capitulation which I shall read, but as far as this Government is concerned, there will be no request of capitulation signed at all. There will not be any concession or amendment to our Resolution in this matter. There will not be the slightest acceptance of any modification whatsoever because we do not intend to capitulate on this matter since we consider it a fundamental issue of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I shall continue to read the Resolution which we have before us. I continue from paragraph 81. When I say "I", I mean "We" in contradistinction to the loyal members of the Opposition. We recognize all the conventions. We adhere to them and we respect them. We have a convention of collective responsibility in my Government, and the act of one of us is the act of all of us. From this principle there cannot be any derogation. Those who are politically flexible, who should have been exceedingly lucky to be here resuscitated and brought back into respectable society, even although they may consider that these principles are capable of emendation, we do not accept it. That is why we shall have to overcome. I went on to say in paragraph 81 that "Since no such threat or inducement," that is the threat of aggression — "Since no threat or inducement exists in the Eastern Caribbean any movement towards integration of the people of the area must spring not only from a natural desire for independence but primarily from a reasonable expectation, if not a certainty, of economic advantage. The movement must be sustained by a full appreciation and understanding of its implications and by mutual respect and sincerity of purpose."

That is what we are being criticised for today. We have said that none of these experiments has been a success. We do not want to have an assassination of anybody else for having a different opinion from us. Those are the facts. People like the late Professor Ivor Jennings, when they wrote on the Federal Constitution, although realising the difficulties and stating certain prerequisites of Federation, they were not able sufficiently to break down their analysis to be an accurate guide to people who were embarking on this exercise for the first time. Only a West Indian who is working with West Indians, or a Malaysian who is working with Malaysians today will understand the full implications of the Federal exercise. It is one of the most difficult of exercises.

Let me put it in this way. I am treating you, Sir, with all the respect which is due to you, and through you, John Citizen, the man in the street. The Federation broke up when two colonies seceded and three others pulled out. I told Sir Stephen Luke that we were not here to work as scavengers; we do not want to have a Federation at all costs with the loss of our self-respect. We were very careful during our campaign not to create any atmosphere of embarrassment for the Government that was in power then, by campaigning against their breaking up of the Federation. I want all of this to go down on the record.
3.30 p.m.

I want it to go down on record that Sir Grantley Adams went to Jamaica and had an interview at 10.20 in the morning with Norman Manley who was President of his political party, the Federal Labour Party, and half an hour after, he called a Press conference in Jamaica, in Mr. Manley's territory of which Mr. Manley was Premier. Mr. Manley was President of his Party, and he as Federal Prime Minister, envious of Mr. Manley's position in the hearts and minds of the West Indian people, envious of Mr. Manley's leadership of the Party, indignant of the fact -- and I am going to call names — that he and the hon. gentleman who was Chief Whip of the Conservative Party, Mr. Buchan-Hepburn got on very well. He was the Chief Whip, the axe man of the Conservative Party who was made Governor-General of the West Indies and became Lord Hailes. He married the granddaughter of Lord Durham, another Federalist. They got together in Antigua. I was in Antigua and I am talking here for the first time, although I have Sir Grantley's voice on tape recording in Queens Park when he said that Mr. Manley was the most politically dishonest person he had ever met. It was a directly personal matter, and I am going to expose all because I was in Antigua with Mr. V. C. Bird, than whom there is no greater statesman. If I had listened to him, we would have been independent in May last year when we brought in our new Constitution.

Mr. Manley, Lord Hailes and Dr. Williams decided that the leadership of the Federal Government was worse than useless. Dr. Williams used those words, and he was a member of the Federal Labour Party. We were not in it; we were in the Opposition, but both sides invited us to join, and the Hon. Leader of the House can tell you. Sir Grantley's Party asked us to join and we said "No". The Federal Democratic Labour Party asked us to join and we said "No", because we said the part could not be greater than the whole. We were the first Democratic Labour Party in the West Indies, and there were more capitalists and humbugs in the Federal Democratic Labour Party than in the Federal Labour Party. These gentlemen got together in Antigua when I was there, and I did not want to provide any grist for the mill of the Barbados Labour Party or the Federal Labour Party, and that is why I did not say anything about what they said. They said that the only way to get rid of Adams was to make him a member of the House of Lords because he would jump at that, and then they would have a Federation of the West Indies — and if Sir Grantley Adams said it, it is the only truthful thing he said in his life because I was there. I was not at the meeting; I was not a part of the conspiracy. I was an accessory after the fact, I plead guilty. He was to go to the House of Lords. The other person who was to go to the House of Lords was Lord Gordon of Castries and the third person was Lord Nelson himself. You may not know who that is, but that is Mr. Learie Constantine who for years played for Nelson Cricket Club and he was to be called Lord Constantine of Nelson.

We had a Federal Government, but Mr. Adams deliberately broke his journey and went through Jamaica and paid his compliments to Mr. Manley, and immediately thereafter called a Press conference. Let us not fool ourselves. Sir Grantley Adams is still alive and may God preserve him to see Barbados become independent although not under his leadership; so let us preserve his body and soul. He belongs to the dim recesses of history. Mr. Adams did not reject the idea of going to the House of Lords, but what he wanted to do was to go to the House of Lords and remain Federal Prime Minister and get rid of the only threat who was Mr. Manley, Chairman of the Party. When he heard for the first time that these things were possible, that the British Government used the system of honours in order to get rid of people whom they found embarrassing, that it is not for services rendered but for services which you have not rendered — they call it kicking you upstairs — and when he realised that for the first time in the West Indies a man of African descent could go to the House of Lords, because it had come from no less a person than the dispenser of patronage himself, because the person in charge of patronage for a number of years in the British Parliament was Mr. Buchan Hepburn who was Governor-General of the West Indies, this struck him like a big brick.

I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he wanted to be a member of the House of Lords and be Federal Prime Minister, and you will remember, Sir, that in 1958 when my colleagues and I, when the hon. senior member for St. Peter who is General Secretary of the Barbados Worker's Union and a man whose name I will never forget, whose skin was of a different pigmentation than mine, but who was a human being, the late Deputy Speaker of this House, the late Athol Edwin Seymour Lewis, better known to us as "T.T." —when we campaigned throughout this island in 1958, it was not because we were anxious to go to any

federation, but as political protagonists we could not allow people to win an election by default. It was not politically or economically or in any other way expedient for the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union, Mr. "T. T." Lewis, the Hon. senior member for Christ Church on my right and the Hon. Leader of the House here on my left, for any one of us, to be in a Federal Government, but as a political party you could not profess to represent people unless you were prepared to fight the issue and we did not put up a half-hearted fight. I am still making an analysis of the results of that election and they are revealing. Outside the parish which you represent and the neighbouring parishes of St. Andrew and St. Thomas, the parishes as it were -- do not take this in a derogatory sense – of difficult terrain, with the polling stations miles apart, we got the remarkable result that 15% of the electorate turned out in densely populated parishes like St. Michael and Christ Church and 73% turned out in the most difficult parishes. Have you ever studied the results, Sir? Are you surprised that any Federation founded on dishonesty or run on such statistical dishonesty has failed?
3.40 p.m.

Can a Federation grounded upon dishonesty or can any Government grounded on that kind of statistical dishonesty survive?

During the last Federation, I said night after night that Mr. Adams could not make up his mind about going to the Federation because Mr. Manley did not make up his mind; therefore, it was only a matter of days after the news came out that Mr. Manley had declared his intention to remain at home that Mr. Adams declared his intention to run in the Federal elections.

I made two predictions. If you do not blow your own trumpet, nobody is going to blow it for you. I said: (1) that if Mr. Adams were elected, he would be the first and last Prime Minister of the West Indies. I said: (2) that the Federation would last just over three and a half years. It expired and breathed its last, despite the efforts to apply artificial respiration, on the 31st May, 1963. Why did it breathe its last? Without warning Mr. Manley what he was going to do, Mr. Adams went to Jamaica and called a Press Conference immediately after discussing other matters with Mr. Manley and said that the Federal Governement intended to impose retroactive taxation for five years. There are some of us who cannot pay taxes for a year, far less pay retroactive taxes, and we are supposed to be better off than many others in the West Indies. Therefore, you can imagine the dramatic effect of a declaration like that in a country like Jamaica where the two parties are equally balanced. The immediate effect of that announcement was that Mr. Manley was forced into the position where he declared a referendum.

I do not want anybody to get up and ask any stupid questions in this House. Nobody is going to advise us. There is no provision in this Island for a referendum, and as long as this Government is in power there is not going to be one. As long as this Government is in power, there is not going to be any proportional representation. We have had a direct franchise all this time. The only electoral reform we promised to do is to abolish the anachronism of dual-member constituencies. As far as electoral reform is concerned there is no electoral reform to be performed in this Island; we have fought and won those battles. If Mr. Anthony Greenwood elects to put into the hands of the other Islands constitutional proposals that there can be a Unilateral Declaration of Independence by any of the islands of the Lesser Antilles after a two-thirds vote of the legislature, that is a matter for him and them; but he could not be so crazy as to send these proposals to the elected Government of Barbados.

A lot has been approved in this Island. I am merely stating the constitutional position of the Government *vis-a-vis* the electorate of this Island. I am not making any proclamation of dictatorship; the "Daily News" has written in Montreal that I want to proclaim and make myself President of this Island for the next twenty-five years. Anyhow, we have court cases in Montreal and in Barbados and I would say no more about that. But, can you imagine even the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in the fulness of his power in the Bridgetown City Council even proclaiming himself as a dictator? The women would tear him in bits.

I am a penniless politician, but I want to remain an honest one: and if you want to be honest to the people, you have to tell them the plain facts of life. If they do not like the decisions taken by the Government in office, they have recourse to the ballot box. This is what we call a democratic system of Government, and as long as this Government is in office we will stick to that. I have heard a former Premier of this Island who is now no longer in the Party to which I regret I belonged, declare that the only thing a Legislature could not do is to make a man a woman and a woman a man. I believe that assertion came from Professor Dicey.

People must understand that a good Government is put there to make decisions. I have to make decisions on the part of the people of this Island. You can sleep better in your bed because we make these decisions. As a matter of fact, a democratic Government functions best with organised opinion. It virtually amounts to this, that at election time the people place the decision and policy power into your hands. To make you keep on a straight and narrow path, the political party should normally declare its intention, in what is called a Manifesto, of the things which should be made clear.

Therefore, you have two checks. You have the ballot box and you have to publish a programme in what is called a Manifesto; otherwise any man can get up on a public platform and say whatever he likes.

I remember that one gentleman promised that he was going to run a four-inch main from Brandons Beach to one of the central parishes so that the people up there could get a sea bath. You can make all kinds of promises and say all this nonsense if you do not have a Manifesto.
3.50 p.m.

I am not ridiculing the gentleman. In his enthusiasm he wanted to do so much for the people that he did not see that he could not put everything in a Manifesto. You cannot put things like that in the Manifesto. What you put in the Manifesto is a serious matter. All of the things in the Manifesto may not be capable of performance within certain periods of time, but those are your objectives. I get very irritated at the pace at which the machinery of Government works sometimes; sometimes I feel extremely frustrated about that. I see that Civil Servants take home files night after night and you cannot get a proper summary made of a problem. It is a question of your training and capacity for doing things, especially where the atmosphere is competitive and you have to produce results; but we train ourselves to deal with things quickly. If I am able to get certain things done in three months, I would still be a happy man.

Mr. Speaker, these are things which have been published in a document where people can challenge us about them. If you were to tear out the first four pages of the Manifesto, well, none of the Ministers will accept the responsibility for them because none of these things are capable of performance within that time. You can look at the propositions in that part of the document, and the rest of the document. You go through it after page four, page by page, and you will see that within a matter of eleven days of this Party having been elected to office, we had instituted a crash programme which is still going on in this island, and the crescendo of that programme is increasing. On the first day of the Session, members on the opposite side – well, not all of them, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition – I like to give the Devil his due. Of course, I am not referrring to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as a Devil. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition had the political sense to support the passing of a Resolution for the sum of $250,000 at Christmas time. That was not an Election plank because the Election had passed and the enemy had been scattered in all directions. We instituted that programme and because traditionally the House used to be adjourned and members used to go inside and drink, they said that we had no right introducing that Resolution then.

I go back now to the checks and balances. If you have a declaration of your intention towards the people of this Island,

then the people of this Island can check your declaration against your performances, and that is the test, and the only test, which will be applied to a Government in a democracy. The test is not to buy votes by bribes; and you can never in a democracy hope to get rid of the Government in that way. You can only remove the Government when the people are dissatisfied with that Government. The Government has been put there to make decisions and this Government has made a decision. I want it to go down on the record of this House because, as I said in my earlier remarks, I am an angry man: but I am still restrained because I am not yet ready to be otherwise. I do not think that in introducing this debate I should make it impossible for people to redeem themselves because if I were to start exposing them, they will have to go into hiding. If I said that I cannot possibly tell all the truth in Barbados that is so; because it is sordid and the Government has to survive so that the people's work can be done. There are a few delinquents in this island who want to pull down the country. However, I will overpower them on that score.

There are some members on the opposite side of this House who gave interviews to the Members of the Press and said all sorts of slanderous things about me and the Government. All I have said about Independence I have said, and the Ministers have agreed with me. This is what I want to say and I have been studying the behaviour of people. Last year in September I flew down with a friend of mine, and he is one of the greatest Ministers which the Caribbean area has ever produced. The two of us went out at the invitation of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Mr. Speaker, I am merely stating the facts because there are certain things which you cannot discard.
4.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, when you are in a country, you owe loyalty first to that country. You can have difficulties and differences; but whatever your difficulties and differences, whether the country is an independent country or whether the country is a non self-governing territory or whether it is a grant-aided territory, the society — meaning the Government, because that is the policy-making sector of the society — has to draw the line between allowable conduct on the one hand, and insanity or crime on the other. That is why you have criminal courts and civil courts, because you cannot do as you like with your neighbour's property, since he can get recourse in the Civil Courts and you cannot commit an act where it endangers life, limb and property because the society itself imposes sanctions.

I want to say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Some people are talking as if today is the beginning of creation. We have a country and we have a Constitution. We have laws, we have police forces, and we are not going to invent police forces any more than we are going to invent crimes or criminals or sadists. We have them in the society. If anybody goes to gaol, it is because he has been going to goal for a long time and because we have been vigilant enough to send him to gaol; but we have a country and this is the meaning of having a country. Let us get this thing in the right perspective. It is not a question of independence for anybody or that kind of nonsense spread by disloyal Barbadians writing that we want a dictatorship established. Some gentleman wrote an article blaming the Government for tapping people's telephones. I had the greatest authority in the Commonwealth to come and investigate this allegation, because I was shocked and surprised. I have to be careful how I describe the highest authority, but it was someone who would be familiar with this kind of investigation. I wrote three letters to the gentleman saying that we were surprised and we assured him that we would call in the Manager of the Telephone Company. We did all that, and the same gentleman who accuses me and the Government of wanting to establish a dictatorship because we say we want independence for Barbados has not had the decency to reply, and he is the same gentleman who deliberately misrepresented the proceedings of this House in today's paper by saying we are trying to keep somebody out , that we only had three meetings and there are two more to go. We protected that hon. member from the folly and ignorance of his own ways by deliberately calling meetings of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I knew the time of this meeting three months ago, and I say now that we have a proper Cabinet, because all my Ministers had some kind of intimation; but they are loyal people and they are people who are trustworthy. I am sure that until you got the notice, although you belong to this Party, neither you nor His Honour the Speaker had any intimation that this debate was going to take place today. According to our Standing Orders, you have three months for a measure to remain on the Order Paper, and this Government which they accuse of being a dictatorship deliberately summoned five meetings to make sure that the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party would be, God willing, here today. God did not so will, and you cannot blame us for the Almighty striking somebody down. That is why I say I am an angry man. The Leader of the House summoned five consecutive meetings, and if those in politics credited us with any decency at all, they would realise that we were trying to save the hon. member from himself. That has gained us nothing. Some are desperate because we will hear their political death rattle before this debate is finished. I am very angry today when you can get a newspaper in this island to which the Government pays subscriptions and gives advertisements deliberately mis-representing the proceedings of the House, when the Minister who is Leader of the House brought members out and we even had an abortive meeting to make sure that the hon. member would be here today. The Almighty has taken care of him, not us; and if I had the assurance that he would not waste the time of this House with his rhetorical meanderings and it was possible for him to come out and vote, I would ask the Leader of the House to adjourn the House after the debate has finished if I had the assurance that he could come in his pyjamas, because we want them to vote, and posterity would judge them. They are the most politically inept bunch that I have had to deal with.

I remember there was a book written called "The Five Graves to Cairo" and the hero was a gentleman by the name of Rommel; his counterpart is on my right. We set four traps for the people on that side for their political extinction and they did not know it. I may be ingenuous in so far as trusting people, but I am not ingenuous when it comes to Political Science. The greatest amount of abuse has been heaped on the heads of this Government. I know well, Sir, that you have given me a certain amount of latitude, but certain principles have to be enunciated. People of this country try to set white people against black people. Some members over there would rally members of European descent in this population and tell them that Barrow intends to do so-and-so. They do not have enough sense to ask what is his intention. Never has anybody in this political party expressed or implied any intention that this Government or this country should proceed along anything different from an orderly path to independence. The constitution which we are operating now is the type of constitution which we will be operating after independence, because when the Hon. Attorney General who was then Minister without Portfloio and the Acting Attorney General went to England, I rented a house for them because I did not intend that they should leave London until they got the Independence Constitution. I told them that they could park themselves there and go down to the Colonial Office; and this is the Constitution that they brought back.
4.10 p.m.

I have here the Statutory Instruments of 1964, No. 491 Caribbean and North Atlantic Territories, the Barbados (Letters Patent Consolidation) Order 1964, made at the Court at Buckingham Palace, the 26th day of March, 1964. Present, the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

"Her Majesty, by virtue and in exercise of the powers conferred upon Her by the West Indies Act 1962 (a) and of all other powers enabling Her in that behalf, is pleased, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, to order, and it is hereby ordered as follows:-" Listen to this.

"1. -(1) This Order may be cited as the Barbados (Letter Patent Consolidation) Order 1964."

I had to argue with the Colonial Office about this title. I did not want it. They said to let it remain for the sake of speed.

I have an understanding from the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows about that. When the West Indies Dissolution Act was proposed, I cabled Mr. Reginald Maudling and told him that I have read section so-and-so of the Bill containing provisions which could not apply to the Island of Barbados. They have these things devised for Mr. Gairy and some of these recalcitrant Ministers. This is how these countries are run when they are Colonies and they want a blind. I said to Mr. Reginald Maudling that I wanted him to understand that these provisions cannot be extended to apply to Barbados and I got back the reply from him saying that these provisions were not intended for Barbados.

We have a Constitution and on the 5th May, 1964, the Constitution was read out to the General Assembly and it was then pointed out in the Senate, in the Other Place, by His Excellency the Governor of Barbados. I will show you how dishonest some people can be. When Senator Vaughan and Mr. Jacobs were hammering out the Constitution of Barbados "and e'en the ranks of Tuscany could scarce forbear to cheer", when we finished that exercise, the stage was set for the independence of Barbados.

That, Sir, is in the Speech from the Throne on the 5th May, 1964, when the new and final Constitution for this Island was implemented. We departed from the Other Place and we came to the lesser regions down here – in the Commons. We left the lofty heights of Mount Olympus and descended into the arena. This is where the battles are fought and will continue to be fought.

As far as I remember, my colleague, the hon. junior member for the parish of St. John who is on my right, as is his wont got up and moved a Resolution on the Address from the Throne. Speeches were made subsequently on that motion. There are some people whom you cannot stop from speaking even if they have nothing to say. I am speaking from memory and I cannot name all the hon. members who spoke on that Resolution, but today is one day in the history of this Parliament when all the members are present.

Surely, if the hon. junior member for St. John moves a Resolution thanking His Excellency for his Speech from the Throne, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has as his right to comment on anything in the Speech from the Throne. When Her Majesty the Queen goes to Jamaica, she may make a Speech from the Throne. The Governor General is only standing in her shoes. Whether the Speech is made by the Governor General of Jamaica or whether it is made by Her Majesty the Queen, a Speech from the Throne is an enunciation of the Government's policy and it usually reviews the Government's achievements. If you go through every Speech which was given from the Throne since this Government came into power, you will see that we never made a pronouncement which we never intended to keep. A Speech from the Throne is a serious matter. It is not a pious expression of peace and goodwill; it is delivered so that the people would know what they can expect.

Her Majesty the Queen, when she comes here, will not be delivering a Speech from the Throne. Her Majesty will not be saying anything on policy, but she will be presenting a new Coat of Arms to this Island. It will not be the Coat of Arms of the two animals or sea horses which you see; we are going to have something which represents Barbados, and Her Majesty will present the Speaker of the House and the President of the Other Place with a facsimile of the Coat of Arms which will adorn the space above Your Honour's head. Her Majesty will not be making a Speech from the Throne: Her Majesty will be doing so in Jamaica.

As I have said, the Speech was made on the 5th May, 1964, setting out broadly the Letters Patent of 1964 and the Royal Instructions to the Cabinet which forms part of our Constitution. I do not see, if people are responsible, why they should challenge certain conventions. You should only challenge when it is necessary. That is a matter which I am prepared to discuss with the Opposition when they come like sensible people and talk the matter over with us.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows how I feel about Federation. I digress to say this. The policy enunciated by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for the independence of people is going to be contingent on his views on the matter that his boys would lose some money.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to cross the Hon. Premier but I have never at any time talked of any boys.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The difference might have crept in because "gentlemen" might have been used instead of "boys".

4.20 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had no intention of interrupting the hon. member at all during this exercise, but I have never told the Hon. Premier that the boys said that they would lose some money. I have never said anything of the sort. That would not come from me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the disagreement between the hon. member and myself is not whether he had informed me that certain vested interests in Bridgetown would lose money. If I did not pursue this method ... I called them boys .....

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. Whether I called them boys or gentlemen, I have passed that stage. The point which I am really making is that I have never said to the Premier anything about anybody losing money.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, I will ask him if they feel they will lose money.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There will not be any exchanges in here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I left Sherbourne – getting back to what I was saying – and recounted a conversation which I had with Sir Stephen Luke to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the hon. senior member for the City, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church. The hon. member knows the conversation; I discussed the whole situation with him. There is a difference in the terminology between us, but I am prepared to go ahead. I would like the Editor of the Daily News to listen to this. This is a Speech from the Throne which was delivered on the occasion of the Legislative Session for 1964-66.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that the honourable and learned senior member for St. John was addressing the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Your Honour was well advised. On page two of the *Official Gazette* of the 5th May, 1964, His Excellency the Governor said this in his Speech from the Throne:-

"The main constitutional provisions for Barbados are contained in the Order in Council and the local legislation to which I referred earlier. There are, however, certain conventions which are related to those constitutional provisions and I now wish to restate briefly the more important of these conventions ....."

These are the main provisions. The post of Attorney General to be a Ministerial post instead of a Civil Service post and the establishment of a post of Director of Public Prosecutions and the abolition of the post of Solicitor General.

When I spoke about people going to gaol, I have no authority to advise the Solicitor General to prosecute or not to prosecute anybody. That is all enshrined in the Constitution of this Island. I have no more power to do that than I have the power to advise the people on the other side not to commit any crime.

The other provisions are:-

"The abolition of the Executive Committee and the transfer of the powers and functions of the Executive Committee and the Governor-in-Executive Committee entirely to the Cabinet;

The transfer of authority in respect of the management of Government finances from the Governor-in-Executive Committee to the Cabinet and the Minister of Finance."

Nobody here, not even the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, could claim that at any time in the history of the Island we had a full system of responsibility. I remember, Sir, that my stationery vote is so zealously guarded that I had to come for a vote for $27.00 for stationery, paper clips, paper and things of that sort, whereas the Chief Minister of Montserrat, a kingdom of about 20 square miles with an annual revenue of $480,000, would not have to do that. The revenue of one island is something like $14 million and the Chief Minister collects half a million and spends one and a half million. We, in this island, collect $35 million and save some of that for building schools and things of that sort. I have to face the criticisms of the other side for running out of blotting paper and stationery, whereas Mr. Bramble can sign a warrant for $250,000 on any day of the week without going to the Legislature at all. So can Mr. Le Blanc and Mr. Southwell. Therefore, when Mr. Gairy put a refrigerator in his office, he did not have to wait on the decision of the Legislature because that is the system which they have instituted.

When you had constitutional advancement in these islands, the British Treasury delegated to those people the right to do these things without any reference to the Legislature. When I suggested that you should write into the Constitution that you should not do this or that, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that there are people who threw up their hands in horror.
4.30 p.m.

When they have three meetings of the Legislature in the course of a year, that is supposed to be an Olympic record for the Legislature because the only meeting held usually is the opening of Parliament, and after that the Ministers would do what the hon. senior member for St. Peter would describe as "go through the eddoes". This is how these Governments are run and this is what they want us to do. Do you think they are going to accept any dictatorship by Barbados? That is why I woke up one morning and told the Hon. Minister of Education on my left that they nearly had us, because in that Constitution to which we contributed foolishly, relieving the British Government of their responsibility, we had the good sense of saying that the British Government must make a declaration as to the financial support for the grant-aided territories which up to now they have not done. Moreover I have decided and I hope members on the other side would subscribe, to put up a prospectus for $1 million in Government debentures next week, because I do not believe in increasing our burden overseas. Barbadians have to do some savings and contribute to the economy. Only when I have exhausted the accumulated capital in this country will I go outside, because when we have to pay interest and so on to people outside, that money does not circulate.

Mr. Speaker, I have not invested one single penny of Barbados money in any foreign country. However, to return to my original thesis, under the Constitution that they are so much in favour of, and none of the islands appears to be interested in at the present moment – the Minister of Development and Finance in Barbados has a Development Programme entailing an annual expenditure on Capital Account alone of more than the accumulated capital of all these territories put together with the exception of Antigua, an expenditure involving $13 million per year in our Four Year Development Programme, and whereas I sit down and read the *Financial Times* and send cables to the Crown Agents, brokers and other people in the other money markets timing the loans to finance the programme by various devices, all legal, and paying low rates of interest from the Joint Consolidated Fund, under the Federal Constitution we would be in the ignominious position of asking Mr. Bradshaw or Mr. Bramble whether we could raise a loan; and they would treat us, if past experience is any indication, in precisely the same way that Mr. Bird was treated then. Mr. Bird had to go several times to the Federal Capital to get his Estimates approved. I was naive because I credited people with more integrity – which in politics you should never do – and with more good intentions than I should. You should have everything sewn up tightly so that nobody would be able to take advantage of the people of this Island, because you never know whom you are going to deal with, and if you have written a Constitution, you have to make sure in that written Constitution that your interest is safeguarded.

Mr. Speaker, we are not at any stage in our history going to commit any voluntary act of political suicide, and we very nearly did, because as I said before, if the Federal Minister of Finance or the Committee that they appointed said that Montserrat had been in debt all these years, and that Barbados should not spend all this money at all and that the work we are doing on the Financial Building, the East Coast Road, School buildings like the new one in St. Joseph which Her Majesty will open and which rejoices in same name as Her Majesty -- all these things should be drawn to a dramatic close overnight by a Constitution which I sat down inadvertently or through too much goodwill and agreed to; but when I saw the behaviour, I knew what was happening. You could get a situation in that kind of set-up that with the strongest possible Government elected in Barbados with twenty-four seats out of twenty-four, you would find it increasingly difficult to carry on and run this country.

They talk about Independence within a Federation; this is the kind of Independence which did not dawn on me until I woke up in a night-mare at 3 o'clock in the morning and found myself covered in perspiration, because several activities which were going on on the periphery were beginning to bother me in the back of my mind, and I was watching the behaviour of certain people, and I tried to analyse why it was that certain people were so dead set on certain things. I looked at the Federal Constitution until about 1 o'clock that morning in my office, went home, made a cup of tea and went to bed and woke up in cold sweats. Mr. Bird has all the seats because the people gave him all. "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away; Blessed be the name of the Lord". Some of them over there will get their seats taken away; so be it. No one has a claim to political immortality; there are no political immortals under our Constitution. You cannot give yourself immortality. As a matter of fact, I would like to say to the Editor of that Newspaper that anybody who made himself President of a country for his life time was automatically signing his death warrant, because that is the only way you could remove him. Only an inept person would make himself President for life, and this is what I told Dr. Williams when Duvalier was made President of Haiti. If a man makes himself President for life, you cannot get rid of him the constitutional way, but you can get rid of him by assassination. Some on the other side are so desperate now that although they know the Constitution of Barbados, they cannot wait until elections; they want to get rid of us by assassination. It is pitiable, sordid and regrettable.
4.40 p.m.

I would not like to see the day when we have a single Party being returned by the people of this Island. Of course, I do not want to discourage you from giving us twenty-two seats, but I ask parties to make sure of their candidates and do not say that some member of the Government Party does not want two parties in the House. I say that the day you have twenty-two or twenty-four seats in a Legislature of this kind, you are going to have confusion from inside your own Party, and that is worse than what you have now with all the nonsense that you have on the other side.

This pronouncement was made with the sole object of doing discredit, not to me, but to the country. They planned that if that kind of discredit gets around, the country would never be able to get any investment. They would be able to scare away capital, and there would be a scarcity of capital in the Island and nobody would invest in Barbados. Then those persons would go and tell the people how hard it is with us, we cannot raise money in London because the country is not in a good position.

There is nobody who has a better record of raising money than we. The last loan which we negotiated in London, which was $6.25 million, was oversubscribed 32 times in 90 seconds. Therefore, Sir, they cannot criticise the Government for lack of timing or of financial ineptitude or financial dishonesty. Therefore, their main objective now is to go outside and write articles in the *Montreal Star* and in the *Trinidad Guardian*, but never in Barbados, because the people in Barbados never had any dishonesty. It would be torn to bits by the people.

I am going on now to the Hon. Kenneth Jones. I was even criticised for going to his funeral. He was the person responsible for the proposal of a Tropical Meteorological Institution in these parts, not only here but in the United States. I am very serious about this. Great Britain was at war and people were fighting for survival. When Great Britain had shut the door of mercy to mankind by the Commonwealth Immigration Act which restricts the quota to 7,000 immigrants — and then no one country is entitled to 15% — there were 5,000 illegal immigrants inside the United Kingdom.

How do they apply this legislation? They apply it against Commonwealth countries and in favour of the European countries; and whether they like it or not, I will say again that we have a lot to thank the United States for — and I do not care if President L. B. Johnson comes from Texas or Montgomery, he has done more for the people of the West indies by his new immigration policy than the Socialist Government of the United Kingdom.

I am deadly serious on this. I challenge anybody to say that Mr. Amery, whose father was a Proconsul, a Cabinet Minister, killed anybody. He did not kill anybody. He got up and spoke against his country when his country was at war and fighting for its survival. He spoke in favour of the enemy — the people outside against the people inside of this country — and despite the fact that his father was a Cabinet Minister and a member of the Government, he was hanged for treason. I want everybody to hear me. I want to tell you of their dealings with people who are traitors to their country and who are prepared to vilify, slander and attack everything, even if it means pulling down their country and causing starvation.

Let us remember a gentleman called Mr. William Joyce. A lot of people contributed to his delinquency in the same way that certain people who write in certain newspapers have contributed to the delinquency of those newspapers because they give currency to threats being published. All Mr. William Joyce did was before the war was over. He did not kill anybody; he did not commit any of the offences mentioned in the Offences against the Persons Act that are prescribed in our law. He did not commit any malicious injury to property. He did not steal secrets and give them to anyone. He did precisely what the people on the other side have done. He attacked the Government, not justifiably, when the Government and the people were fighting for their survival. We talk of psychological injuries that have been done to our young people by instilling in them a sense of inferiority. There are people in this House who have said they would never employ a black man before they employ a white man. People who are Editors in this country would not invite a black man to their house unless they want to sell some idea to him. Therefore, let us understand the various heads of survival. You have survival of being able to fight against the invading hordes of Nazi Germany or any agressor. You have survival of the human personality. You have economic survival. These are very important factors in human existence. These are very important survivals.

4.50 p.m.

They are not the people who are in need of emancipation; they are prisoners in chains. They are the people who respond only to the stimulus of money and they do not care what the stimulus of money will do. There is no political party outside of our Party in Barbados which has a clearly defined ideology and perspective for the people of this island, and that is why they are against it. Mr. William Joyce did not commit any of the crimes which are easily identified; he did to a lesser degree what people on the other side have done, and this means inside and outside. Mr. William Joyce merely got on the air and said for example that three Canadian National ships were torpedoed. Robert Amery made a mistake according to the laws of the land; when his country was at War he allied with people in the opposite camp. With the Americans there was a man called Benedict Arnold; his case was slightly different because it was believed that he sold information. William Joyce and Robert Amery, who spoke against their country, were dealt with; but they did not speak as violently against their country as the people on the other side had done.

The theory that you cannot bring seditious actions against people because it was the black people who were shot down -- well, in this emancipated day, you did not charge people with sedition. The Director of Public Prosecutions did not charge them. I would like to send them to England and the United States of America. The great democracies could draw up an indictment against these people and place them in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States of America and in the hands of the Director of Public Prosecutions in England, and they would realise that they could not get away with the things against those countries as they got away with here. I say if the same principles which were invoked in the trial of William Joyce and Robert Amery were invoked against them, the position would have been different.

Since we are in this country we have to pay prices for everything. They have tried to prevent the people of the Caribbean from emerging into the light so that they who have striven so hard to get into the light -- I want to get this record straight -- may remain there. I will not accuse anybody because it is for the Director of Public Prosecutions to do that ... We have had information and we have passed it on to the proper authorities. Immediately when information is given to us, we say that this is not a matter for us; it is a matter for the Commissioner of Police and the Director of Public Prosecutions. When you start probing you will find that everybody is scratching everybody else's back; but if they were in the United Kingdom or in the United States of America carrying out the same kind of conduct which has been carried out in this country during the past three months, they would have felt the true weight of democratic Government. Those are the paradoxes of history.

The democracies are merely asking for the same kind of justice that was meted out to William Joyce and Robert Amery. I am saying that these people should have been judged by the same standards. Whatever judgment was pronounced on those people should be pronounced on the people here. We will pay their passages and send them out. There is no greater traitor than one who, in peace-time, will sell his country for certain considerations.

5.00 p.m.

I have no more to say; but I said it, Sir, because I have been in this House since 1951 and with the exception of about three members over there, I know them well. At one time you sat next to me, and you know I used to write out three sentences in advance when the former Premier of the Island was talking. I knew exactly what he was going to say, and you know we used to run our little sweepstake on this side of the Table as to the precise time at which a great big row would come up, and it took a long time before hon. members found out my secret, because just before he told a lie on another member of the House, he used to stand up on his left ankle and I used to watch under the table; and if you see him today or anytime — long may he survive — and he is addressing you and you see him turn that left leg and bend his toe toward the other foot, you know you have to

deal with a great deal of suspicion with the next sentence that comes out of this mouth. That is only a digression because in the course of this debate it might get very monotonous, and we have to have these little parliamentary digressions. I will, however, return to my main proposition.

You will remember that I was dealing with pages 39 and 40, paragraphs 77 to 81 and I said in paragraph 81 that the West Indies Federation floundered after three fruitless years, and the Malaysia Federation, established as recently as September 1963, has had its communal difficulties and is held to gether only by the threat of Indonesian aggression. I further went on to say that since no such threat or inducement exists in the Eastern Caribbean, any movement towards integration of the people of the area must spring not only from a natural desire for independence but primarily from a reasonable expectation, if not a certainty, of economic advantage. If you can get Independence and economic advantage without having a constitutional superstructure imposed upon you, there is absolutely no inducement and no valid reason why a country like Barbados should surrender to the Lesser Antilles, that is, the less politically astute and experienced politicians of the Lesser Antilles, and I make no apology for saying it, because even the worst on the other side of the Table, with possibly one exception, is better than the best that they have in many of these islands when it comes to political experience, and as I look around, not ten per cent of them over there have any experience in Government; the kind of Government we operate in Barbados, no politician in the Windward and Leeward Islands has any experience in. Not one of these Governments has ever raised a loan for any Development Programme; and yet they write in a Federal Consitution that we have to get approval and that their loans will be backed up by out money, but when we want to borrow money we would have to ask their permission. That is why I woke up in cold sweats, because I felt that I had almost sold out the people of Barbados, and now I am apologising for my misdeeds. And if I say that I do not consider that this Government should engage in these federal discussions until after independence, I am merely guaranteeing the independence of the people of Barbados, because we have no guarantee of the independence of the people of Barbados if we go into a Federation first. It is as simple as that, and it took me a long time to realise it.

When some people accuse me of not wanting a Federation because I cannot be Federal Prime Minister, I would say that the only discussion I have ever had on the question of Federal Prime Minister was way back in 1962-63 with certain people in Great Britain, and I told them I was not interested. They said if I was not interested, the British Government was not interested. I have never had any discussion with anybody in Barbados about going to the Federal Government. Neither of my Ministers has told me he wanted to go the Federal Government. Some of them may have nourished certain ambitions in their breast, but it certainly has not been disclosed to me, neither have I given the matter the slightest thought except when I got a shock when a British Official told me that one of them would be interested. Maybe he was not in a position of responsibility; so he could express his opinion. But I know what Mr. Duncan Sandys told me and I have said this before and I have put it in black and white. Shortly after I published this, he wrote me a letter not protesting about that, but telling me that his daughter got married.

You will remember that I read out where the Governor wrote to the Secretary of State and told him that the prospects of Federation were getting exceedingly dim unless the British Government came out and made certain pronouncements. From then up to now nothing has been done. You will remember that I quoted, — I think on page 10 — where we wrote in paragraph 23 that no reply was received from the Secretary of State after the meeting in September 1963, and as a result of this silence, the Chairman of the Regional Council who is the Governor of Barbados indicated to the Secretary of State that there was mounting frustration and criticism at the dealay which, if allowed to continue, could wreck any hope of ever forming a Federation. This is what the Governor said in 1964, and this is nearly 24 months later because we are in 1966.

There are $7 million grant-in-aid which they have to dispense, which means that the whole of our budget surplus would be taken up, and the people in those islands would mostly be buying Blue Bomber Soap, Velvo Kris and Mello-Kreem — what I call the margarine lobby. This is what the campaign is being fought on now. I know that the Oil and Fats Agreement is fought on the margarine lobby in Barbados. They want to make independence of the people of Barbados a by-product of edible oil. The people's salvation has got to be a by-product of an individual's edible oil and his profit and loss. The gentleman once said that he used to give a certain politician money, but it was getting too expensive.

It was therefore, Sir, between the meeting of September, 1963 and the Governor's SOS that the Secretary of State spoke to me in the Governor General's house in East Africa, and I am going to say something now. I hate to have Federal Constitution.

5.10 p.m.

I told him that we are ready as soon as he was ready to make a pronouncement about the quantum which the British Government was prepared to give. I was told later in the same year, that the British Government was not prepared to put the Federation on its feet. They could not be serious.

I want to say this. It is one thing to be critical of politicians in the small areas and about the way they function: but these are systems which were set up by Her Majesty's Government when they used to run their affairs and nobody know what they did. These Ministers have inherited, problems and worries, and the islands were in a condition where all the services and institutions were dilapidated and run-down. These are countries which have been exploited until the last drop of blood has been squeezed out of them, and under these circumstances, you cannot be surprised if the British Government wants to palm off these islands and wants others to take them on.

When they discovered that Mr. Bird was getting more and more disinterested in the Federal Exercise, they sent down a Mr. Crum Ewing and I challenge anybody to say that is not true. Ask the hon. junior member for Christ Church who is sitting over on the other side. The Leader of the Opposition is absent, but he may have had some contact with the hon. junior member for Christ Church other than through the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. member is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Norton came to Barbados and Mr. Crum Ewing went to Antigua. I am not going to any rumour. I am the person who notified Mr. Bird of his coming. I can go on and say something else. Do not let anybody over on the other side think that I am throwing bricks at anyone. I also protested to our people who are responsible for security. I told them that the Government is concerned about any disruptive force coming to the Island whether it comes from Communist sources, Fascist sources or Conservative sources. We are concerned over anything detrimental to the State whether it is inspired by Communism or Conservatism. I called names. That is how the people's fate is being decided.

They sent him to Antigua because Mr. Bird had lost interest. He went to members of the other political party because he knew that all of them were antagonistic to the Government, and he said to them that the Conservative Party has authorised him to make this initial contribution of £10,000 to any political party that was opposed to Government . A similar offer was made in Barbados. He left Antigua after being presented to the likely candidates. These men were being paid at the expense of the Conservative Party to come down here to do that. I do not mean the Conservative Party here; I mean the Conservative Party in Great Britain.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, my name has been called as knowing something

of Mr. Norton who came here to the Conservatives and, apparently, offering something to the Party.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say that he offered it to anybody here.

Mr. GODDARD: I know nothing of any money being offered to our Party. Our Party has a membership. There are no outside hands doing anything for our Party nor has there been any offer made to our Party.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I thank the hon. member for his assurance. I have never at any stage suggested that Mr. Norton offered the hon. junior member for Christ Church £10,000, but I may say that Mr. Norton came here for the same purpose for which Mr. Crum Ewing went in Antigua, and I said that I deplored the fact that they should use the Colonial Office to send people who are not members of Parliament down to these parts, but members of their group in Government to induce revolution just because the Governments of Antigua and Barbados would not assume the responsibility to do what the members of British Government wanted them to do.

I say that Mr. Norton was brought into the debate because of what I knew of Mr. Crum Ewing. I knew nothing of the mission that he was about then. Had I known of the mission he was sent down here to do, he would have been asked to leave the country forthwith. You cannot have people coming from outside to disrupt the Island.
5.20 p.m.

We made the mistake all the time of thinking that Communism is the threat, but Conservatism is as much a threat to the living standards of the working-class man as Communism. I find it difficult when people who have been deprived of their manhood, like the African people, want to be associated with the philosophy of Conservatism. I have already cited British Guiana and there is a certain group in this country who are nothing at all. We are not changing our laws, but we will invoke them. This group which is under the leadership of Mr. C. L. R. James is proposing to have a disruption in the West Indies in 1966 and they are people in Barbados who are in this group. Whether it is Marxism, Nazism, Communism or anything else, we do not have to look to anybody for our philosophy. Whatever be the colour of the people in Barbados, we should be able to produce our own philosophy and our own forward thinking. We have to give a sense of direction for the people of the West Indies. You have people like Dr. Williams — and whatever you may say about him, what would they do in Trinidad without Dr. Williams?

What is the position of British Guiana without Mr. Burnham? We are not taking instructions from anybody except from the people of Barbados. We are propagating our own political dynamics in this country. This matter is not a dissertation on political thought in the 20th century, but this is an important debate and we must know what we are standing for. We are supposed to say we believe in God, but belief in the people is belief in God; that is what I would say. The people of wealth can use their influence and their money in order to buy whatever they want. They can even buy the people; they can buy allegiance. We have to evolve in this area a philosophy which is indigenous to the West Indies. As to the Constitutional arrangements which Her Majesty's Government was bent upon, this Government came to the conclusion that they were not likely to enure to the benefit of the people of the country whom we represent. Belonging to a West Indian Nation, you cannot be a Russian. You have to be a Trinidadian, Vincentian, St. Lucian or Montserratian or a combination of all of them or of some of them. You cannot be a West Indian unless you are a Barbadian first, and a Barbadian cannot be a West Indian otherwise, because you cannot be a West Indian in a vacuum.

Mr. Speaker, I am a very frank person. There are lots of people who could give you an analogy of things. A lot of people say that there is no such thing as Judaism. If there had not been a Jewish race, how is it that I could pick out every Jew who travelled in a bus with me? How can you pick out persons who are Jews on a bus if there was no Jewish race? The Jews are a very proud race and I would say that it is the Jews who have contributed probably more to the people of Barbados than perhaps the people who are supposed to be presiding over our destinies. That is what I would say.
5.30 p.m.

The people were told by the British Government way back in 1948 that the country could not support a population greater than 600,000, that it would not be economically viable. Thank God there are 2 1/2 million people in Israel. They have come from the four corners of the earth and they were told they could not have a nation. Mr. Ernest Bevin as Foreign Minister was bitterly opposed to the idea of Israel being established. He wanted to go back on the Balfour Declaration which had been made 25 years or so before which gave the undertaking to the Jewish people that they would have a nation. As far as I know, Sir, apart from London, Manchester, Birmingham and a few benighted places like that, for us as distinct from the Israeli, we will not be gathering from the four corners of the earth because of persecution. As a matter of fact, if anybody has been deprived and persecuted, it has been the people who have remained at home and the unfortunate ones who have been under British tutelage who refer in the newspaper to their Mother Country; it is not my Mother Country. I have the profoundest respect for the country where I had part of my education, and for the good things in it; but the point is that this is the parting of the ways, and when you come to the parting of the ways, you should be able to continue in correspondence without any acrimony, which I hope is what we will do here in Barbados.

I am not going to go into a long recital of all that has not been done in these territories, which is the reason for the present impasse. Colonialism is the reason for the present impasse in West Indian affairs, and we cannot afford to wait. I am not going into a recital of what the British have done and what they have not done. Their relation with our people has not been a happy association. It has been a very unhappy association, and it is regrettable that we will have some of the downtrodden, who feel that they are now slightly privileged, fighting on the side of the people who perpetrate all these acts of inhumanity against our people. What Dr. Williams has written in his book called "Capitalism and Slavery" is not a matter of interest now, but you must know your history. That is why a former Minister can get up in a crowd in public and say that when I go to a Conference and I want to tell the Secretary of State to go to hell or to know his place, I tell him so, because I know the premises, and the position of strength from which I am speaking is not a position of feeling inferior in any way. They are the people who should feel inferior, because they are the people who have broken every single law of morality as far as relationship with us is concerned; but I am not drawing up an indictment against the present British Government or any British Government. This is a matter of history, and this is all the more reason why we should stand on our own feet, because people are not going to respect you, Sir, if despite the fact that you are financially independent, you still want to be deemed to be a second class citizen of another country.

I was reciting, Sir, from the Preamble to the Resolution which we are supposed to be debating. This is a moment in our history of which we should all be proud instead of being ashamed. If I have any sense of shame, it is shame to know that in my country there still exists an element -- that despite all we have gone through we still have people who are so degrading, and people who are so tantalised by the trappings of colonialism. I do not want my children to grow up as second class citizens, and I do not want the children of any of the ladies who work for me in my house assisting us in the discharge of our daily duties, or the man who works in the garden, or the man who drives the proverbial omnibus to grow up with any sense of inferiority to any person. We will preserve law and order. Independence does not mean that you become disrespectful to anyone provided he respects you; and I know that Barbadians

have enough good sense; they have a reputation for being polite and courteous to people, and the fact that we have independence would not mean that we are animals cut loose and starting to run around in circles, because we have been operating an independent constitution all these years.

Compare our situation, Mr. Speaker, with the countries which have emerged in Asia and Africa. I said just now that the true test of democracy is the right to vote. Great Britain is now following Barbados in reducing the voting age to 18 years. Australia has it; Dr. Jagan asked for it and Jamaica is now asking for it. We have constitutional arrangements in this country which are more advanced than the constitutional arrangements between the State and the individual than exist in the United Kingdom or in all the other independent countries, because if countries are now following us into recognising that a man of 18 years of age in these modern days is probably more astute politically and more capable of making decisions than his grandfather who did not go to school at all – and this is what it amounts to in this community because we recognised these facts long before the United Kingdom -- constitutionally we are in advance of the United Kingdom. Constitutionally Barbados had a political Attorney General running for a seat, and a Solicitor General. No other West Indian territory had a political Attorney General who was a member of the Legislature. We controlled our Colonial Treasurer, and money had to be voted from year to year, and he had to be appointed by the House because he was the custodian of the Island's funds.

Mr. Speaker, in the Preamble to the Resolution, we went on to say that the discussions had proved fruitless, and we gave reasons. No other Government in the West Indies has given a reason for anything. The Trinidad Government came out on Monday, 15th January, 1962 and made a big declaration, but that was not a declaration on a Resolution before the House. It was a party Resolution and it was handed to the Secretary of State; there was no meeting of the Legislature. We recited the failure of the United Kingdom Government to state what financial aid would be available and I have now dealt with that exhaustively and will pass on. Then there was the withdrawal of the Governments of Grenada and Antigua from the discussions. Nobody has abused them for withdrawing.
5.40 p.m.

Three and a half years after the Government of Grenada had withdrawn from the Federal exercises on the pretext of going into a unitary state with the Islands of Trinidad and Tobago, they have not succeeded in getting to the position even to discuss it. I said in the White Paper, Mr. Speaker, that we discussed the alternatives, we discussed the federal principle; we discussed unitary status; because we were saying from 1961 to 1964 that we did not understand why Grenada should wish to secede. We did not understand if it was a political device to get rid of Mr. Gairy by his opponets – and I am not a friend of Mr. Gairy either. However, we have too many Gairys in Barbados; we have too many flambuoyant people. I can tell you a story about Mr. Gairy which would make it that he would not be able to go on a political platform again at all.

Mr. Gairy is talking about Federation for Grenada and Mr. Blaize is talking of unitary status. What conclusion would you come to? Nobody was anxious to have Mr. Gairy entering Grenada into a Federation at the time, so Mr. Gairy lost his seat and Mr. Blaize who was talking of entering his country in unitary status won his seat. Nobody shed any tears when Mr. Gairy lost his seat.

Let me show you the analogy between the two situations. Mr. Gairy is going to fight the next election on the point that Mr. Blaize is not succeeding in getting Unitary Status with Trinidad and Tobago. Mr. Blaize fought the last election on the ground that he wanted unitary status; so Mr. Gairy passed through Barbados and has said that Federation is the only salvation. The analogy which I am trying to draw is that what is best is not the point of view of the politicians on the opposite side; their point of view is what is the best advice you can use to get rid of the Government. It has nothing to do with what is in the best interest of the people.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said this on the same day that I came from Sherbourne and, as I said I would consult with the Opposition Leader, I called him into your office, Mr. Speaker, and we sat there for a long time. I would not say until the wee hours of the morning, but it was close to midnight, and I think that we only seceded when your sherry was exhausted. One of my Ministers sitting down on the opposite side, the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition along with myself sat down and discussed this impasse and I told them exactly what the situation was with Montserrat. I told them what Mr. Compton and his Government wanted. They did not know whether they wanted to join in a unitary state or to go into a Federation. They were not prepared to say that they would come into Federation. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows the whole story. That discussion Sir, took place in a room of Parliament. I would be very grateful if one of the hon. members who was present would instruct you as regards what I said. I do know that before the meeting ended we had exhausted your sherry.

Mr. SPEAKER: It should never be assumed that my sherry was exhausted.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It was only sometime after twelve o'clock (midnight). The Hon. Leader of the Opposition did not drink any beer or sherry.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The meeting lasted only until ten o'clock.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Well, it was only until 9.30 o'clock. I respect his position as Leader of the Opposition but I do not understand his machiavellian manoeuvres.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I object to that strongly. The Hon. Premier cannot refer to me as making machiavellian manoeuvres.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying that you are referring to him as using machiavellian manoeuvres, under Standing Orders No. 26 (5) it prescribes that it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members in the House.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not accusing the hon. member of anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is making objection to being engaged in any machiavellian affairs. "Chamber's Encycloypaedia defines machiavellian this way:-

"Machiavelli's evil fame has arisen largely from misapprehension of his purpose. As Bacon wrote, 'He set forth openly and sincerely what men are wont to do and not what they ought to do'. He sought to draw from events which he had experienced, and studied principles of political action which would preserve the life and maintain the liberty of the state. His separation of politics from morals was a process of scientific investigation and must be criticized from that standpoint. His weakness lies in exaggerated and one-sided judgements, bred of his tendency to see everything through the spectacles of his cherished convictions. His low view of human nature is inconsistent with his unbounded faith in individual achievement.' "

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you have stated the statutory interpretation to which Parliament is bound within the ambit of "Mays". The one which you have not mentioned is the one which is not included and that is the meaning of the phrase.

Mr. SPEAKER: "May's" has certain words and phrases prescribed. Others are not yet proscribed. The use

of Machiavellian manoeuvres is not yet prescribed, but in my view the phrase may be regarded as offensive.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am trying to remember myself the ruling on the matter. Where there is an objection, it is a matter for which you should find some precedent. 5.50 p.m.

If the hon. member would only say what he finds so obnoxious about the phrase. These Machiavellian manoeuvres were manoeuvres.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It conveys the impression that it is not a happy expression, even when it is good or respectful.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If Your Honour wants me to say that the manoeuvres exhibited by the hon. member were the best, that they were respectful and good, it would be impossible for me to say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps we may rely on the Oxford English Dictionary to provide us a more suitable word than the word which was used just now.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am quite prepared to withdraw it, but it would not be doing any good to my conscience to say that we could.....

Mr. SPEAKER: There is the Oxford English Dictionary available, but the hon. senior member for St. John could use.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member can tell me what he understands by the phrase, then I would hasten to re-assure him that what he said was not my intention. I do not have to do this. .....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition may not indulge in any cross talk with the Hon. Premier.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Your Honour can refer it to him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have taken objection to the hon. member's remarks and Your Honour will have to rule as Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to say that no shouting affects my judgment. The phrase "Machiavellian manoeuvres" has been objected to. Exception has been taken to that phrase and I may say that the words "Machiavellian manoeuvres" are words capable of being regarded as offensive, and certainly as uncomplimentary.

Mr. WALCOTT: Churchillian manoeuvres.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I sincerely hope that your attitude is not conditioned by the behaviour of the hon. member on the last occasion. Let us try and get on with the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is all I want, first and foremost.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It might possibly be true. You want me to get on with the debate and do not want me to use the expression. I have great respect for the hon. member on his left, the hon. junior member for the City. I do not know what is his understanding of the phrase. The hon. member's philosophy is consistent with their philosophy and their manoeuvres which are acceptable to people all over the world, but which do not find acceptance with the people of my persuasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: What does that have to do with the hon. member?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It has a lot to do with power politics at any price. We have to throw certain recognized canons through the window. Does the hon. member object to what I said? Does he find it obnoxious?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot reply.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not substituting anything; it is a question of what Your Honour's understanding of the word is. The hon. member never has an opinion because he consults with the hon. junior member for the City on his left or with Mr. Bryden. He has not got an interpretation of the phrase from the hon. junior member for the City yet. When I bring a Resolution in here he says that he has to consult his boys. I have used the word because I thought it was a proper interpretation of what is going on. The hon. member has not asked me to withdraw the translation but, as you will see, his advice has got him confused. I am asking: is the interpretation all right with the hon. member?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have sent Mr. Clerk for the Encyclopaedia to which I will refer.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: It has been suggested that I should substitute for the words "Machiavellian manoeuvres" the words "Churchillian manoeuvres or tactics".

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. member has withdrawn the words "Machiavellian manoeuvres" and has substituted therefor the words "Churchillian manoeuvres"?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir, I was invited to substitute the word "Churchillian" for the words "Machiavellian" and he advocated certain things which should be done.

Mr. WALCOTT: Malthusian manoeuvres.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have given my interpretation. 6.00 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I understand the hon. member is not objecting anymore.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Of course I am objecting.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Then I will wait until His Honour rules.

Mr. SPEAKER: The objection which has been taken and submitted to me for consideration is in respect of the phrase "Machiavellian manoeuvres" to which exception has been taken by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Reference to the shorter Oxford English Dictionary, the Third Edition, page 182 discloses that "Machiavellain" means "of, pertaining to, or characteristic of Machiavellain or his alleged principles; preferring expediency to morality; practising duplicity especially in state-craft; astute, cunning, intriguing. A follower of Machiavelli; one who adopts his principles in state-craft or in general conduct."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Does the hon. member object to being described as "astute"?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I still object.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will withdraw, Mr. Speaker, I want to borrow the dictionary if you do not mind, I just want to satisfy myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member in doubt?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not questioning Your Honour's ability to read correctly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Or even to see without a light -- of which I have none tonight!

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member and I unhesitatingly withdraw the word "Machiavellian", and would like to substitute much more parliamentary words: "motley manoeuvres", and the same dictionary tells us that "motley" means "variegated;

chequered; composed of elements of diverse or varied character". I think that would suit my purpose.

Now we can get down to something more serious, because he cannot object to his own name. You have to curse for your money; I have to curse for my people. The hon. member has been slandering the members of this Government for the past three months; so nothing he does in here tonight will surprise or shock me or the general public, because I heard his behaviour in the Lower Green *(ASIDES)* The words of alleged slander were that a member of the Government refused to pay taxes.

Mr. SPEAKER: That has absolutely nothing to do with the debate.
6.10 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is it slanderous to say that somebody refused to pay their taxes?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. and Learned Premier continue with the debate?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The stage which we reached before the hon. member objected to being described as using Machiavellian manoeuvres, and I withdrew and substitued "motley manoeuvres" --

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned member for St. John is aware of Standing Order No. 26 (6) "No member shall refer to any other Member by name."

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is from the Shorter Oxford dictionary which you invoked, Sir.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think we should get on with the debate. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is satisfied, hon. members are satisfied, and I am satisfied because I have put it more descriptively and he has got my withdrawal.

I suggested that the hon. member did indulge in certain manoeuvres which I did not find palatable from my own Victorian ideas. He should not get incensed about that. "What would it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul?" The same people in a community like this, the same people who may he regarded as political mercenaries are people of like background to myself and they are ready to assassinate their brothers. I only want to serve notice on all those mercenaries that they will be despised by the same people whom they are working for. They are despised more than we are despised; we are respected and feared.

I have said positively that some people came to the West Indies to destroy the countries of Barbados and Antigua. The money was not handed over in Antigua then because the Conservatives were not impressed with the personality of the person who was supposed to carry out the deal. I am talking about the time before the last meeting of the Council of Chief Ministers. That is why for the first time in the history of the Government of Antigua a party which knew that it did not have a chance of winning the Government submitted three of its candidates because it knew that by running them against the three most important Ministers and then withdrawing their candidacy, it would mean that the Government could not take its seat because they would have to hold fresh elections.

Here in Barbados the analogous situation is that people who belong to particular parties, the same party to which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition belongs, do not have the courage to come out in public and make a single declaration -- a declaration that working members of the community should get better wages, a declaration against the injustices to people; but you find people of no particular party, people who have not spoken in Parliament before, being offered £10,000. I am not making fun and the hon. member knows that it is true. (A VOICE: £10,000 is a lot of money). The hon. member said that £10,000 is a lot of money. He should know. *(Loud Asides)*

There are rules of this House which states that a member should be heard in silence, and as long as I am a member of this House, I expect to be heard in silence.

I understand that the former Leader of the House said that they have resurrected a former gentleman of Barbados, Mr. E. K. Walcott. He never had any respect for the hon. senior member for the City. That is what went out. It is a strange situation in a country like this that a former member of this House, a man who has been rejected from a party that has been rejected, a man who has retired from legal life, a man whom I have tremendous amount of respect for -- and there are few people who have his intelligence in this Island. His intelligence, however, has never been used in a social sense; it was always used in power politics. He was the Lord High Executioner. All that I am showing is that they are so desperate to get back into power that they have brought back out an old man like this to appear on platforms because they feel that somebody may have owed him a debt. When I say a debt, I do not mean a debt of money. I am referring to Mr. E. K. Walcott. They have even brought him out to canvass against Independence. He has lived in a society which has had a Conservative policy. He is a hater of people of African descent. Of course, he would respect me for my legal achievements, for my ability to stand up with him and work as long as he. But this does not fool me about those people.

I want to bring over to the people the enormity of the situation that those people are fighting those battles, not for their own people but for people that despise them. They cannot even go into their homes through the back door. They are the people who are intellectual inferiors of those people, but because of their vested interest and because they get money coming into their pockets, they are prepared to do anything to destroy their self-respect and the national integrity of the people of Barbados. Mr. Speaker, you should know that.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was pointing out on this Resolution for independence that in this country there are people who have been trying to sow disruption. They have been recruiting mercenaries and people who never appeared in any political party to do their work for them.
6.20 p.m.

What I am merely saying is that it is rather sordid; it is demoralising even to think about it that the same people whom we are employing have been able to dispossess more people than there are employed. There is no other country which has gone into Independence with as bitter public discourses as we have had, and with as ridiculous an attempt to undermine the Government which is merely saying that this Government should proceed to Independence now just as the people gave us the Mandate to do in 1961. No other country in the West Indies has ever had such a Mandate. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago certainly did not have any such Mandate. The Government of Antigua's full discussion was an exercise in 1962 carried out at Marlborough House in June, and they attended subsequent meetings of the Chief Ministers and myself in various places including Barbados and Antigua. We have had ten meetings, and are they now telling us that they have the right to pollute the atmosphere with all kinds of accusations against members of the Government ascribing to them improper motives, the inability to discuss things and so on? They have even suggested that I broke up the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers.

Previous to the meeting of the Council of Ministers the Government or the people gave me a Mandate. One half of that mandate was disclosed for the simple fact that even at that late hour we did not want to do anything, but we had more or less made up our minds that things had reached an impasse. I will read the Minutes, but I deliberately have not read those Minutes before; One person has spoken at two meetings and he has not said anything different from what I have said. What do they know about Federation and

how Governments are run?Did they know about the policy, did they know about the Constitution of the Windward and Leeward Island? You will find that the Minutes are on page 10 of the Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. The Secretary of State for the Colonies said that he was not accepting Antigua's views. An Independent Federation has to be worked out by the people in the area. In an association you have to work together and not one person gets his views agreed to. There was no reasonable compromise because they were things which were unacceptable both to the Government of Barbados and the Government of Antigua. There is the newly-appointed Chief Minister of St. Lucia and he is a man with whom I always got on very well. I had certain professional relations with him as I did with Mr. Vere Bird, Mr. Bradshaw and Mr. Southwell. I went to the same University as Mr. Compton and I was the first person to congratulate him. Mr. Southwell had deported 62 St. Lucians from St. Kitts and up to now the only St. Lucians who have been deported from Barbados are those who are deemed rogues and vagabonds. I do not want any enmity stirred up between this population and other populations, but when people accuse me of all sorts of things, I am not going to preside over this Government and see corruption carried out, see people deprived of their jobs because of political reasons and say nothing about it. I will not see every constitutional principle thrown through the window and discarded. I will not preside over the Government under those conditions. We have made decisions with which our own people do not agree, but if we did not make those decisions you would have heard a hue and cry and uproar.

Sometimes when a person has a legal and moral right because of his association with the Government in one form or another, I have had to make a decision. It cannot be said that this Government did not pay proper attention to the constitutional proprieties. I want the editors of Newspapers who have writeen articles in the *Montreal Star* to know that it may cost them some money. I am not disclosing any details at this stage. How is it that we are going to have a dictatorship and we are not going to have elections and that sort of thing? I want to say this: The Secretary of State for the Colonies cannot tell me or this Government when we should hold an election; neither can the newspapers tell me when I am to hold an election. I will tell the Secretary of State for the Colonies that I have the authority to call for an election, to say when an election is to be held, so long it is held -- and it will be held -- within the statutory period. In that case the newspapers can go on writing; they can say that the Secretary of State for the Colonies can call for an election and show to the people that I am a liar.
6.30 p.m.

I do not want to embarrass the Secretary of State or any other Government. I make the decision about elections and this is a constitutional right. This is not a right which I have arrogated unto myself in my search for dictatorial power or any nonsense like that. How dishonest can people get in this country? When you examine it, you will find that the people who go in for this kind of vilification have not got a single achievement to their credit, a single achievement which has been the subject of impartial examination by anybody inside a school or University or outside; not a single political achievement for the years they are supposed, like the last Government, to have spent in here. The only achievement they have is the achievement of slander and degration; but they underestimate the intelligence of the masses of this country, because the masses of this country want independence. The masses of this country have been feeling the pinch; the masses of this country have too much sense to aspire to get into company which is intellectually inferior to the African heritage; but we have a bunch of humbugs in this country whose only ambition is to identify themselves with the hegemony, the presiding power of Great Britain, people who look like British people and therefore are associated with the presiding power, and if they get into their company, they feel that some of this prestige will rub off on them. That is why they do not want independence, because when you remove the tutelage of subservience and the bonds which keep you down, then every man is the same man. This is a psychological problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it depresses me particularly and the members of my Party because we recognise analytically that this is one of the sad effects of colonialism. I really would be disappointed in a certain way because I thought that with the long tradition we have in Barbados, when we have had to stare facts in the face, and knowing that the people think about us, we would see that they are economically and culturally opposed to the masses of this country. The masses of a country are the true people in every country and they know it; and to try to fool the masses is to underestimate the intelligence of the masses.

What I find rather depressing in the whole exercise is that they know we have a Constitution, because they have been living under the Constitution and working under the Constitution in so far as it suited them. When it did not suit them, they committed breaches of the constitutional proprieties. If I say, therefore, that I cannot view their activities with any sense of repect as a Barbadian, it is because I am a Barbadian and I am a loyal Barbadian. Anybody who knows me would know well enough that I have no ambition. This is one of my stumbling blocks all my life. I probably would have been a lot further if I had ambition. I have certain principles; they may be Victorian and you may consider them ingenuous. Because of the modern-day thought of 'dog eat dog', some people think that anybody who thinks in Victorian terms is out of date and not "with it"; therefore among some people it is an expedient thing to accept money for political favours dispensed as part and parcel of what they call the game of politics. But it is not a game with us; it is a serious business. I see issues directly in terms of black and white, and there are no gradations between as far as I am concerned; but there are people in this country and other countries too who consider politics a game. They make the pretext that they would do this and that for the people and that kind of thing. They do not want the people to get too much, because if you do all the things for the people that should be done for them, the State would then wither away and you would no longer continue to be an important personage.

If you give a man the right to work for his own living at a wage he considers compatible with his aspirations for himself and his children, then you do not have any more hold over him; but if you can keep him in a state of degradation and make him feel inferior, then they will always use you as the buffer between his oppressors and himself, and this is the role assumed by too many politicians in Barbados for too long. This is the role which has been assumed by too many of our politicians in Barbados, content to be the buffer element between the masses and the people who do not participate in the society. They only bleed the society; they do not participate; they do not speak to certain people; they do not communicate with them except during business hours. This is the kind of society we are against and they know we are against it. It is not a question of black or white, because we have more black political humbugs than we have white humbugs, and we have them right here in this House unfortunately. There are certain things, for instance, that some members on the other side would stoop to which the hon. junior member for Christ Church would never stoop to; he does not have to, and he knows he would incur probably the animosity of his party if he did them; but other people do these things which are detrimental to the society and they get applauded for it, because to be smart in this society you have to scramble over somebody. It does not matter how you get there; all will be forgiven. It does not matter how many people you assassinate or how many people you put to death or how many people are deprived of their livelihood; it does not matter as long as you get there; when you get there like Morgan the pirate, and all the other rogues and villains of history like Lord Nelson, you will be crowned with imperial honours at the end.

If we go back then in making this analysis of West Indian society, we have been made this way by our history. It has been a history of oppression, and some of us are in a hurry to dissociate ourselves from this long history of oppression, and they are so stupid, they have become so im-

bued with this spirit of cynicism that they are unaware that the quickest way to get away from this long history of oppression is for all the people to get away, and not a few of them climbing to the top of the ladder and kicking it down behind them.
6.40 p.m.

All of us have to escape; they are not a few of us escaping. What does it profit a man to be Prime Minister of Barbados or of the West Indies? What does it mean? It means nothing if you lose your soul and achieve these objectives. What can you do with a man who is living at subsistence level after you have profited and have acquired all of these material comforts? How many meals a day can you eat? I want to tell some of the young professional people in this country that nobody has ever been revered in history for having become the richest man. As a matter of fact, in the United States, they are in danger of their lives. At one time they had that as a national philosophy: but people respect the late John FitzGerald Kennedy, not because he was one of the wealthier people in the United States, but for the principles which he had. They respected Mr. Henry Wallace not because he was Secretary of State, not because he had a Socialist swing, but people respected him for his ability as Secretary of Agriculture.

People do not respect you for getting into a certain position. Nobody respects me or would respect the Ministers of Government or any Premier of Barbados if they go in for corruption. With all the slander and lies which members of the Opposition have told on me, if any of them can stand up and say that anybody paid me five dollars, I will hold my peace. I will hold my peace if anybody would get up and say that I have accepted money for doing anything corrupt. A lot of them over there cannot say that. I have never been fortunate enough to win a sweepstake, but I do not intend to get my hands soiled for them or anybody else. I have to discharge my duty to the programme which has been laid down by us and to the people of Barbados and those are the premises from which I am speaking. Some of them are so corrupt that they cannot understand how none of us on this side of the House are not. Corruption is something to them which is crowned with precious stones in these days when you look around and see "bauball" going around – to use a good Trinidadian expression --. Some people feel that you must try and get as rich as possible in the shortest possible time.

This political conduct appears to be notable today. However, when you have finished, look at Batista of Cuba and all the other people like him! Mussolini of Italy was hanged upside down. He was the leader of one of the largest countries in Europe. Look at how Hitler ended up! At one time he held the sway with 88 million people in Germany. No West Indian politician can hold that domination and sway which the Reich Chancellor held in Germany. Where are all of them today? But the names of the liberators, however poor they were, would remain. Simon Bolivar died a poor man on a little island called Marguerita off the North Coast of Venezuela. Look at the liberators like Alexander Hamilton, George Washington, Touissant L'Ouverture. They were in the position where they could have been corrupt, but they did not allow themselves to be corrupted. When the history of Barbados in 1966 is written -- I am a very angry man now, but I am going to make a positive statement of fact -- all the people who have participated in this exercise of trying to pull down what we have built up for Barbados posterity would have their names desecrated in every sense of the term, and if posterity could dig up their bones or hang them in effigy, posterity would do that. Therefore, do not let any of them have any illusions. This is a very serious matter. After the country had been exposed during the last three months -- three months which we allowed for democratic discussion -- to the sort of sordid conduct that has been witnessed and to our having mercenaries like the white bastards in the Belgian Congo – and it is a historical fact that even in the African countries, they employed white mercenaries to shoot down their own people, that even in this country of Barbados you find the white people hiring black people to keep back their own people. I want to tell you this. I rejoice because the Almighty moves in a mysterious way, his wonders to perform, because what this exercise has done more than anything else is to separate the sheep from the goats, the honest from the dishonest and the liars from the leaders.

No Government in the history of mankind has ever made a projection as this Government has made for the people of this Island. This Government have been subjected to attacks from outside and inside, from within and from without. They were working like termites from within. This Government has been attacked from inside and from outside, but we have managed to eradicate certain disruptive elements which we were aware of, but due to my own defect of giving every man the benefit of the doubt I have to wait until they come out with something openly. It is not my character, it is not my nature, to do anything on which I am not completely informed. In these days of this kind of political scramble, you have to be a man like L. B. Johnson who knows all the ditches and knows what to expect. I do not have the time to learn all the tricks; I learn by the mistakes which I make. Anyhow, once I have identified who is my enemy, he would never be able to get back into the confidence of myself or the people of Barbados. What this exercise has done for us is to act as a kind of enema. What it has done is to separate the sheep from the goats. It has purged the conscience of the community of the disharmonious elements. This has acted as a catalyst to bring up to the surface everything that is wrong in a community like this. We have learnt one lesson and one lesson alone, that is how not to live together in unity.
6.50 p.m.

We have evolved a formula for living together but not having any strength. This is one of the paradoxes of our Colonial situation in Barbados. I could go on and give you a lot of stories. Things are improving, but they are not what they should be and there are many things which we have experienced since this Resolution was laid in this House. The White Paper was laid before the Legislature in August and the Resolution was tabled afterwards. We have allowed three months for free unbridled discussion in this country. I know of no other country including the United States and the United Kingdom where the people who exhibit these disruptive propensities would be allowed to walk about the capital with impunity. I say that without any reservation. That in itself shows that we have had to purge ourselves of the things which have existed in the community for all of these years. The masses have begun to speak for themselves and long may they continue to do so.

There are people who get on platforms and make all sorts of disruptive statements. It has been an expensive exercise, not in the sense of money to spend, but an expensive exercise psychologically on the time of the people who have to explain with restraint and dispassionately the issues which confront us from day to day. It has been a severe test of endurance to my Ministers and on the patience and goodwill of all of us on this side of the House. At one time I was somewhat afraid that the people would have become very incensed about this situation which other people want to create. Do not let us mince matters; why have we had to tell lies on ourselves? What do we say to ourselves all the time? You are a barrister, the Speaker is a barrister and there are certain barristers in this country who have never invited you to their houses, and you could provide things better than they and many of them are your inferiors culturally and otherwise. When they read the laws and go home they speak in the most derogatory terms about us because you are getting too close to anything. You are practising the same profession. Most of them are the descendants of slaves who have been sent out here for committing crimes; that is their mentality and therefore they cannot get away from it. They are discredited in politics and they have to use the Press. The soul of this community has to be laid bare, and there is no better time to do that than when we are preparing for independence, so that we know what we are, who we are and where we are going.

I began practising in the Law Courts in Barbados when professional men were addressed as "boys" by Judges. They have said that I am unruly because I am always telling off the Judges. I have been sitting in Court and I heard a

judge address a barrister as "boy" and I have had to say: "Your Honour, you are not now on a plantation; you are in Her Majesty's Court and that is a learned member of the profession." There is no sanctity in the Court. Some of the greatest crimes have been perpetrated under the name of truth and justice. Christians were persecuted because of this belief in the protection of the Empire. Judge Jeffries was a notorious criminal and he was a Judge. When there is a little political agitation going on and they can attack me, that is all right. I expect that because I can defend myself. I cannot use any Latin phrases because His Honour the Speaker has said that the debates have to be conducted in English. I will say that there is a most wicked animal; the more you attack him the more he defends himself. The animal is wicked because the more you attack him, the more he defends himself. I intend to defend myself. The people who have money in this country are uncultured and they have no use for nine-tenths of the people of this country. Look at their houses. All they want to know is how much profit they are going to make and how much money they are going to lose. They do not understand the first thing of the complexities of the system. They know more than Dr. Williams, who is the Premier of Trinidad and Tobago, and Mr. V. C. Bird, who is the Chief Minister of Antigua and who they claim was only a captain in the Salvation Army.
7.00 p.m.

On a public platform they said that Mr. Bird is only a Captain in the Salvation Army. Well I must congratulate Mr. Bird on having officer's rank, because if he had been a Private in the Salvation Army, I hate to think what they would have said about him. Who are all these people and what have they contributed to the society? Nothing. They do not like the legislation we pass, and I am not asking them to like it. They are going to like the Tenantries Bill and they are going to like the Social Securities Bill. They do not like these things because they feel people are becoming too independent; so what are they saying? They have no cultural standing; they have no political ideology; they are only in an entrenched position of privilege and prestige, of prestige inherited by the association with the metropolitan country which is always willing to run to their rescue.

I want to say something about the metropolitan country. I have already made my peace during the course of the debate by saying that there are a lot of things I admire. I admire the British system of justice when it operates in the way it is supposed to operate. It does not always operate so, and Judge Jeffries is a case in point. You have had crimes committed in the name of justice. You have had people shot down here for merely trying to protest something that was boiling up inside of them, and what I want to refer to is this: right here in my White Paper I have referred to the Central African Federation which lasted from 1953 to 1963. The Central African Federation was dissolved in 1963 because of Mr. Kenneth Kaunda and Dr. Hastings Banda, the respective leaders of their peoples..... You only need one Moses to bring the people out of Egypt. You have heard of Kenneth Kaunda and Dr. Hastings Banda. Both of them have been in gaol for agitating for freedom for their people; so what did the British Government do? They threw them into a Federation with Southern Rhodesia in 1953 and put Mr. Kaunda and Dr. Banda in gaol, and the effect of this Federation was to give 200,000 white Rhodesians perpetual dominance over the 4 million Africans in Southern Rhodesia, and God knows how many, probably 8 million, speaking subject to correction, in what used to be Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, and which are now Malawi and Zambia respectively. I do not know Dr. Banda; I know Kenneth Kaunda. He said in 1963 that the whole device of this Federation was to give the white settlers in Southern Rhodesia prominence over the territories and they tried to justify it on economic grounds. The complimentary nature of the economy was the fact that the power station, the Kariba Dam, was useful to both territories, that copper had to pass through this railroad and that kind of thing. There were all kinds of fancy reasons.

You will remember, Sir, that Britain proposed economic sanctions against Rhodesia and Mr. Douglas Bader opposed those economic sanctions, and said that he was not against Rhodesia and was defending the cause of Mr. Ian Smith. I do not have anything against people who are white; I get on very well with them until these issues come up. He is one of the greatest heroes produced in history; a man who escaped several times from the Germans, had both legs amputated and continued to fly in the face of overwhelming physical odds. I have sat down right here in Barbados and eaten lunch with him; I had a tremendous respect for him; but what has he done? He came out now and said that there is nothing wrong in what Mr. Ian Smith has done; so he is not now my friend; he need not even send me a postcard, because I would send it back. His record is there and nobody can take that away from him; but as far as calling me by my first name and my calling him 'Douglas' is concerned, all that is over, because I have to be with my people first, and Mr. Douglas Bader came out two weeks ago and made a statement attacking the British Government for selling out their people. Who is being sold out?

Let us examine the situation. The British Government tried to sell out the people of Southern Rhodesia -- I am talking about independence now -- and Mr. Kenneth Kaunda and Dr. Hastings Banda managed to mobilise the Africans and world opinion against them so that they had in 1964 to grant independence to these countries; but they had to break up the Federation first. You had the countries of Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda; they had an East African Common Service Commission, and all the economic reasons existed why they should have a political union. As a matter of fact, as late as 1963 when I was in East Africa, Mr. Milton Obote and Mr. Julius Nyere told me that they still hoped to have some kind of confederation. For years they have had an East African Common Service; this is a contrivance by the British Government to get rid of their constitutional problems; they do not care what happens afterwards because they are not responsible for you afterwards. I will go further and I am going to quote, and the Leader of the Opposition knows what I am saying is true because he was in London with me. I was fighting for greater constitutional advancement -- and the Leader of the Opposition can raise his hand when I am right and shake his head if I am wrong. I was fighting for greater constitutional advancement for these islands when I was in London and I sat down and listened to Mr. Maudling, and to Mr. Fraser who was Under-Secretary, and I listened to the supercilious officials who were smirking all the time at the behaviour of some of the Chief Ministers. Mr. Maudling was saying that we had too much Government down here and too many Ministers, and that we must cut down. I pointed out to Mr. Maudling that when they did not have any Ministers at all in Antigua the national income was something like $1.8 million, and a few years after Mr. Bird took over, it was up to $13 million and the cost to the people of Antigua was $25,000. I told Mr. Maudling to his face at that Conference that he was talking through his hat for the reason that people came along through the Trade Union Movement and had to fight against entrenched interests to get some kind of constitutional advancement in these islands. They were not economists.
7.10 p.m.

Those were different days -- days when people thought in terms of constitutional change. They thought that was the solution of everybody's problems. For example, Rhodesia never thought of giving the four million Africans the vote. I would come back to that in a moment because I hinted when I took sanctions against Rhodesia that I would say something which would make your hair curl.

Finally, I got so disgusted with the behaviour of the British Officials that I pulled out the Report of the Leewards and Windwards Constitutional Conference held in plenary session after the conference to decide on the constitutional changes for the Federation.

Sir Grantley Adams' Federation was a dependent Federation, a Crown Colony Federation, and in desperation Mr. Manley and Dr. Williams called a conference in England which was to make the Federation independent on the 31st

day of May, 1962. That was the date set for the independence of the West Indies Federation, but it was broken up on the same date. The British Government broke it up on that date.

Immediately after that, the leaders of the Leeward and Windward Islands called for a conference and they never left London. This was held and I baited Mr. Maudling all along the line. I think that I produced the Report of the Windwards and Leewards Conference which had propounded constitutional changes, which were far superior to what they had and Mr. Maudling said something as regards the Constitution and I replied "keep Barbados out of this." Then I pulled out my despatch box and produced correspondence which passed between the Government of Barbados on the 15th October, 1960 and the Government of the United Kingdom. It is the only Constitution in the world which says that the colony should have not less than so many Ministers. As you know, our Constitution states that you should have not less than five ministers and Mr. Maudling got the shock of his life. I asked him if he was seriously suggesting that. You have them sending down a man with a cheque for £10,000. Those whose main concern in politics is money can take these bribes; but we consider independence to be more important. All that they were doing was to put a big millstone around the people's necks. These were people who had no programme for the people of these Islands, but wanted to milk the people of Barbados like a milch cow.

At that Conference, as you will see in the Report, we discussed the statement that the Ministers should reduce their number of Ministers to three in each territory and two in Montserrat. I pointed out the cost to the Government and people of Antigua for ministerial system was $25,000. Under the British Government, they had only been able to raise a revenue of $1.8 million and out of that the Government paid its official representative.

Now, Sir, we are indifferent to the talks from the people on the other side. The effect of the Conference in 1961 was to propound constitutional changes. As far as I can see, the sole aim was to relieve Great Britain and save them from criticism on the floor of United Nations. I have to presume that people's motives are straightforward. There would be no future occasion for me to blow any fanfare or fulminate against the British people other than on matters of international policy.

Let me tell you now that I am very perturbed. I took this document in there to the conference and read out the proposals. You will have to know these things to understand. None of these people who have been going around posing as intellectuals has been engaged in these exercises as long as I have been.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition may recall what I told him of what had transpired.

This document is a Report of the Windwards and Leewards Constitutional Conference which was held in June last year. In this document you would see that each unit must have a Governor, each Island is entitled to have a Premier, nominated members appointed to the Upper Chamber or the single Chamber. The Governor is to be appointed by the Queen after consultation with a Federal Prime Minister. All that is in here. I said: "Here it is; today you are saying things which mean a substantial reduction not only on this document, but even on the Constitutions which they now enjoy.
7.20 p.m.

How can you do that? I nearly lost my temper because they were treating these people like little children. "Why is it that you are prepared to give them all of these things in 1961?" This was the Conference at Lancaster House; we were at Marlborough House for the first time. This was at Lancaster House immediately after the West Indies Conference which fixed a date for Independence. You may think that I am digressing at length, but I want people to understand. You must know the premises from which you are arguing so that people will understand the mentality of the people whom you are dealing with. You know the pressure which is being put on Great Britain and the United States, and the only people who are arguing against independence for Barbados are a few touts and mercenaries of Barbados. It is only some employers and I can call their names.... I can get off any plane or any boat in the West Indies so long as the territories are inhabited, and every policeman would know me and every Cabinet Minister also would know me. I know the premises upon which I am arguing, and they know that I was trying to impress upon them the things which they could not even see at the time.

I have come across in the United Kingdom some of the crudest people I have ever come across in my life, and some of us try to ape all the worst features of the English educational system. I did not eat any lunch up there because I was worried. The hon. senior member for the City was more lucky than I am because he could bring along his lunch with him. There were people who told the hon. member that he must not have his lunch. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was very much perturbed over the attitude of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I was so perturbed that I asked: "Why are you telling these people that they cannot have this and they cannot have that and twelve months before you were telling them that they could have internal self-government for each colony?" They were going to have a constitution not dissimilar from the constitution which Barbados enjoyed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say what I am saying now quite slowly. In saying this you will understand the official attitude, the great underlying attitude of those people, the British Officials, towards us in the West Indies. He looked me straight in the face and said that the answer is very simple; "we thought that by this time we would have got rid of them." If you ask me outside who said it, you will get the shock of your life. The hon. leader of the Opposition knows who it is, too. In other words, they were putting off the headaches of the Leeward and Windward Islands to the Federal Government, and if the Federal Government had not broken up we would have had this Constitution. When you talk about political immorality, you have to understand that there is a country which has ruthlessly taken hold of the economy of the other countries, people who are more benighted than ourselves and less advanced in what they choose to call civilisation; they have murdered, detribalised and suppressed their religious activities and that sort of thing, forbidding them to use their own language. You cannot be surprised that the residual effects of that kind of harsh treatment must still be manifested in the behaviour of some politicians of the Colonial territories today.

What I want to impress upon hon. members is that there is nothing politically moral in the exercise of this Federation at all. In other words, it was the device to get rid of the incorrigible politicians of the Leeward and Windward Islands who were causing them quite a lot of headaches. At the same time, there will be people of a certain mealy-mouthed, holier-than-thou attitude who would say that they have created another territory free to a state of independence as if the whole experience was some sort of Sunday-School exercise and not one of the worst things which could be perpetrated in the history of mankind. Sir, do you think that we will get the results of this exercise overnight? You cannot get that. I could not understand the attitude of the British Government because I had this document. I brought it here with me today not knowing that I would have had to use it. I brought this document here in order that I could move on from here.
7.30 p.m.

I want to say now for the last time that you are only able to appreciate this thing in its true perspective when you understand what I was told in the Church House, which is the headquarters of the Colonial Office in Great Smith Street, during the time I should be in to lunch, and I was perturbed in my mind at the attitude of the British Government that they were only granting the Windward and Leeward Islands this constitution because they thought that

within twelve months they would have got rid of them. In other words, it would be the headache of Trinidad, Barbados and Jamaica, and they could not care less.

I want to move on now because I have been speaking for a long time, and I want to answer any foolishness which perhaps the members of the public may want certain elucidation on that may emanate from the other side during the course of this debate. I am not therefore exhausting your patience or the patience of hon. members, but this is an important matter, and I am saying things today that I never said before. I am confessing that I laid a certain political trap for my political enemies, and I make no apology for it, and I confess that the purpose of laying that trap is that I would not have felt secure with this country going into independence not knowing who were the enemies of the society; but now we know.

The attitude of the British Government was that they would have got rid of the Islands. The attitude of the British Government today is still what it had been before, that is, that they are not prepared to underwrite the cost of Barbados carrying these other islands. I am not going to discuss the Federal Constitution, because I have been discussing that for three and a half years. The other people are new on this thing and are reading documents for the first time, and 99% of the documents they have not read because some of them are not available to them; but I will tell you the documents that students of history will have to read. I read the first and second reasons advanced, the first being the failure of the United Kingdom Government to indicate the amount of financial aid, and second being the withdrawal of the Governments of Grenada and Antigua from the discussions. The third reason was the stated unwillingness of the Government of Montserrat to join a Federation which did not include Antigua.

The Government of Antigua sent a dispatch before the Tenth meeting informing the Secretary of State that the Government of Antigua would not be prepared to continue the Federal exercise anymore. Now you would think that the Government of Antigua was the first Government to do that. Little do you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Government of Montserrat about a year before that had informed Her Majesty's Government that they were not continuing the Federal exercise, and they were not continuing because Mr. Bramble did not want to pay more taxation. Montserrat can bear a lot more taxation, but Mr. Bramble has 18,000 acres of land in Plymouth and Mr. Bramble wanted Montserrat to be exempt from any kind of taxation in any shape or form whatsoever. Mr. Duncan Sandys is a very tough man, and he could not understand how a colony with a budget of $460,000 could want to abolish all taxation on companies. I am not talking about import duties, because that would be a Federal matter.

When Mr. Duncan Sandys did not give the undertaking although we said that if that is the way the British Government felt about it, that is their own responsibility to make up the deficit of the money -- of course they did not do that -- and refused to make any commitment on this, Mr. Bramble filed a notice with the British Government that he was not prepared to attend any more conferences on Federation. I have the despatches here, and any member of the House is entitled to get up and read them. This happened long before Antigua withdrew, some time around December, 1964 or January, 1965. I may not be correct on the dates as I am speaking purely from memory. I have been at this thing 3 1/2 years when I should be looking after the business of the people of Barbados, when I should be looking to see that some of the things which should be implemented are only now coming into force; but my energies were diverted to this tedious exercise all the time. Mr. Bramble went on television like a screen star selling land in Montserrat. I believe he passed through London and got the Secretary of State to agree that he would consider making Montserrat a tax haven, and if you carry on business, you would not have to pay companies tax.

On returning to the capital City of Plymouth, Mr. Bramble addressed a telegram to the Premier of Barbados from the Chief Minister of Montserrat which read as follows:-

"In view of recent assurances given to me by the Government of the United Kingdom, the Government of Montserrat is now ready to resume the Federal exercise."

They withdraw from the Federal discussions. We did not publish this; but the Secretary of State gave him the undertaking that he would not have to pay any taxes. Now for the first time Mr. Bramble's economic position had a tremendous advantage. I wonder if this is an advantage for the people of Montserrat. I wonder if people can have their self respect if in perpetuity they have to depend on charity from somebody else, because in the latest constitutional proposals, Montserrat is left out. No matter how Dr. Carleen O'Loughlin and Professor Hicks worked computations as if they were playing Vernon Pools, they could not get Montserrat out of being a grant-aided territory in ten years; so you imagine the effect of removing taxation and income tax altogether where they really should be put, and then imposing that burden on the only two territories who pay their own way, Barbados and Antigua. This is what they want me to put the people of Barbados in.

I just began to read the Tenth meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers on page 6. These are the minutes and can become documents of the House. After the Governments of Antigua and St. Lucia had complained about St. Lucians being deported from St. Kitts, all the Chief Minister of St. Lucia could say was that he was prepared to recommend to the St. Lucia Government that they should continue their discussions with such territories as wished to establish some form of association in the Eastern Caribbean. 7.40 p.m.

The Chief Minister of St. Lucia was prepared to recommend that they continue their discussion on some form of association in the Eastern Caribbean. That was the beginning of the meeting. This particular form he could not however state because a number of things had changed since they had been summoned to the meeting. For example, the Government of Antigua had withdrawn and the Chief Minister of Montserrat had declared his reluctance to participate between a Federation which excluded Antigua.

Now the Premier of Barbados in paragraph 10 on page 3 made his first statement. He said "he would never agree "that Barbados should take up whatever bits and pieces "were left from the original decison of the Eight. From "the beginning and right up to the change of Government in "St. Lucia the territories contemplating a Federation had "negotiated on an equal basis and their negotiations had "been conducted in an atmosphere of harmony. He was not "willing to say that the Secretary of State was correct and "that the view of the Government of Antigua was wrong. "Antigua had been discarded without any attempt to find any "solution to the impasse. For that reason he thought the "whole situation was in need of re-examination. They were "not prepared to proceed on the basis of the Secretary of "State's dispatch which was not seen as an ultimatum to "Barbados. The United Kingdom has failed to state the "quantum of financial aid that would be forthcoming to the "proposed Federation. If such action had been taken two "years ago there would have been no difficulties in ac-"cepting Command Paper 1746 as a basis for Federation. He "could not understand how anyone could take exception to "the present stand of the Barbados Government since the "United Kingdom Government had been equivocating and had "adopted an attitude of ambivalence and had refused to de-"clare how it would discharge its responsibility to the "territories of the group this reshuffling of cards would not " be acceptable to the Government of Barbados. The survi-"val of Barbados did not depend on accepting a Federation "on any kind of basis. Barbados had survived without bud-"getary assistance from any other Government. His Gov-"ernment had done everything possible to foster the idea "of Federation and he would have to consult the Legisla-"ture and the political parties including his own political "party.

" The Barbados Government had made several conces-"sions throughout the federal exercises. Since Marl-"borough House, a territory had been allowed to contract "out. They had made another concession to the Government " of Montserrat with respect to its income tax. He was

"however, prepared to examine the whole matter de novo "but not on the basis of the Secretary of State's dispatch. "No one could take exception to the Government of Barba- "dos, in the changed circumstances, declining to state "categorically that it favoured a Federation of the Six in "view of the failure of the United Kingdom Government over "the past two years to make any declaration concerning the "quantum of financial aid that would be available to the "proposed Federation."

I just want to tell you this. On page 4 at paragraph 13 "He (The Premier of Barbados) referred to a conversation "which he had had in 1963 with Mr. Duncan Sandys, the then "Secretary of State for the Colonies, who, when questioned "about the quantum of assistance that would be available to "the proposed Federation, said that he was not prepared "to buy any federation and that the territories must want "federation for the sake of federation. This remark he con- "sidered insolent."

I have said it in this House and I have said it in public

"14. He wanted to know what form of federation the "Chief Minister of St. Lucia and the other Chief Ministers "had in mind since in the circumstances he could not as- "sume the validity of either the draft Federal Scheme or "the Secretary of State's despatch."

Mr. Bradshaw asked Sir Stephen Luke what statement he had to make. Sir Stephen Luke said that "he had no idea of the quantum of aid that would be available to the federation", all he could say was that the Secretary of State made a "promise of sympathetic and extensive consultation when the Governments had decided in broad terms whether or not they wished to federate."

Now, Sir Stephen Luke was telling us: "You federate first; and after you federate, we will then see if we can give you sympathetic consultation. What I want to know is how much this sympathy is worth in dollars and cents to islands which are given $7.9 million?

In a private conversation explaining the issue, I said: "You are paying $7.9 million and that it is for administration. You give them so much now under Development and Welfare grants and then you are giving them one or two special grants which you make available. Why do not you add them up and say that this is what we know about?" Every time I came up against this blank wall and the words came back to me which I repeated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and those words kept repeating and repeating themselves. So, he had not even been given any authority to say anything except as far as you can see from the despatch which was released and circulated in this House.

We did not agree with the Secretary of State. Antigua said that they had finished. They did not come to the next meeting.
7.50 p.m.

I am quoting again from the much-misquoted meeting. I will say this: it is true that Press releases are scanty and they do not have much information. Sometimes that is a good thing because, when you are trying to arrive at a unanimous decision with a lot of different information in a group, whether it be a public company, a political association or otherwise, it is not wise to come out and say what the position is because you have a person in a position where he cannot really modify his views. Press releases have got to be scanty unless something has really been achieved. Therefore, I admit that the Press releases were scanty and what you are hearing now you are hearing for the first time; but that does not give you the authority for saying something which is not true.

Nobody who has been going about parading as a political pundit has had the Minutes of the 10th Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. If somebody tells a lie as to what happens at meetings, I have no authority for saying that it did not take place, because I am restricted by the rules with which we are governed and by the conventions by which we are regulated; but I have the authority to say, with all the people who have been pontificating, that the Hon. Leader of the House has had special arrangements to have the Official Gazette brought out early with this debate. There is not going to be any broadcast of this debate because on the last occasion it took eight months to get the debate finished, because we only had half an hour allocated to the broadcasting of the debate each night. We had to suffer and therefore we must have an accurate and speedy report of the debate. So, for the first time, you are now hearing this in public. They never even had a drink with any of the Ministers; or discussed how the talks were progressing; never invited them to their homes and all of a sudden all of this has started. They are a bunch of dishonest people.

I will now give you the facts. With a burden of $7.9 million and Barbados being the only country which has been able to balance its budget, I see this money disappearing through the eddoes, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter would say, instead of being used in the employment of the people of this country. The people must have had some confidence in the good sense of the government. The people who have elected us to power have expressed their desires and aspirations. It is not necessary to make a long introduction. "The Chairman said that he understood that "until Her Majesty's Government would give a clear in- "dication of the financial assistance it was prepared to "give, Barbados would not be prepared to discuss the Des- "patch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies in re- "lation to the Draft Federal Scheme." Paragraph 18 at page 4 of the same Report shows that "the Premier of "Barbados said that there appeared to be some uncertainty "as regards the form of association which was required, "whether federal or unitary, and that the Government of "Barbados would consider the positon when this was made "clear." At paragraph 22" the Chief Minister of Montserrat "complimented the Premier of Barbados on the eloquent "statement which he made to the effect that the Regional "Council of Ministers could not entirely ignore the claims "of the Government of Antigua. With this he was in com- "plete agreement. On the other hand, he wished it placed on "record that they could not agree that the failure of the "British Government to state the quantum of financial aid "was the reason why they had not federated. He considered "it paradoxical that they could clamour for independence "and at the same time insist on knowing the quantum of "financial assistance before they could become indepen- "dent." "In his opinion, the British Government could not "state the amount of aid which it was willing to provide, "until it knew the kind of Federation which it was being "asked to support."

That was the same Mr. Bramble who signed a formal statement saying that the Government of Montserrat is prepared to resume the same exercise when the British Government gave an undertaking that it was prepared to relieve him of income tax.
8.00 p.m.

Before I sit down, and in conclusion of my address before the motion for suspension of the sitting, I think it is best that I should just read this paragraph:-

"At this stage, the Premier of Barbados handed to the Chairman a statement with a request that he should read it to the Conference. The Shatement reads as follows:-

"PROPOSED EAST CARIBBEAN FEDERATION"

The Cabinet concluded that the Leader of the Barbados Delegation should at the appropoiate time state the position of the Government of Barbados as follows:-

(i) that on the general principle of the desirability of an East Caribbean Federation, there was no change in this Government's position as expressed some three years ago;

(ii) that one of the contributing factors to the present state of disagreement and indecision among the seven territories was the continued failure of the United Kingdom Government to state in unequivocal terms the quantum of capital finance which it was prepared to make available to the Federation for the long overdue development of the constituent territories;

(iii) that any further discussions on proposals for the establishment of an East Caribbean Federation woul d be dependent on the willingness of the United Kingdom Government to state its intentions with regard to (ii) above."

I just want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this was a unanimous decision of the Regional Council of Ministers as far back as 1963, and it was particularly important for Barbados to know. It would be immaterial to Montserrat because they cared for none of these things. Their substance is to fall like manna from Heaven. They could afford, when they are not collecting one-fifth of the money needed for their normal administrative requirements, to adopt a bombastic attitude and tell the British Government that they are withdrawing from the Federal exercise unless they relieve them from paying income tax. When you are in that fortunate position, you are not going to be concerned, because you will not have to pay somebody else's debt; somebody will be always paying yours. He could afford to ask what is all this talk about asking the British Government how much money they were going to give.

Somewhere in this document which is the White Paper, you will see my summing up of that situation which is found in paragraph 108 on page 47. It reads as follows:-

"The submission we do not want to have is a blind submission to a constitutional form without the assurance that the people of this island will not become the holders in due course of a dishonoured promissory note."

Why should I use that expression "a dishonoured promissory note"? We had made unanimous Resolutions. The Government of Barbados, as I said before, told them that something had to be done, and Mr. Duncan Sandys made a statement in which he said that he was not buying any Federation. All the time we were insisting because we were the people who had to lose, because it is true that a Government usually honours the commitments of a previous Government, so that whether it was a Conservative or Labour Government in England, one would expect any commitment entered into would be met and honoured; but as neither one of the Governments was prepared to make any commitment, therefore a fortiori neither the Conservative or Labour Party was prepared to make any statement on financial aid for the setting up of the Federation like the system they set up in Southern Rhodesia.

We have been unnecessarily harsh on the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia because this is a system that the British Government never complained about as long as they were getting copper and so on, and things were going their way. They have never complained to any of the previous Prime Ministers, including Sir Roy Welensky. I was at the Prime Ministers' Conference in 1962, and the issue of Southern Rhodesia was never discussed to disenfranchise the 4 million Africans. All these are the effects of Colonialism. They will set up a system which is to your detriment; it has a debilitating effect on your economy; and when you ask how they are going to rectify the situation, they tell you they will give it sympathetic consideration. Whether we call that buying a pig in a poke or whether we call it becoming the holders in due course of a dishonoured promissory note, a promissory note is dishonoured when there are no funds to meet it or they stop payment at the Bank.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I will read paragraph 28 of the Minutes of the same meeting which are now being disclosed for the first time. Never have I treated the House with the discourtesy of saying anythong. I have been holding my ammunition in public, because this is a matter for the House of Assembly. Why did they not hold public meetings in 1962 when we were holding the discussions and splash it all over the newspapers that this would curtail our projects such as the School Meals programme and the East Coast Road. One of the declarations we made in our Manifesto was that Barbados was going for independence, but they now say that we have closed our minds to any further association. We have not closed our minds up to now; only a fool would to that. We are not the residual repositories of all wisdom of mankind from now until eternity.

In paragraph 28 I said that "the House of Commons had stated the precise amount of financial aid to be given "to a small territory like Malta before that territory "gained its independence. On the break up of the East "African Federation, the House of Commons had been "informed that the British Government would provide "a large sum of money to ensure that the British Inves-"tors would not lose their money" - £278 million. The "Government of Barbados had decided that it would not "go to London before all of them had reached complete "agreement on the establishment of a Federation, and "unless and until the Secretary of State had stated the "quantum of financial assistance that would be given. He "could not understand the present reluctance of the Brit-"ish Government in the light of its past performance.

"Sir Stephen Luke suggested that the next meeting "of the Regional Council of Ministers should take place in "the West Indies and be attended by the Secretary of State, "and that at that meeting the Secretary of State could "make known the amount of aid which he was prepared to "give.

"The Premier of Barbados said that it was not ne-"cessary for the Secretary of State to come to the West "Indies since he could communicate his decision. He re-"ferred to the agency which was to be set up by the Bri-"tish Government to examine the economic requirements "of the area, and wondered whether the establishment of "the Mission was contingent on their decision to form a "Federation. He said that the territories would need aid "whether or not there was a Federation. There was no "point in saying that if certain features were included in "the Constitution they would get aid, but otherwise they "would not get aid. The main object of establishing the "Mission must be to make recommendations concerning "the requirements of the area."

In paragraph 32 "the Premier of Barbados said that "the Barbados Cabinet's decision which had been read out "to them by the Chairman was precisely what the Re-"gional Council of Ministers at the Seventh Meeting held "in Antigua had stated in unambiguous terms. The posi-"tions of the Barbados Government was that the Secretary "of State had projected a Constitution in which the power "to raise external loans would be in the hands of the "Federal Government. Consequently, the Federal Gov-"ernment would have the power to tell the Barbados Gov-"ernment that the time was not appropriate for it to "raise loans to carry out its development plans. The Bar-"bados Government must therefore know the sources "from which it was going to receive loans or grants. If "his Government was going to change its unfettered "right to go to the London market, it could only do so if "the British Government discharged its responsibilities "by letting his Government know what alternative sources "it could look to. It was not in the interest of the people "of Barbados for the Government of Barbados to commit "an act of blind faith in the charity of the British Gov-"ernment.

8.10 p.m.

Paragraph 44. "The Chief Minister of St. Vincent "said that the question of finance has always loomed "largely in their discussion and he was therefore sur-"prised to observe that the stand taken by the Barbados "Government should be viewed with suspicion. The British "Government's statements on the amount of financial aid "had always been equivocal. They said that the aid would "not be less than what they were then receiving in the "form of grant-in-aid but that formula had been complete-"ly unacceptable too. He was therefore in agreement with "the Premier of Barbados to press the British Govern-"ment for a reply as to the amount of financial aid which "they could hope to receive."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you give me two minutes I would quote this part of my address on this much contro-

versial meeting, I was, Sir, amazed to read that a member of the legal profession was discussing the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers when he did not, legally or otherwise, have access to the document from which I am now reading. This is the kind of arrogance which you get in this community. How can anybody discuss the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers when he was not in receipt or did not have access to the documents of that meeting?

On page 10, paragraph 49, I "quoted from paragraph "15 of the despatch of the 14th September, 1953 to the "Secretary of State from the Chairman of the Regional "Council of Ministers, which appeared on page 41 on the "published draft Federal Scheme as follows:-

"The conference unanimously endorsed a request that "financial assistance on the scale envisaged in Dr. "O'Loughlin's Economic Survey be made available and "that no conference to settle the details of a constitution "for an independent Federation be held until satisfactory "assurances about the quantum and duration of assistance "from Her Majesty's Government had been obtained."

In paragraph 50 I "asked the Conference to note "that the present Barbados stand was a reiteration of a "unanimous decision reached by the Regional Council of "ministers at its Seventh Meeting in September, 1963, "which decision had been communicated to the Secretary "of State."

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

"The Chairman referred to the Secretary of State's "telegram of the 26th February, 1964, in reply to the "despatch from which the Premier of Barbados had "quoted, and which appeared on page 43 of the published "Draft Federal Scheme in which the Secretary of State "had said that if Federation could be brought about on "satisfactory terms, British aid would continue, and that "over the first five years of Federation, the amount "would not be less than the territories were together "receiving from Britain at present. The Premier of Bar-"bados remarked that that meant absolutely nothing to "Barbados , since Barbados was not in receipt of any "grant-in-aid." In paragraph 55 "The Premier of Bar-"bados said that the Regional Council of Ministers was "aware that he had a mandate from the people of Bar-"bados to go to independence, either within or without a "Federation. If it was found impossible to form a Fed-"eration, Barbados would have no alternative but to pro-"ceed to independence alone." In paragraph 57 "the "Premier of Barbados said that he was not prepared to "discuss the Secretary of State's despatch because of the "new situation created by the withdrawal of Antigua, and "because he felt that publicity ought to be given to the new "situation that had arisen."

In paragraph 61 - that is on page 12 of the record - I stated that "no conference to settle the details of Con-"stitution should be held until the quantum of financial "assistance to be given by Her Majesty's Government was "known. The Government of Barbados was prepared to "accept the White Paper as a basis for Federation, but "they were not prepared to go to London until they had "assurance of financial assistance.

"At that stage, Hon. J. M. D. Bousquet remarked that this was a "smart alec" attitude."

That was a decision made in 1963 — a Cabinet decision. It was printed by Senator Ward and handed to the meeting in printed form. Here was a Government trying to bring the people out of the throes of Colonialism. Here was a Government that was fighting Mr. Maudling over giving us a dishonoured promissory note because I was told in 1962 that the British Government thought that they would have got rid of them by 1962.

I was also told that the British Government thought that they had got rid of the Leeward and the Windward Islands and it was agreed that they should be palmed off and certain people go to the House of Lords.

That is the only thing they wanted. In those days, in 1961, as late as that in the history of mankind, there were to be peers in the House of Lords, rewarded for relieving the British Government of their responsibility to the islands.;8.20 p.m.

As a matter of fact, the expression which he used was that they would give sympathetic consideration after we had established the Federation. The rumour is being disclosed. "The Premier of Barbados objected to that remark and requested the Chairman to ask Mr. Bousquet to withdraw this remark."

The Leader of the Opposition has asked me to speak up because sometimes he cannot hear me. I usually speak more quietly when I am angry. When I am angry nobody knows. It is not that I lower my voice because I do not want people to hear what I am saying; I lower my voice so as to control myself. "Mr. Bousquet withdrew from the meeting but rejoined the meeting within a few minutes whereupon the Premier of Barbados drew the Chairman's attention to Mr. Bousquet's reappearance."

They are like boys in the form; they have not done any homework. I implore them to do their homework because it was an important debate. I discussed the matter with him in 1964; this was a Cabinet decision, the decision of the Regional Council of Ministers in Antigua. If people come out and tell lies I can refute the statements which they have made. The Paper which I presented at the Regional Council of Ministers was checked by Senator Ward and to make abundantly sure that I did not deviate from the Cabinet's decision, Mr. Ward had it typed and presented it to me and said: "Here is the Cabinet's decision." The only disagreement I had with Senator Ward is that he wanted me to give it up right away; but I wanted to hear what the others said. I understand that he went out and telephoned some of his friends. I am reading from the Cabinet's decision. It reads as follows:-

"The Premier informed the Cabinet that the most im-"portant issue to be discussed at the Tenth Meeting of the "Regional Council of Ministers which would be on Monday "26th April, related to the proposals for the establishment "of an East Caribbean Federation. The Secretary of State "had now made known the views of the United Kingdom Gov-"ernment on the Draft Federal Scheme, and since then the "Government of Antigua had declared its intention to dis-"continue discussions on a proposed Federation which was "based on the Draft Federal Scheme or on the Secretary "of State's Proposals.

"The Premier asked the Cabinet to indicate what "should be the attitude of the Barbados Delegation in fur-"therance of this matter.

"The Cabinet concluded that the Leader of the Bar-"bados Delegation should at the appropriate time state "the position of the Government of Barbados as follows:-

Mr. Speaker, I have already read out the decision which I handed to the Chairman of the Regional Council of Ministers which is a body comprised of the Chief Ministers of the Windward and Leeward Islands and the Premier of Barbados. We should not have anybody but the Chief Ministers at this stage. Sir Arthur Lewis had expressed the view that it is a great mistake to take anybody in there but the Chief Ministers. The Chief Ministers make decisions. There was a great tragdy and mistake to bring in others on the side lines. Sometimes people like Mr. Bousquet cause more trouble than the Chief Ministers themselves. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition would know to whom I am referring because he had to deal with that person. This is the Regional Council of the Chief Ministers and the Premier of Barbados because that was what was agreed to at

Marlborough House. We brought people in as advisers. This decision was dictated by Mr. Ward himself and I am quite sure that it was delivered to me by Mr. Ward. He brought it in to me printed. I had a copy which he did not know. I had my copy: so I put my copy in my Box and never gave him back his copy. Apparently other people were privy to that decision because it was communicated by people who had not only drafted it but who had been sworn to secrecy. 8.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier gave an intimation of the last submission by the Government to the Colonial Office. We will have no more submission made about that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Talking about the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers, the Hon. Premier referred to the fact that he had no doubt that I knew something about the Cabinet decision. I want to assure him that this is the first time I am hearing anything about this meeting and of these arrangements, and I am paying great attention to them now.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has made his point, but this is not what he was telling the general public during the past two months. He was telling them he knew everything that went on.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. senior member for the City risen?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have risen on a point of order. The hon. member said that I was telling the public that I knew everything that was going on.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has made his point. If I may continue, Sir, Mr. Ward forgot three little words like "I love you" — "at the appropriate time." This is what we had decided in London at a Conference with the Premier of Barbados and the Chief Ministers. It has no legal status; it is a series of discussions between Heads of Governments; it is not a dialogue between representatives of the Legislature of Constituent territories. It was a continuing exercise by the Heads of Government, and I being the only Minister there who had a mandate, never derogated one iota from that mandate.

Now, Sir, we have heard the first part. This is not found in the proceedings of the Regional Council of Ministers and you will see the reason why.

"Cabinet further concluded that if further discussions "towards the formation of an East Caribbean Federation "appeared to be either unlikely or fruitless, the attitude "of the Barbados Government towards those matters on "which there was now joint action by all the territories "should be as follows:-

" (a) the Barbados Government would be unable to "continue to support joint representation overseas with the "other Governments;

" (b) the Barbados Government is in a position to es- "tablish its own offices in the United Kingdom and in Canada "without any additional financial outlay;

" (c) the Barbados Government would be prepared "to undertake overseas representation on any matter on "behalf of any East Caribbean territory which so desired "on a contributory basis."

The next Item is headed "Judiciary".

"The Barbados Government should stress the need for "the replacement of the present unsatisfactory arrange- "ments for the British Caribbean Court of Appeal by a per- "manent West Indian Court of Appeal which would include "British Guiana".

This is a part of the Cabinet decision which was not disclosed then and is now being disclosed for the first time after I had communicated with the Secretary of State on the results and the misrepresentations of this meeting. I have a document which I will send to some of my friends who are expert writers on constitutional law, because I explained to the Secretary of State the improprieties which had taken place and what should be the position of a Government which is placed in the invidious position of perhaps being guilty of a breach of the Official Secrets Act if it disclosed matters which had been erroneously, falsely and maliciously misrepresented by former members of the Government.

These were the Minutes of the meeting held at Government Headquarters on Saturday, 24th April, 1965 at 9.45 a.m. "Present were:

"Hon. E. W. Barrow, M.P., Minister of Finance;
"Hon. J. C. Tudor, M.P., Minister of Education;
"Hon C. E. Talma, M.P., Minister of Communications and "Works;
"Hon. G. G. Fergusson, M.P., Minister of Agriculture and "Fisheries;;
"Senator Hon. H. A. Vaughan, Q.C., O.B.E., Attorney Gen- "eral;
"Senator E. R. L. Ward, Minister without portfolio."

Two members of the Cabinet were not present:-

"Hon. W. A. Crawford, M.P., Minister of Trade and "Labour — on account of family bereavement;
"Hon. A. DaC. Edwards, M.P., Minister of Health, Housing, "Local Government and Community Development — out of "the island."

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Hon. and Learned member for St. John given way, or has he finished his speech?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. member has given way.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second the motion.

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

8.40 p.m.

On resumption,

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, will you ask that the Bell be rung?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Bell be rung

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the hon. and learned senior member for St. John was addressing the Chair.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the suspension of the sitting, I was dealing with the document which had been prepared of the meetings of the Regional Council of Ministers and I explained how much, to my surprise, various persons who have reasons best known to themselves are opposed to something which is a foregone conclusion — political independence and the emancipation of the people of this Island — and profess to have so much knowledge on what took place at the last meeting of the Regional Council of Chief Ministers.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition admitted that he heard these things from the horse's mouth. My advice to

people who find themselves in the same position which he finds himself in – that is, induced to take part in a public discussion – is that he should remember the words of the Psalmist David: "Lord, I am not highminded, I have no proud looks. I do not exercise myself in great matters which are too high for me."

The hon. senior member for the City gets up in public and gives the general public the impression that he has inside information which he has himself admitted today that he does not have. Therefore, he is not discharging his responsibility to the electorate of the Island. He may not have said so in precise terms, but he gave the impression to the Press of the Island – a Press which has always been opposed to the oppressed masses of the people of this island – that at one time it was thought that the Barbados Labour Party was fighting for the emancipation of the people of this country.

Sir, I will now continue my discussion on the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers and the only authentic discussion that took place. I had reached the stage where I explained to the hon. members of This Place that contrary to popular belief, the meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers did not break up. The meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers held on the 26th, 27th, 28th and 29th May, 1965, moved like the political life of many members on the opposite side – peacefully towards its close.

In paragraph 46, after I drew to the attention of the Chairman of the Regional Council of Ministers, who incidentally is the Governor of Barbados, who incidentally also was insulted by the Hon. J. M. Bousquet, a Minister of the newly elected government of St. Lucia, the member who was editor of the Draft Federal Scheme, gave his synopsis of the opinions which had been expressed by Governments from time to time in our three and a half years of discussion.

Mr. Bousquet was for some time Minister without portfolio. We had a plethora of them in the West Indian Federation which Dr. Williams described as the worst Government in the history of mankind. I am not prepared to take part in any Government worse than that.

Now, the independent territories of Trinidad and Jamaica and the territory of Antigua was also represented by a Minister without portfolio. None of this would have been vouchsafed to these Federal exercises.

The whole discussion centred around this meeting and this item on the Agenda. I should like to explain that there were several items on the Agenda, but it was a question of economic assistance which was desired from the British Government. Montserrat and St. Lucia adopted a recalcitrant attitude. They did not know whether they wanted a Federation. As a matter of fact, when we were in Trinidad in 1962, Mr. John Compton, who is now Chief Minister of St. Lucia, was in the Opposition and he sought an audience with Mr. Maudling and in this audience which he had with Mr. Maudling, it was published, not only in the Press of Trinidad but of St. Lucia, that Mr. John Compton's party was not in favour of Federation. They were only in favour of a unitary state. At least, I would say this. Mr. John Compton was entirely consistent on the matter and Mr. Bousquet saw nothing inconsonant with the party's policy when he destroyed the Draft Federal Scheme in St. Lucia.

There was a debate which followed the Speech from the Throne, and in the despatch, the Administrator of St. Lucia stated that the Government of St. Lucia did not commit itself to joining the Federation.

These territories have never been infavour of Federation. Various sortees were made before the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers to form a unitary state, the only islands not taking part in that were Barbados, St. Kitts-Nevis-and-Anguilla.

What I would like to make clear at this stage is that at the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers, there was an Agenda on which was the consideration of the Secretary of State's despatch saying that the Secretary of State in his wisdom did not accept the Antigua Government's proposals. I saw that Mr. Bird would have no further say in the Federal exercise and as a result of the Secretary of State making this quite clear, I thought that Barbados should not have attended that meeting either. I am not going to sit down and allow the public to be misled and the impression given that the meeting was broken up as a result of the behaviour of the member of the Government's delegation, being myself.

In paragraph 62, Mr. Bousquet made a remark about a Cabinet decision and in paragraph 63 on page 12 I said: "I objected to the remark."

The Chairman did not ask Mr. Bousquet to withdraw the remark.

I was doing no more than the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did when he asked me to withdraw the remark that I said he indulged in Machiavellian manoeuvres and I withdrew the remark.

In paragraph 63, it is stated: "The Premier of Bar-
"bados objected to that remark and requested the Chair-
"man to ask Mr. Bousquet to withdraw this remark. Mr.
"Bousquet withdrew from the meeting, but rejoined the
"meeting within a few minuted, whereupon the Premier
"of Barbados drew the Chairman's attention to Mr.
"Bousquet's reappearance. The Chairman said that when
"people were in debate, from timt to time words were
"used which were unfortunate as in this case, but he
"thought that if all members agreed to conduct their dis-
"cussions in a more orderly manner they would get on
"very much better. He said that they were not in the habit
"of conducting the meetings of the Regional Council of
"ministers in accordance with strict parliamentary pro-
"cedure. The Premier of Barbados said that he had no
"alternative but to withdraw from the meeting, but before
"doing so, he would ask to have it placed on record that
"the Hon. J. M. D. Bousquet had made a remark which
"he considered offensive, and that he had asked the
"Chairman to ask Mr. Bousquet to withdraw his remarks,
"but that the Chairman had failed to do so.
9.45 p.m.

"As from that moment therefore the Barbados Gov-
"ernment would be attending the meeting purely as ob-
"servers. No opinion could be canvassed in his absence
"from any member of his delegation concerning the views
"of the Government of Barbados.

"67. The Premier of Barbados then withdrew from
"the meeting at 12.20 p.m. Mr. E. S. S. Burrowes also
"withdrew.

"68. The Chief Minister of St. Lucia then announced
"that he and Hon. J. M. D. Bousquet would be returning
"to St. Lucia early on Thursday 29th April, but that in
"his absence he was authorising Hon. George Mallet to
"make decisions on behalf of the Government of St. Lucia.

"69. The Meeting then adjourned at 12.55 p.m. until
"9.30 a.m., on Thursday 29th April, 1965."

Let us accept that what the hon. senior member for the City says is true. How could he and the members of his party accuse me of walking out and breaking up a meeting when the facts are as I have mentioned? It was the first time that we were discussing whether or not we should have a debate on the Secretary of State for the Colonies' despatch and we decided that we should not. Our despatch dealt with the Government of Antigua as if we were discussing that colony and not the Federation. They were told that we must Federate first and then we must pay for their responsibility. The meeting was convened on the next day and the Items on the Agenda were

discussed. There was no acrimonious atmosphere, and subsequently in Trinidad Mr. J. W. D. Bousquet moved a Vote of Thanks to me for my Chairmanship at a meeting of the Regional Shipping Council at which it was said that never had they had a meeting conducted in the way in which I had discharged my duties.

There are certain vicious people in the community who will be dealt with by the general public when the time comes, because they are prepared to distort even the facts of recorded history for their own personal ends. The Regional Council of Ministers was formally reconvened and this is what the Chairman said:-

"The Chairman therefore suggested that the Council "should adjourn discussion on the subject for the time "being. He was unfortunately not in a position to say "when the Barbados deliberations would be completed "but he felt sure that there would de a desire to com-"plete them as soon as possible.

"The Council agreed under the prevailing circum-"stances to adjourn discussions on the Draft Federal "Scheme and on the Secretary of State Circular Despatch "121/65 of 22nd March, 1965 until a date to be announced.

"Sir Stephen Luke withdrew from the meeting at 9.45 p.m."

After this several Items were dealt with:-

Paper No. RCM. 1/65 Estimates of Expenditure of Eastern Caribbean Commission in the United Kingdom for the year 1965-66:

Paper No. RCM. 3/65 - Legal Aid for West Indians in Britain.

Paper No. RCM. 2/65 - West Indies Student Centre London, Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure 1965-66.

Paper No. RCM. 4/65 - Vacation leave for former employees of Barbados Immigrant Liaison Services:

Paper No. RCM. 9/65 - Responsibility for accumulative vacation leave for Assistant to the Acting Commissioner, Commission in Canada.

Paper No. R.C.M. 22/65 - Future of the Regional Research Centre after 1966:

Paper No. RCM. 5/65 - Chairman's Visit to the United Kingdom - Settlement of Air Passage:

Paper No. RCM. 6/65 - Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1965-66 for Commission in Canada:

Paper No. RCM. 7/65 - Commission in Canada -unauthorised expenditure:

Paper No. RCM. 11/65 - Leasing of Additional space adjoining existing premises of Commission in Canada.

Paper No. RCM. 12/65 - Financial Assistance - re Hospital and Medical Expenses:

Paper No. RCM. 13/65 - Eastern Caribbean Marketing Mission to Canada:

Paper No. RCM. 14/65 - Renewal of contract of acting Commissioner, commission in Canada.

Any other business

(1) International Development Association

The Chairman promised to circulate to Governments information concerning the terms on which I.D.A. loans could be made and the projects for which loans might be made available.

(2) British Caribbean Court of Appeal.

In this matter the Council decided that contribution should be sought for the six month period July to December, 1965.

(III) Treatment of Nurses in London Training Hospital.

The Chairman informed the Council that he had received a letter dated 26th February, 1965, from the Acting Commissioner, Commission in the United Kingdom, stating that the Communist Party in Great Britain was requesting information concerning the treatment of Coloured Nurses in London Training Hospitals and that he had instructed the Acting Commissioner to inform the Communist Party that the Eastern Caribbean Commission in the United Kingdom was not in a position to offer any comments on the matter until a policy decision had been reached by the Regional Council of Ministers.

The Council authorised the Chairman to state that, as a matter of policy, no information should be provided by the Eastern Caribbean Commission for any political party on matters of that kind.

(IV) Regional Education Conference 1965.

These matters were also dealt with.

"The Chairman" in paragraph 75 of the Minutes of the 29th April, 1965 — the day after the meeting was supposed to have been broken up, according to the people on the other side "thanked all delegations for their "co-operation, and at paragaph 76 The Chief Minister "of Montserrat paid tribute to the Chairman's patience "and calmness and said that he had exhibited outstanding "qualities. The meeting was then adjourned sine die at "1.40 p.m. on Thursday 29th April, 1965."

A Press release was issued on the 29th April, 1965 concerning the proceedings of that meeting. These Press Reports were very brief, but that was not any fault of mine. It is completely erroneous for anybody to suggest that the Government of Barbados had broken up any Federal discussion. The Government of Barbados, long before this meeting, discussed what should be done under the doctrine of collective responsibility to the Cabinet by which Cabinet Ministers are bound.
9.55 p.m.

Quite apart from that, I know that the hon. senior member for Bridgetown does not accept constitutional conventions, because these must be matters of expediency and not of practice. I hear him sniggering when I talk of collective responsibility in the Cabinet. It does not suit the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to have Cabinet secrecy or collective responsibility of the Cabinet, because under that system, he is not in a position to run the Government from outside of the Cabinet. He is therefore not addicted to the constitutional niceties which we in our Victorian straight jackets and our exposure to the English legal system and to constitutional practice in Western democracy are likely to observe. I envy the hon. member Mr. Speaker, for the licence which he can exercise in matters of grave importance to the people of this country, and for the flexibility with which his political career has been conducted and the success which he has so far achieved; but it is likely to be short lived.

I will return Mr. Speaker, to discussion on the Preamble to the Resolution which we are discussing today. I have read paragraph (c) in the Preamble which states that the discussions have proved fruitless through the stated unwillingness of the Government of Montserrat to join a Federation which did not include Antigua. I have quoted directly from the Chief Minister of Montserrat as recorded in the Minutes of the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers which is the last meeting which has been held up to now. I have made reference to the unsatisfactory proposals made by the Government of St. Lucia — which that Government has never withdrawn — supported by the Gov-

ernment of Dominica, for the disposal of Federal surplus Revenues.

We have enumerated, Sir, several good and sufficient reasons why the Government of Barbados should not engage in protracted and fruitless exercises. We have done more than any other Government in the region for closer association. You will see that in this very Resolution we have expressed our determination to pursue this objective, but at the same time this Government is under no obligation to be pushed around by anybody either inside or outside of Barbados. This Government has to make decisions, and there are two things I should like to say. I went down to St. Lucia in August, 1964, shortly after the new Government was elected, to congratulate them on their victory and to brief them – a task which I took upon myself – on the state of the Federal negotiations and to invite them to do their homework, because I did not know the Chief Minister yesterday or week before last, like some of the hon. members on the other side. I understand that one or two of my former Ministers who completely ignored the Chief Minister of St. Lucia when he paid visits to this territory found themselves watching and besetting his office premises in St. Lucia during the past few weeks. I know Mr. Compton as far back as 1946, and this year would make twenty years that we have become associated. On the night Castries burnt down, I was lying down reading on a carpet in a flat occupied by him; he was inside playing cards. I went inside and notified him along with some other friends of mine that there had been a fire in St. Lucia; so as the senior stateman, not in age, but constitutionally, I felt that someone should set his mind at rest. I spoke to Mr. Compton because he had made a statement prior to the elections on economic collaboration and not necessarily constitutional changes per se, and I said to myself that there at least is a person who is not prepared to accept the second-hand notions of the British Government on how we should proceed, on not being treated like a child by officials in the Colonial Office, and who is prepared to examine the problems of the West Indies and the economic solutions which we may have available.

I went to St. Lucia and spoke to Mr. Compton. I told him that I was toying with the idea of a Free Trade Area in order to get something going. I explained to him that if in the former Federation we had started with a Customs Union and Free Trade Area, the Federation would have survived its constitutional arrangements, because it would be impossible to unscramble the intricate mechanism of a Customs Union and a Free Trade Area. Mr. Compton agreed with me but made one reservation. He said to me that there would have to be some kind of transfer of development funds from the richer territories – meaning Barbados – and the other two territories that I was having discussions with at the time – the Government of St. Lucia and the Government of St. Vincent – becuse they are the two territories closer to Barbados. We in the Government were having misgivings about the possibility of a federal system of Government being either workable, practical or possible in the future. I did not really understand what the Chief Minister of St. Lucia was driving at when he said this. I really honestly did not understand the enormity of the suggestion. It was subsequently revealed. It did not dawn on my consciousness at the time; so I felt we had accomplished something. We prepared a joint release and Mr. Compton came out in favour of a Free Trade Area with the reservation about development funds which he did not enlarge on. I then went over the same morning to St. Vincent and spoke to the Chief Minister Mr. Ebenezer Joshua, who had been an ancient crusader in the Federal cause, and Mr. Joshua agreed with the proposals within Mr. Compton's reservation. As I said before, the Government of St. Lucia tore up the Draft Federal Scheme because it did not do anything for St. Lucia. They said they could not agree. They said they could not agree that the revenues from import duties should be refunded to the respective Governments on a derivation basis. This is just a sentence I use to explain something which we, who have been engaged in the exercise, took for granted as significant to the members of the general public.

The Government, Sir, has to be supported some way or the other. The Government of Barbados has full charge of its affairs in Government, and the only thing which we do not manage now are our external relations. We do this through the British Governments and we pay the British Government who performs for us, have to pay the Ambassador in Brazil for distributing the pensions which are paid to Barbadians down there. A large sum of moeny is paid to the British Embassy in Cuba for Barbadians there. We pay money for hospitalisation in Panama just now.
10.05 p.m.

That shows the entire dishonesty of people who come in here. They know that we come in here, year after year, and we manage our own affairs realistically, in the political sense of the term.

As regards our external affairs, we manage them in conjunction with some other Governments. There are nine or ten territories and in some of the external affairs, Barbados pays as much as 50 percent. Along with that, we pay for out own external affairs in Montreal, Canada. We run an independent office for the Tourist and Development Boards in Toronto and we have a similar institution in New York and pay for every single thing; and if the British Government sends a telegram on our behalf, we pay for it.

The British Government never made any decision relating to the external affairs on our behalf. If there is an international convention, the British Government asks us if we want to be associated with it. That is what they call external affairs.

There is one important matter which I think we cannot ignore. If the British Government decided to go to war with France, let us say, we would be involved because we do not make any decision for that and it means that very often the lives of the Barbados citizens can be affected as a result of some foreign power going to war with the Imperial Government. They have this authority because of the history of our association with them.

However, we have a country and Barbados is our country and we want to run our own country. No official, sitting in Whitehall, should have the right because not one of them is better acquainted with our problems than our own officials sitting around our desks. Therefore, you will understand what we are talking about when we have to correspond with them. Up to today, I have been trying to get people to understand what I am talking about when I say what it is to have these highly paid ranking officials sitting down behind the desks. The members of the Opposition according to their statement prefer to have people whom they they do not even know rather than to have our own people. They would not even have some of their own people in their drawing rooms or offices because of their social state; they prefer to have these outside officials managing our external affairs rather than the Government of Barbados.

Let us be a little more personal. There is one hon. member on the other side who has not taken part in this talk that you must have federation and then independence. Of course, being a schoolmaster he has a lot more sense than the others. All the rest sitting down over on the other side have been taking part in public meetings and this confusion, saying that they prefer independence within a federation. One member went so far as to say that we want independence, but we do not want independence under Barrow. That is the kind of nonsense which they have said. I have been independent more than all of them put together, all my life. They are saying: "We prefer to have an Englishman whom we do not know, who has no responsibility to Parliament, dictating the life and death which we of Barbados should live or die rather than to have any of the representatives of the people in Barbados who are responsible not only at election time but from week to week". We are saying that, so complete has been the victory of Colonialism.

I have enumerated the reasons which we have set out in this Resolution why we should seek independence on our own, but I think in fairness to the Chief Minister of St. Lucia, I should say this.

Mr. Compton said: "We have a number of reservations. The most important are Income Tax and Customs Union. We thought that Income Tax should be shared or redistributed not in derivation – well, Customs Union should be distributed not on a derivation basis, but as an equalisation grant used to finance certain services for the islands. So there should be no great disparity in, particularly, the social services in these Islands."

Mr. Compton did not know the difference between import duties and Custom Union. Customs Union is a union of countries with common external tariffs. Although he went to the same University as I, he did not know the difference. The hon. senior member for St. Philip says that Mr. Compton is a great economic expert. A lot of them got on platforms without reading this document at all.

Now, the Federal Government must derive its revenue from the Unit Territories direct taxation which by the Constitution would be vested in that Government or, as in the last Federation, by contributions handed out by the participating Governments.
10.15 p.m.

Mr. Compton said that social services are the individual responsibility of the Unit Governments. A Federal Government must derive its revenue either from direct taxation which, by the Constitution, would be vested in that Government or, as in the last Federation, by contribution, the kind of dole or subsistence meted out to the Central Government, which was undignified. This Government existed on a mandatory levy of $9 million bearing in mind what it would cost to run the Federal Government and what duties they would have to perform. The Federal Government, as we proposed in the Draft Scheme, would have authority vested in it under the Constitution. It would have charge of Customs; they would collect all our money from Customs which would be about $12 million. Under Mrs. Hicks' proposals, we would have to give them 65% When we transfer Customs to them they would have to pay the Customs Officers which would enure a savings in Barbados. Under Mrs. Hicks' proposals 65% would be deducted and 35% revenue would come to us which would be an additional burden of $4.9 million on the people of Barbados. The Financial Secretary together with Dr. O'Loughlin said that it was unfair to anybody who was in the plan. I have Mrs. Hicks' Report here, and not one of them has read it. She and Mr. Compton produced a document trying to shave the expenses down and Mr. Bird's proposals became relevant; he did not want a trial with it because he was in two Federal Governments. He had had his experience. In the light of this experience we proposed to reduce our contribution from more than $13 million to $6.7, that is the Financial Secretary, Dr. O'Loughlin and myself.

Mrs. Hicks was completely unrealistic because she did not realise that $5 million in taxation would start a revolution. People are now saying all sorts of things about Federation. The newspapers did not publish the real material which was released, and the ambitious politicians who came up like mushrooms overnight did not read Dr. Carleen O'Loughlin's Report. When I said that external affairs would cost so much, that was not my projection; that was the revised version of what Mrs. Hicks said. Dr. O'Loughlin made a survey of the Economic protential of Barbados and the rest in 1963 at the request of the British Government. When the British Government saw what Dr. O'Loughlin said, the British Government had to be put under severe pressure by the Governments of Barbados and Antigua before they published the Report. They released all the other Reports, and we had to send them requests for four months in order to get them to release that Report. There was a Capital requirements of $373 million over ten years, with Montserrat never getting out of the grant-in-aid stage. The British Government refused to say whether they accepted or discarded this Report. Up to now they have sent down another Mission and we would go on for another ten years having Missions. I challenge any of the three Secretaries of State for the Colonies, Mr. Maudling, Mr. Duncan Sandys, Mr. Greenwood or the Under Secretary, Mr. Fisher, and I now have a despatch from the present Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Before I sit down I will read a Message to this House from the present Secretary of State for the Colonies. Not one of them with whom I was associated could say that any statement I made is not true. Here is a paper printed by Her Majesty's Stationery Office, in 1963 which the British Government was extremely reluctant to release. It is Cmd. 1991, Report of the Fiscal Commissioner, Mrs. Hicks, of Oxford University. This was done at the request of the British Government; but there was another document revising Mrs. Hicks' document. Mrs. Hicks' suggestion was that Barbados should receive grant-in-aid, but she did not suggest where the rest of the money was to come from for the support of this superstructure. We pay for our external affairs; it is not a question of anybody doing us a favour. We pay for them.
10.25 p.m.

The House approves every year the payments which we make for our external affairs. Is it asking the Legislature too much to let the formalities be observed and the proprieties and the constitutional niceties regulated so that we can run these external affairs ourselves in the same way that Gambia, Malta and all the other smaller territories of the Commonwealth are doing today, and who are not afraid to take their destiny into their own hands?

We have a document which they have not seen, a document prepared at my request by the Head of the Institute of Social and Economic Research on the full cost of overseas representation, and I want to quote from that in reply to the meetings I have been hearing. I have recordings of nearly all of them and reports of others. I do not attend these meetings. I do not even attend meetings of my Party when I am not speaking for several reasons, because as soon as I appear, everybody will take it for granted that I am supposed to speak. If I went to a meeting tonight after standing up for six or seven hours, they would expect me to speak. Has the Hon. Leader of the Opposition seen this document? He should not underestimate people. I am going to enjoin him that when he sees people with a modicum of common sense and experience, he should not underestimate them and think they had a rush of blood to the head.

Now I want to quote the Report of the Fiscal Committee arising out of the Ninth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. Miss Hicks had prepared something prior to this meeting and so we set up a Fiscal Committee of all the Financial Secretaries and Dr. Carleen O'Loughlin, Head of the Institute of Social and Economic Research of the Eastern Caribbean. Did the Hon. member know about that? Not even the Cabinet Ministers knew about this. The Committee comprised of E. S. S. Burrowes, Financial Secretary of Barbados; C. A. Sorhaindo, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Dominica; N. E. Watty, Establishments Officer, Dominica; A. Haley Esq., O.B.E. Financial Secretary, St. Kitts; N. E. Venner, Esq., Financial Secretary, St. Lucia; C. A. Jacobs, Esq., Financial Secretary, St. Vincent. There is a document which Dr. O'Loughlin prepared along with the Financial Secretary of Barbados and myself. I would not like to say that I did any of the actual writing, but I held several conferences and meetings to see if we could make this thing realistic. If I am a person accused of being anti-federationist, I want my head examined. On page 2 of the additional cost of Overseas Commissions is $271,302.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do you think that all these Financial Secretaries pulled that figure out of the air? As to the young and not so young humbugs that we have had befouling the night air who would like to make people believe that they have seen this document, ask which one has seen it. I was entrusted with the responsibility of this portfolio, and my Ministers, the ones who are not over-ambitious, are satisfied with the way I discharge my duties under that portfolio, as the Estimates disclose from year to year. I do not have to look over their shoulders, and they do not have to

look over mine. I prepare the Estimates every year of some $47 million; so what is a budget of $6 million to prepare?

In the first year that I was in office, we were saddled with a commitment of back-pay for the Civil Service and a recurring expenditure of $2.6 million plus a deficit of $1.26 million, and in nine months I made predictions and came out $17,000 to the good after imposing certain taxation measures on non-essentials such as beer, cigarettes and rum. What happened in this country in those days? There was a public hue and cry and outcry initiated by the members on the opposite side that the Government had just got in and was taxing the poor people's rum. I can remember the hon. junior member for St. Joseph practically rolling on the floor in pain and touching his belly because four cents was put on rum to pay the policemen and Civil Servants so that they could put shoes on the feet of their children and send them to school.

This Report was written by all the Financial Secretaries in the area plus Dr. Loughlin who knows more about the economy of the West Indies than anyone else, and the Financial Secretary of Barbados who is in a position to challenge all the Financial Secretaries and the Minister of Finance in Barbados. But a lot of dishonest people tried to give the impression that they knew something about it. Where did they learn to begin to understand the intricacies of public finance? I do not like to say these things because I am a modest person, but I am an angry man tonight, because there are certain people who are trying to sell my country. We went into every single item including uniforms for chauffers at the different Embassies. I have to send the money to London to pay for the office there; so I should know how much it costs. In addition, the High Commissioners of Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica keep me up to date on the estimate of what it is costing them for overseas representation. Some members say we must not have independence because it costs too much money. They did not see the document, and they should proceed with caution and not exercise themselves in matters which are too high for them because it will prove them dishonest, and I do not expect a person by virtue of his being a member of the Legislature to be an expert on financial matters or anything else. All they have to do is to ask a Government Minister a question, and not assume he is wrong and get up and abuse him.

Mr. Speaker, I will give the facts and figures, chapter and verse. On page 2 the additional cost of overseas Commissions is $271,302. On page 3, Table E.3 — Common Services Overseas Commission, present cost $228,698. If you add those two figures together, you get $500,000. In paragraph 111 Dr. Carleen O'Loughlin in her suggestions for a fiscal structure for the proposed Eastern Caribbean Federation estimated the net cost of the federation to Barbados at $1,521,000, and in paragraph 112 the cost of overseas commissions for the proposed federation was $500,000. I want to say that overseas representation for Barbados is going to cost from year to year what I want it to cost, and what I consider necessary for the people of Barbados to be properly represented. It may cost us $200,000 or it may cost us $2 million; I am not telling you what it is going to cost five years from now, but everything has to be done within the limitation of our financial resources; that is, you cut your coat to suit the cloth. She said in paragraph 113 that, assuming overseas representation for Barbados alone to be on the same scale as for an independent federation, the cost of federation to Barbados would be $1,021,000 more than the cost of an independent Barbados. This is a statement of fact from experts appointed by the British Government to revise the figures prepared by all the Financial Secretaries. This document has not been released. In what position are these dishonest persuaders on the other side to get up and pontificate on financial matters they do not understand? The same people who ranted and raved when I was trying to find money for the debt inherited from the last Government, are telling the people that Mr. K. R. Hunte exports $3 million to the other islands and not to mind that they had to pay $4 million in taxes. The lard oil lobby, the people who want federation for Barbados at Roberts Manufacturing Company, are telling the people not to mind they have to find $4 million.

10.35 p.m.

The Chief Minister of St. Lucia has been insisting, so is the Chief Minister of Dominica. They say that Barbados has too many schools and too many roads; so, we would now have to mark time. Therefore, largely, the Federal Government proposes to collect its revenue from import duties. As soon as they control the Customs Departments they will require $6.7 million for the Federal expenses and therefore they should have handed back 65% of these duties to the Government on a derivation basis. That means if they take $10 million from us, they will keep $3.5 million and give us $6.5 million. Since they would also relieve us of some of the expenses, the net cost would be $1.5 million. They would be controlling the Government of Barbados from the top to the bottom. People with less experience of democratic parliament are inveigling and trying to lead us down the Gadarene slopes to disaster. I told you that I broke out in cold sweat one morning this week. I have no compunction in admitting it. Some people cannot even face the light of the sun. They also have to disguise their motives behind dark vision.

Mr. Speaker, you will then appreciate why members of this Government have every reason to be angry, but we are trying not to be over-disturbed. This should be a cheerful occasion; the passing of this Resolution should be a formality; but the record has to be put straight. This document was printed in 1965 and may be made available for scrutiny to hon. members but not to be taken away. It is still classified "In confidence"; yet they can get up on platforms and disclose certain matters. Either somebody should have been put in gaol or they were pontificating on something which they knew nothing about.

I want in fairness to the Chief Minister of St. Lucia to read some correspondence which passed between me and him. This is a letter dated 14th October, 1965, which he wrote to me:-

"My dear Premier,

The newspapers of October 13, 1965 have carried the text of a resolution purported to be tabled in the House of Assembly of Barbados by you on October 12, 1965, dealing with the reasons for the decision of the Government of Barbados to withdraw from further discussions on the formation of a Federation of the Eastern Caribbean and to seek independence alone.

The text available to us gives, *inter alia*, the following reasons for the decision of the Government of Barbados referred to above:-

> "the rejection of the Draft Federal Scheme by the Government and Legislature of St. Lucia before the 10th meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers"

This statement is incorrect and, since this resolution will inevitably become an historical document. I venture to presume that you will insist on the highest degree of accuracy of the facts therein contained. I therefore hastened to give you the facts:-

> On the 19th March, 1965 the Legislature of St. Lucia debated a resolution offering "thanks to His Honour the Administrator for his most gracious speech delivered to this Honourable House on the 17th December, 1964".

This speech contained the following reference to Federation:-

> "An analysis of the international trends in both the economic and political spheres has given to my Government proof that small territories such as ours cannot stand alone; that the demands of our people for a better and fuller life cannot be met within the limits of our own resources and that political independence cannot meaningfully be achieved within the confines of our limited landmass and small population.
>
> My Government has consequently entered into discussions with other non-self-governing territories of the Windward Islands and Leeward Islands and Barbados in order that satisfactory basis for a viable

Federation may be achieved. My Government will, however, hesitate to enter into any union unless such union is armed with adequate powers of economic planning, regional development and taxation, and is capable of bringing to the people of this Island a measure of economic advantage without which political association is meaningless."

In the course of the debate, several members were critical of the Draft Federal Scheme but since no resolution was before the Legislature of St. Lucia, and since the resolution "giving thanks" was passed without division, it could not be said that criticism of the Scheme constituted rejection of "the Draft Federal Scheme by the Government and Legislature of St. Lucia...."

I assume that you came to the conclusion set out in the text of your Independence Resolution from newspaper reports of the St. Lucia debate, and as you well know these reports are not always as accurate as one desires.

I therefore hope that you will proceed to set the record straight by making an appropriate amendment to the preamble to your resolution as it is important that not only that the Legislature and people of Barbados make their decision on this vital issue with full knowledge of all the facts, but that future generations be not misled by inaccuracies contained in an historical document.

With continued esteem for the Government and people of Barbados,

I remain,
Yours sincerely,

JOHN COMPTON;
Chief Minister.

The Honourable Errol Barrow
Premier
Bridgetown, Barbados.

In reply to that, in a despatch by me on the 27th October, I stated as follows:-

My dear Chief Minister,

You have suggested in your letter of October 14th that the text of our Independence Resolution is inaccurate in setting out in the preamble that the Government and Legislature of St. Lucia had rejected the Draft Federal Scheme before the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers.

The official reports of the legislature debates of St. Lucia are unfortunately not made available to this Government so that I have had to rely on the reports appearing in the Voice of St. Lucia for the period March/April, 1965. I have since read no refutation of the statements or actions attributed to responsible members of the Government including your good self.

Until I receive some positive evidence that a copy of the Draft Federal Scheme was not destroyed and thrown aside by a member of the Government of St. Lucia, or some proof that the reports contained in the Voice of St. Lucia are indeed inaccurate, I regret that I cannot advise either the Cabinet or Legislature of this Island that the preamble of our Independence Resolution should be amended as you have requested.

I shall be grateful if copies of your Hansard from March this year could be made available to my office. I shall be only too willing to despatch regularly to your Government copies of our Legislative debates.

Please accept, Mr. Chief Minister, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(ERROL W. BARROW)
Premier.

The Honourable John Compton,
Chief Minister,
ST. LUCIA.
10.45 p.m.

On the 20th November, 1965, this is what Mr. Compton wrote:

Government Buildings,
St. Lucia,
The West Indies.
20th November, 1965.

My Dear Premier,

Your Independence Resolution

You suggest in your letter of October 27, 1965, that you prefer to place credence on newspaper reports than on the statement made to you by the Head of a Government. This is a regrettable departure from the norms accepted by the society of nations and more so when it emanates from the Head of a Government whose declared intention is to enter such society. One only hopes that the accepted standard of behaviour will be acquired prior to your Government's entry into full nationhood.

Should you, despite the assurance contained in my letter of October 14, refuse to amend the offensive part of the preamble to your Independence Resolution, then the preamble becomes not merely inaccurate, but false. It will be regrettable therefore if you should choose to lead Barbados into Independence using as pretext premises which are deliberately misleading.

Please accept, Mr. Premier, renewed assurances of my highest regard and esteem.

Yours faithfully,
John Compton.
Chief Minister.

The Premier,
Government Headquarters,
Barbados.

One of the Ministers of my Government had paid hurried visits to St. Lucia. Now this is a letter from me to the Chief Minister of St. Lucia on the 24th November, 1965:-

24th November, 1965.

My Dear Chief Minister,

I regret that you have chosen to misrepresent the contents of my letter of October the 7th in your communication dated 20th November, 1965.

2. The only legitimate inference to be drawn from paragraph 3 of my letter is that upon receipt of the official report of the proceedings I am fully prepared to amend our Resolution if these Reports disclose that the draft Federal Scheme was accepted by the Government and Legislature of your territory.

3. I hasten to reassure you that I accept your statements on the Administrator's speech and the criticisms levelled against the draft Federal Scheme, the only point of difference appears to be whether the paragraphs quoted

from the speech coupled with the criticisms and the tearing up of a copy of the Scheme by a Government Minister amount to objection or not.

4. Please accept again the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(ERROL W. BARROW)
Premier.

The Honourable John Compton,
Chief Minister,
St. LUCIA.

There is no reply and there is no copy of the debate. Hon. members may see Reports of the Debate in the "Voice of St. Lucia".

I will now read from the Resolution. I have read the correspondence between the Chief Minister of St. Lucia and myself, and hon. members can judge it for themselves. Mr. Bousquet tore up the copy of the draft Federal Scheme and the Government and the Legislature of St. Lucia had rejected the Draft Federal Scheme. After this exhibition in the Legislature of St. Lucia, Mr. Compton rose to his feet at the 10th meeting of the Regional Council and said to the Chairman: "Mr. Chairman, may we have a copy of the Draft Federal Scheme because you remember that ours was destroyed in the Legislature by hand and not by fire."

I now proceed with the Resolution with no amendment after the rejection of the Draft Federal Scheme by the Government and Legislature and Chief Minister of St. Lucia:-

AND WHEREAS these matters have been fully set out in the White Paper which was laid before this Honourable House by order of the Cabinet on 17th August, 1965;

AND WHEREAS the Eastern Caribbean Federation contemplated by the Report of the London Conference 1962 is not immediately possible in the changed circumstances;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Barbados, reaffirming its dedication to the principle of Regional Association, will continue after Independence to work in close co-operation with the Governments and Peoples of other Commonwealth Caribbean Countries to promote by joint endeavour the complete political social and economic emancipation of all classes in all territories:

If I may pause here very briefly; compare that with the attitude of the Premier of Jamaica and the attitude of both Parties in Jamaica. There is no attitude of this Government that they are prepared to go into Federation with us. All we have said is that three and one half years have elapsed since these negotiations have been going on and they have proved to be fruitless. I was not elected here by K. R. Hunte and I do not think we should be importing copra under an agreement devised purely for a small group of people As I have said, this is the lard-oil lobby on the other side; this is the kind of economic weapon which they are using. One of them told me in front of fifteen people that he did not intend to reduce the cost of feedstuffs. That is how they want this Government to be run — by bribery and corruption from outside. They do not want a Government which can stick to its convictions. The British Government gives a subsidy on behalf of the Leeward and Windward Islands, to run the Commission in London. We have had a loss of revenue in loan repayments and have had to withdraw the Migrant Service. Mr. Speaker, how can we work with people who are out to pull the island of Barbados down to their standards?

The Resolution continues as follows:-

AND WHEREAS the present Constitution of Barbados makes no provision for the management, by its citizens, or their external relations;

AND WHEREAS the General Assembly of the United Nations, in its resolution of December, 14th, 1960, proclaimed the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations; and adopted a Declaration

(a) That the subjection of peoples to alien domination constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights;

(b) that such is contrary to the charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation;

(c) that inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence;

10.55 p.m.

"(d) that all armed action or repressive measures directed against dependent peoples should cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence;

(e) that their national territory should be respected;

(f) that in trust and non-self governing territories or other territories which have not yet attained independence, immediate steps should be taken to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories without any distinctions as to race, creed or colour;

AND WHEREAS paragraph 124 of the White Paper states:

"The House of Assembly will be asked to agree to a Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to fix an early date for a Conference on Independence; and if agreed to, the Senate will be invited to concur therein;"

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House request 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.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate be invited to concur herein."

Mr. Speaker, I made a promise and I intend to fulfil that promise. Let me first read the telegram from Mr. Anthony Greenwood in fairness to him. It is Circular No. 33, and reads as follows:-

"I am glad to have had the privilege and opportunity over the last fourteen months of contributing as Secretary of State to the continuing process of the political, social and economic development in these territories from which Britain still has responsibilities. I have been fortunate in being able to visit a number of territories and to study both progress and problems on the spot. I have enjoyed and learned much from many meetings with representatives from overseas conferences. During the year, the affairs of territories as diverse as South Arabia and British Guiana have been matters of deep personal concern to me but my abiding interest has been to work patiently for a future for each and every territory, whatever its circumstances — a future which would satisfy the aspirations of the peoples concerned and would enable them to live in freedom and in harmony in whatever relationship they chose to have with us in Britain.

I am now going to take charge of the Ministry of Overseas Development where I shall of course continue to have in the future a deep and practical interest in the dependent territories.

I am deeply grateful to all my friends and colleagues in the Colonial Office and in the territories overseas for all their support to me in what has been a most exciting, arduous and worthwhile task."

I will also read Circular No. 34 from the New Secretary of State, the Marquis of Longford to whom I referred before. The occasion of our first meeting was not a very happy one for him, because he fell out of an aircraft in which I took him into Berlin. He jumped out before the landing steps were lowered. This is only an aside; but we have remained good friends, and I am glad that Barbados is making this great step under his leadership. Do not let anybody on the other side think that I am ging to use his friendship; I am going to rely on constitutional proprieties, and there is no Secretary of State who can tell the Government of Barbados or the Legislature how they should proceed to Independence. However, let me read this letter:-

"On assuming office today as Secretary of State for the Colonies, I should like to say how much I am looking forward to playing my part in the manifold tasks which lie before us in the 32 dependent territories. Much has been achieved; much remains to be done. It will continue to be our aim to lead to Independence those territories which want it and can sustain it. But whatever the final goal, be it Independence or some kind of voluntary continuing association with Britain, we must continue to work out the future for the territories in consultation with the governments and peoples concerned. I hope to be able to make as many personal contacts as opportunity permits.

As the new Secretary of State, I send to you my personal greetings and good wishes for 1966."

Some people have achieved independence, some were born independent, and some are having independence thrust upon them. It is not often that I make allusions to the history of the Hebrew peoples who are now settled in their own country -- two and a half million of them in a land that was a desert which Mr. Ernest Bevin, a socialist Foreign Minister said in 1946 could not sustain more than 300,000 or 400,000 people, and therefore he could not allow the Israelites to return to their own land. It was not the first time in their own history that they had this kind of tribulation. This was also true at the time of the Prophet Isaiah, the Prophet of national liberation when they were marching to Babylonia, and to those doubtful Thomases, those who are faltering by the wayside, I can honestly quote the Prophet of national liberation and apply it *mutatis mutandis* to the situation which we are trying to obtain today.

"In righteousness shalt thou be established; thou shalt be far from oppression; for thou shalt not fear: and from terror; for it shall not come near thee."

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. *(Cheers.)*

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. junior member for St. Michael seek to reserve his right to speak?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 11 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, 5th January, 1966. I do this, Mr. Speaker, because as I told the House, we are suspending at 6.30 p.m. tomorrow evening; so I do not think hon. members would mind having to come earlier.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would suggest to the Hon. Leader of the House that he makes it later than that.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I therefore beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 12 o'clock noon.

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.

11.10 p.m.

Hon. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present and I ask that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for drawing that to my attention. Let the Bell be rung.

RESOLUTION RE SOVEREIGN NATIONHOOD WITHIN THE COMMONWEALTH BY THE PEOPLE OF BARBADOS

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended yesterday, the hon. junior member for St. Michael seconded the motion for the passing of this Resolution and he had reserved his right to speak; but before the hon. member rises to speak, it he so desires, I would like to inform hon. members that I have received a letter from Government House which reads as follows:-

LETTER FROM THE GOVERNOR RE ABSENCE FROM THE ISLAND

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
BARBADOS.

December, 1965.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that I propose to leave the Island on or about the 2nd January, 1966, and shall be absent for a short period of approximately 8 days.

2. During my absence from the Island, Senator Sir Grey Massiah C.B.E., President of the Senate, will be appointed Governor's Deputy.

3. As I understand that the House of Assembly will not be meeting prior to my departure, it will not be possible to send the usual Message to the House informing them of my proposed absence from the Island. You may however wish to inform members accordingly.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient, humble servant,
JOHN STOW
Governor.

His Honour
J. E. T. Brancker, Q.C., M.P.,
Speaker of the House of Assembly,
PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

I regret to say that this letter was not read to the Honourable House yesterday. Unfortunately, through some inadvertence, it was not placed on my file.

APOLOGY FROM "DAILY NEWS" NEWSPAPER

Mr. SPEAKER: I should also like to inform the House that in respect of certain comments which I made yesterday apropos of the article which had appeared in yesterday's date of the "Daily News", there has been published on the front page of that newspaper this morning under the caption "Apology" what I regard as a full and ample apology. I accept it as such and I regard now that matter as being closed.

CORRECTION OF RESOLUTION AS TABLED BY MR. SMITH

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the Honourable House that when I tabled that Resolution yesterday, I omitted to mention that I was doing so on behalf of my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for drawing that to my attention. If there is no objection, I will have the name on the Resolution changed on the Order Paper to the name of the hon. junior member for St. George. (After a pause.) There is no objection, and that correction will be made.

RESOLUTION RE SOVEREIGN NATIONHOOD FOR BARBADOS

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will (not) proceed to the resumption of the debate on the 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."

(After a Pause). The question is .....

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on behalf of the Leader of the Official Opposition; for some reason or other, he is not in his place. We want to make it abundantly clear that we, on this side of the House, have nothing whatsoever against Independence. *(Cheers)* What we ask .....

Mr. COWARD: On a point of order. I think that the hon. member would be more correct if he said "some of us on this side of the House", but he said "we on this side of the House".

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the hon. member meant the members of his Party.

Mr. SEALEY: I think I said most of us on this side of the House *(Laughter from the Gallery.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let it be made clear that visitors are here on sufferance, and that this room can and will be cleared if there is any interruption whatsoever.

Mr. SEALEY: What we are saying, Sir, is that we would rather have independence within a Federation for many reasons. For many of us in this island for the first time yesterday we heard about this whole matter from the Hon. senior member for St. John. Many of us would like to know the facts about Independence. I have heard my colleague, the hon. senior member for the City, make it abundantly clear that he is not here merely for the sake of offering opposition; as long as he feels that any motion which is brought before this Honourable House is for the good and welfare of the people of this island, it was his intention to support it regardless of who brought it forward. Now, Sir, simply because we did not allow Independence to be forced down our throats immediately, we were called by all kinds of names. For three and a half years the present Government was running the affairs of the Island of Barbados. They fought for Federation and we were told that this Federation would be placed on a mandatory levy and that this Federation would not be allowed to go down like the former Federation. The hon. senior member for St. John feels that he is a Federation genius, and he was so sure that this Federation would be lasting that he boasted that what the former Government failed to do during their regime, he would have done in less than three years. My contention is that if the Hon. Premier of this Island did not know that Independence was the logical thing for the island of Barbados, why did he waste three and one half years before attaining it? 12.10 p.m.

Three and a half years of negotiations were spent behind closed doors at Sherbourne House and we knew absolutely nothing of what was going on; but after the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers we were told that there were quarrels and rows and people walked out of the Conference room. Consequently Independence is being rammed down our throats without letting us know what are the technical points, what it would cost us alone and what it would cost within a Federation.

I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that if we go independent alone, this would be an added responsibility to the people of this island. If the Hon. Premier fought for three years and lost, it is nothing strange to him. I can remember that the Hon. Premier ran in a bye-election in St. John and he won. Why did he not say he was finished with politics when he lost the first bye-election? Today he is Premier of Barbados, and we do not have in our hearts that he should be removed from office, neither do we have in our hearts that the Federation has been unduly delayed; but what we want to know is how much money it is going to cost Barbados. If we go into Independence alone, where are we going to get the excess money from with the amount of people we have in this island? There are many unemployed people in this island, and my feeling is that we should move immediately to remove hunger and starvation and eliminate our unemployment situation. To go independent alone, in my opinion, is to add further responsibility to the poor fathers and mothers of this island.

If you want to know the condition of many of the people in this island you should just throw yourself in the villages. Taxation is high and is going higher every year, and I have been told that it is higher than in any other part of the world.

I heard the hon. Premier mention yesterday that they have ten embassies in various countries, even Cuba. I hope this well be taken as an example by the policemen and Civil Servants of this island who are underpaid. I did not know that we had so much surplus money in the island that we could afford to have embassies.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not want to interrupt the hon. member, and I hope I do not have to do it again, but I think what he has just said is misrepresenting the Hon. Premier. The hon. member has said that the Premier said yesterday that we have ten embassies spread out around the world, and he mentioned the Premier as having said that one was in Cuba. That is of course not true. What the Hon. Premier said, and this was in respect of external relations, is that we pay the British Government money for doing things for us in Panama, Cuba and in other places.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not take a note of what he said, but I remember he mentioned Cuba; so if we can afford to have an embassy in Cuba, we can afford to raise salaries here. Barbados is a one crop economy.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, nowhere was it stated yesterday by the Hon. Premier that we have embassies anywhere. We do not have any embassies. The Premier said that for the purpose of relieving distressed Barbadians, we do have to remit money to the United Kingdom Government who spends it on our behalf.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, that means therefore that you have a Commissioner in the various countries throughout the world to whom money is sent from Barbados. I received a letter from St. Lucia only this morning in which we have been warned that the tension between Barbadians and St. Lucians is very high due to the political situation in Barbados. We know that Independence will come some day, but we are still saying that you should have another try at Federation.

I heard the Premier of British Guiana at a political meeting say that Barbados has 300,000 people. He has given us 50,000 more than we actually have. He also said that Antigua has 60,000 people and that British Guiana has 660,000 people, which together make a total of one million people, and that we could go forward as a nation. That is all we are asking the Government to do today. In Barbados, a country of 166 square miles and with a population of 250,000 people, there are 26,000 unemployed; so where are we going to get the money from?
12.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the information if it were not possible to do anything more. We are not saying that the Hon. Premier has not tried his best. It appears to me that in some cases he had more patience than Job. On page 20, paragraph 28, of the White Paper, it is stated:-

"From this statement it will be seen that, far from a crystalisation of proposals for positive assistance to the Eastern Caribbean, the attitude of the British is becoming vaguer and more nebulous as the time goes on. Indeed when the Premier of Barbados enquired from the Secretary of State in December, 1963, how soon a positive statement could be expected on the quantum of financial assistance that would be forthcoming, so that the taxpayers of Barbados could assess more accurately what they were letting themselves in for, the Secretary of State's reply was that the British Government was not "buying a Federation", and that the islands should want a Federation for a Federation's sake."

It goes on:

"The Premier's reply was that the people of Barbados had no Federation to sell, and were not looking for colonies, but partners."

What does that mean? The British Government for many years has been depending on these small islands and they in turn gave us the joys which we have. Fortunately today, we have got leaders to look out for our economic development; so it means that we are quite aware of that, and therefore, we are quite able to look after ourselves. We are governing ourselves internally; so we have nothing to look forward to from joining a Federation. The White Paper would show you that.

The British Government has been giving grants-in-aid to many of the other territories for many years and are willing to get rid of them. We have seen that; therefore, I can see where the other territories are willing to join in some Federation; otherwise, some would be left knocking at the door.

The White Paper goes on to say:-

The Ninth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers was held in Barbados in October, 1964 where the Draft Federal Scheme was discussed. The newly elected Government of St. Lucia attended the Regional Council of Ministers for the first time. The Scheme was accepted with reservations by the Government of Antigua on Income Tax, Agriculture, Police and Postal Services; by the Government of St. Kitts on Customs Union; by the Government of St. Vincent on Police; and by the Governments of Dominica and St. Lucia on the utilisation of Federal Revenues."

Mr. Compton wanted over 90 percent of the money collected to be spent on the lesser islands.

If you go a little further, on page 25, paragraph 40, you will see that "the Premier of Barbados submitted to the meeting the decision of the Barbados Cabinet of 24th April, 1965, and further informed the Conference that, in view of the withdrawal of Antigua from the Federal exercise, and the uncertainty of the Governments of St. Lucia and Montserrat as regards the form of association required, whether unitary or federal, he felt that publicity ought to be given to the new situation that had arisen, and that after consultation with the political parties and discussion in the Legislature, the Government of Barbados would be in a position to make their views known and at such time they might be willing to resume discussions."

From that time, April 1965, that these discussions were going on, we were puzzling about the outcome.

It goes on to say that "after one of the St. Lucia delegates had challenged the *bona fides* of the Barbados Cabinet's decision in rather offensive terms, the Premier of Barbados felt himself constrained to withdraw from the meeting which was adjourned to the following day."

That was the time we heard that they were fighting.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier did not worry to go on any further with the discussions. My point is, why waste three and a half years in the Federal exercise? Why did he not claim independence before for Barbados? We understand that as a result of this decision, the Democratic Labour Party was split right down the centre, its left, its right and behind.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment:-

To omit all the words after "convene" and to substitute the following words therefore:

"After the holding of elections in Barbados to decide whether Barbados shall proceed to independence, within a Federation comprised of such territories in the Eastern Caribbean as are willing to join in such an association, or alone, a conference representative of all political parties to arrange for the implementation of the decision taken and for the constitutional, financial, defence and other measures for the establishment of an independent nation at the earliest possible time.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the main motion, that is the motion moved by the Hon. Premier and seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like you to state the procedure at this stage. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has just said that he is speaking on the main motion. By that, I would like Your Honour to give a ruling as regards what there is in contradistinction from the main motion before this House and what choice one has to determine which motion one has to speak on.
12.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is speaking on the Motion, and there is only one motion before the House. There can be no doubt that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is speaking on that motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member who is speaking on the motion which is the substantive motion, would like to escape the Standing Orders of the House so that when the other motion is seconded, he can rise for a second time and make a speech on the amendment. That is the only reason why any hon. member could inform you that he is speaking on the main motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: If and when the occasion arises, I will rule on that. At the moment I am not so disposed to rule.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the main motion which is before the House and that is the motion, which has been made by the Hon. Premier. The amendment has not yet been seconded. Mr. Speaker, before any of the remarks which I may make today be misrepresented in the Press or on the air, I think I should make it clear that neither I, as Leader of the Opposition, and Leader and Chairman of this Party, no members of my Party have at any time, publicly or otherwise, mentioned that we were

opposed to Independence for Barbados as such. I want to make that abundantly clear. Today we still take that same stand. However, Sir, it does seem as though, if you differ with anybody in the method of approach to some things, the Leader of the Government seems to brook no opposition or difference of opinion, not even on the approach to such matters.

I shall begin to deal with the laying of the White Paper. After the White Paper was laid in this House, my Party held a general meeting to discuss the matter and we arrived at the decision that while we supported Independence for Barbados, we would certainly have preferred that we attained that Independence together with other territories, which would be of greater economic advantage to Barbados. That matter having been discussed and the decision arrived at, my Party kept its first public meeting in order to put the matter before the general public. At no time did any speaker either in public, private or otherwise intimate that he was opposed to Independence for Barbados. I remember distinctly saying that only a lunatic at large would oppose Independence for Barbados. As Barbadians who were watching and studying world trends and events, we could not offer any opposition to Independence for Barbados, but we differed in the approach to the matter, and we feel definitely that for economic reasons and for the future development of the territories in the Caribbean area, it would be much better for the territories of the Eastern Caribbean to come together and there could be an Independent West Indies. The Hon. Premier has said that had he heard what I told him, he would not have to be in that position yesterday defending Barbados. He further said that he awoke one morning and telephoned the Minister of Education and said that he felt that something was being put on Barbados. The first time I had the opportunity of joining the exercise of a Federation was in 1962. I studied the Minister's actions very carefully and I remembered saying to the Hon. Premier that I thought it would be a difficult job because I had seen behind his back and behind the back of the then Minister of Trade, the hon. senior member for St. Philip — I had seen the action of certain Ministers and I felt that they were not really sincere.

After the illness of the Premier, personalities seemed to have dominated the Conference from the point of view of the West Indies; when he was taken ill there was a scramble and there was the idea that no other person from Barbados was to preside at Committee Meetings. I analysed that this was a personality and not Barbados as such. I discussed with the Premier the pros and cons of this matter.
12.40 p.m.

You will recall the stand I took when we came to this House to discuss the White Paper which was issued as a Report of the East Caribbean Conference, 1962. Lest it should have been said at the time that I was not in favour of or that I would have done anything to prevent the coming together of the Caribbean Islands in a closer association for economic and political reasons, I said as a politician of some experience and a fairly good judge of human nature that it seemed difficult to me after discussing the pros and cons of the then defunct Federation, and that what we should have would be certain amendments to this Report. You will recall, Sir, that I made certain amendments in here relative to the norm which should be given for representation.

Hon. members will recall Mr. Speaker, that I made a straightforward and honest suggestion which a tremendous lot of people criticised, because they said it would be rather unique and could not work, but I thought that it was in the interest of getting a closer association. My suggestion was to give the right to a Minister or Ministers to serve not only in the unit Legislature, but also in the Federal Legislature. From listening to what was said by the Ministers at Marlborough House, it was felt that after Sir Grantley Adams left Barbados, he had lost the grip and contact with the people, but it seemed as though in the absence of that a Second Eleven team would have been sent. We all remember that Jamaica and Trinidad sent Second Eleven teams to the last Federation. I said then that I saw nothing wrong with this, provided in an impoverished area such as the West Indies these gentlemen were only allowed to draw one salary. Being separated by so much water, I said that this Federation would have been unique in having this type of representation. I say that to show that despite the fact that I saw these difficulties, I was a person always in favour of doing something which would bring the islands together.

In the speech which I made in this respect, I made it quite clear that I supported Federation, but only on the grounds that Barbados would not suffer and also that the British Government was prepared to give us the necessary help for those islands which we had to take into closer association. My party took the stand that it did not like going blindly into a Federation. You will remember, Sir, that I criticised the first Economist, Miss Hicks, who after flying over Dominica, St. Kitts and these other islands gave out to the world in less than three days that in her opinion these islands could be economically viable. I did not accept it, but I felt that the British Government would have to come to the rescue of these islands, and I drew to the attention of members that none other than Sir Winston Churchill had mentioned that there was a time when these islands supported Great Britain, and therefore she would in turn be giving us the riches which she had taken from us for which the planters of this country had incurred so much curse and blame. They could have paid better prices for our sugar, but they took it at whatever price they liked, and the plantations in this country went into bankruptcy, Chancery and the like.

I made that speech, Mr. Speaker, fully conscious of the school places we needed, fully conscious of the network of roads which was necessary in this country and fully conscious of the number of social reforms, and I could not therefore agree for a moment that we could federate unless there was that financial aid which should be known in advance, and not wait, as people had said, for consideration afterwards. I feel that we should have had some guarantee even if we did not know the amount.

Now, Sir, this exercise over the past four months has caused me to realise a very important thing, though late in my life. The members of this Chamber and the general public will recall that after my Party made its decision, which was a democratic decision, there were the pros and cons to be taken into consideration. May I at this stage say that at no time were we considering any tallow or butter or any Kenneth Hunte!
12.50 p.m.

For your information and the information of the House and the gerneral public, Mr. Kenneth Hunte is not a member of the Council of my Party, and for the information of the hon. member and members of the general public, Mr. Kenneth Hunte is not a commercial element of my Party; so this tallow, butter and grease talk, these whole gutterhole talks about tallow grease, butter and lardoil has absolutely nothing to do with us.

Mr. Speaker, I went to the general public — and you will recall all that — and I put the case, along with members of my Party, as the case should have been put in a democratic and reasonable community where two sides must be heard by the general public. The next thing I knew, Mr. Speaker, is that the ruling Party held a meeting and there was a unique attack on me. How often has it been said by the general public that I was not carrying out my duties? This is where we were going into matters we knew were of benefit to the people of this country; therefore, why come in here and make yourself objectionable just to oppose for opposing's sake? I challenge any man in this country or any member in this House to get up and say today that I have on any occasion opposed any measure which was for the social good of the people of this Island.

This is one measure which I opposed. In my twenty years in this House I challenge any member to say, regardless of what the affiliation of his Party may be, that I have ever opposed any measure that was brought down for the social progress of the people of this island. I came into

this House twenty years ago — and that is a long time — and you found out that your best was that you must convince those who had the power at that time that others who were fighting the cause of the masses were fighting a right and just cause; therefore, if I have done nothing else, I have the sense in approaching the Cabinet, I look back and see that no one can point a finger at me and say that I have done nothing for the masses of this country.

What I have been taught in this whole Independence exercise that has been carried on is that your friendship can be bandied about so much, Mr. Speaker, sometimes I say things; sometimes I kept my mouth shut because I was unwilling to create unnecessary noise. I am not a party to those people who would have everybody to believe that nobody else in this country has done anything for this country but one man. If you take the Hon. Premier's speeches from 1939 until the present day, you will see that he himself pointed out that during all the various stages of the constitutional development in Barbados we often found people to create an atmosphere of goodwill; we were not prepared to bow, and we were prepared not to be marionettes. You found that in the other territories, Mr. Adams, now Sir Grantley Adams was looked at as a guide and as the Hon. Premier rightly said, he brought them up-to-date; but if you were to listen now to him, you would come to the conclusion — unless you can't think for yourself — that no one else has ever done anything for Barbados but he.

There is a difference of opinion about Sir Conrad Reeves and Sir Grantley Adams; but after all, I know that I have a conscience, I have listened to others and there are always two sides of politics and to say that because a man has made some mistakes that he has done nothing is absolutely rank, stark dishonesty.

Mr. Speaker, who fought the Colonial Office in the old days? As a matter of fact, what the Hon. Premier said was to the effect that he has had to do all this fight. I want to say here and now that the only election that I had not been participating directly in was the election in St. John. I will say this now. Never in my mind have I lost, as long as I have been in this House, the meaning of the word "friendship" with a man who knows that my ideology was different from his; but I was on such good terms with him that I never thought he would have attempted to go in public and draw into our friendship even the closest and dearest person to him and accuse me of the most dishonest thing. When a man does that his head wants examining. What is wrong with him more than his head wants examining? As I have said, the only election that I did not participate in was the one in St. John.
1 p.m.

I was opposed to the Government then. I was asking people to return him because I thought he was a man who had something to offer to this country. I asked people to support him. But today he sees fit not only to criticise my politics but to make innuendoes as to my honesty. I refer to people who walk about masquerading under the pretence of honest men; you keep your hands in your pockets and watch them.

The Honourable Leader of the House said that he should have moved this Resolution and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should have seconded it. There is nothing which I would have liked to do more than that. The hon. member says that he would have liked to discuss the matter with me. I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, but it was only yesterday when he made such references, I repeat: I would have liked to be in a position to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution, but the hon. member suggests that I engage myself in matters which are too high for me. The hon. member has suggested that we went on platforms in this island and accused him of breaking up the Federation. The Federation came to an end after what happened at the meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers and it is only yesterday that the Hon. Premier denied those accusations. If the hon. member really wanted the Opposition to second a Resolution of this sort, well, the hon. member said that these Conferences were not to be attended by members of the Opposition. It was fitting for him to quote Sir Arthur Lewis then, but I wonder how he would like it when we quote Sir Arthur Lewis.

Sir Arthur Lewis said that it would be dangerous to carry members of the Opposition to these Conferences. Sir, I bow to Sir Arthur Lewis on any matter. I say again that there is nothing that I would like better than being able to get up in this House and say: "I beg to second this motion for Independence." All sorts of meetings have been kept in this island and the hon. member accuses me of all people and says that I exercise myself in things which are too high for me. It suits the hon. member at times to quote from Holy Writ and to make reference to it: but when he thinks of dealing with people on other occasions — well, I will not say that. There is nothing I would like to do better than to have been able to second the motion for the passing of this Resolution in relation to this very important matter for the island of Barbados, but the opportunity was not given either to me or to any other member of the Opposition. I have been accused that I went all over this island speaking about this matter, but the general public knows that I spoke at three meetings in this whole island on this matter. At the first meeting we put our case as to the Resolution which our Party had passed; at the second meeting we put our case and I had to defend myself. The hon. member said that people of my Party who would not go out on any other occasion to discuss matters, had gone out to ask the people not to support Independence. The hon. member knows that that is not true. Besides my Party members there was Mr. Jack Dear; we spoke at public meetings in this island. There is one thing which amuses me and it is this: The Premier for the second time in this entire exercise denounced criminals, rogues and vagabonds. The Premier, at a big meeting in Independence Square said that there were people in this country who were still sympathetic with Castro and Jagan. When the Premier says that this criminal element was brought in, I am sorry that he is not now in his place because I would like to ask him something.

At the first Conference when it was moved that they should go straight to Independence, a gentleman described himself as the Director of the big Atlantic Bank. Mr. Sydney Alleyne could only move the Resolution if he was a member and a financial member of the Party. He told a Barbadian whom I first met in England and the Premier himself told me of his criminal record. I am talking about this criminal element because up to then we had heard nothing about any criminal element.
1.10 p.m.

If you are talking about the criminal element, I will say that on the Council of the Democratic Labour Party is Mr. Granville Foster who served time in prison.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member to confine himself, so far as possible, to the substantive matter of this Resolution and not to individual members of any party.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We are being accused of importing a criminal element into this discussion and surely we are entitled to defend ourselves and put the record straight. All we did, Mr. Speaker, was to keep meetings, and then there were meetings held by people known as the underprivileged, and there can be no denying that these meetings were sponsored by the Democratic Labour Party, and if you look at the record of some of them, you will see that they are shady. You can use people for what you want at the time, and when you realise that it is going to boomerang, you get up and denounce them. People who only wanted to express a view were being abused, but we sat by waiting because sometimes you must meet steel with steel, and the only thing we could have done was to have met steel with steel. Now the hon. member asks what we are debating today.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, did I understand the hon. member to say that Mr. Granville Foster is a member of the Executive Council of the

Democratic Labour Party and that he served a term in gaol? All we know about Mr. Foster is that he is or was employed by the Bridgetown City Council, but he is certainly not a member of the Executive Committee of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I wonder if you would say the same thing about Mr. Sydney Alleyne?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just entered this Chamber and I am not in a position to know what is bothering the hon. member who is ranting, raving and screaming at the top of his voice as if you cannot hear in spite of the amplification. I think that you as Speaker ought to request the hon. member to modulate his tones. I did not hear the remarks made about me or about my knowledge of something or the other, but the Hon. Minister of Health, Housing and Community Development has drawn to my attention points made by the hon. senior member for Bridgetown. The hon. member referred to one Mr. Sydney Alleyne whom I said I had first met in England and who I told him, had a criminal record. I want to say that this is absolutely untrue. I do not know what the relevance is to this debate at all, but I am unaware of anybody by the name of Mr. Sydney Alleyne having any kind of criminal record. I know I represented him once in court, and he was acquitted; therefore he is entitled as a result of his acquittal to be considered in the same light as any other person. The hon. senior member for St. Philip got up in St. Philip and said that I denied knowing the gentleman .....

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not and could never be a point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying, on a point of order, that the hon. member is not entitled to get up here and introduce irrelevant matters into a debate of this kind, and secondly if he is making any statement which is relevant or which is irrelevant, he should at least try to stick to the truth. I am saying positively that, whatever the importance of the hon. member in his anxiety getting up accusing people outside of this Chamber who are not party to this debate of commiting all kinds of crime, it is positively untrue that I could ever have told the hon. member that Mr. Sydney Alleyne had a criminal record. I certainly told the hon. member that I represented that gentleman in the Courts of Law in this Island; but I should enjoin you to request the hon. member, if this debate is to proceed on the same high level on which it started, to refrain from making misstatements of fact, and certainly to stick to the subject matter of the debate. Even if I told the hon. member so, which I did not, and I refute categorically that I did not, I do not see of what importance it is or what it has got to do with Barbados going into Independence.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Knowing that the hon. member was sick, maybe he did not realise that the man went to prison in Trinidad. He told me so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I have never appeared in a criminal court in Trinidad. I appeared in the Federal Court of Appeal on several occasions, but I have never done a criminal case in Trinidad in my life.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The relevance of this is that the hon. member has accused this Party of bringing into this exercise of Independence within a Federation a lot of cutthroats and criminals, and I say that his Party brought them in from the beginning. And I say you must have been sick and do not remember.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member not be saying "you".

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I mean the hon. member.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, there is just one thing I would like to say, since the newspapers do not like to report these things. The hon. member says I was sick and I cannot remember. When I was in a hospital in London, the hon. member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown came to visit me, and I was informed at some point by the hon. member for St. Philip that a certain gentleman was trying to see me, and he asked whether I knew him, and after trying to recollect, I said that the only person I knew by that name was somebody I represented in the courts in Barbados. That is all there is to it. But a debate on Independence is going to be dragged down to the level of my having told him that somebody had a criminal record.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, my name has been brought into this matter; I do not know what for. The hon. member for St. John is correct. A man did come to see me in London and I asked the Premier if he knew him, and he said that he remembered appearing for him in a case for collecting money by false pretences, he had no case and he advised him to leave the island.

1.20 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is not the truth. The hon. member is a master at prevarication.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not finished yet. The hon. senior member for St. John told him that the man had no case and the only thing he could do was to get on a boat and go out of the Island. The hon. senior member for St. John charged him $50 and when he paid the money it was all counterfeit money. That is what he told us.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Are you allowing this sort of behaviour in here? These hon. members are running away and now reducing the debate to this type of conduct which is a negation to proper debating. It shows that these are people who are incapable of running a government. What are we to do with Mr. Alleyne?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would never rule an interruption is not a point of order until I hear the point an hon. member is purporting to make.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking on a point of order. There is not a single person in this island who would give credence to what the hon. senior member for St. Philip is saying.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I object to that. The hon. member is the most notorious liar I have known.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of order. I went down.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would not have my point of order interrupted by the hon. member. Since the hon. member made an allegation against me — and this is the way that they have been conducting the campaign.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir, I am on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Philip has made a very serious accusation against me as a professional person. The hon. member is saying that I instructed him when I had to defend him, to leave the Island, and I told him — the hon. senior member for St. Philip — that because Mr. Alleyne had no case, I instructed him to leave the Island. I never said this because when the hon. member asked me about a particular case, I said that the man was acquitted by Magistrate Brandford Griffith in the afternoon. Never in the whole of my legal career have I advised any person to leave the Island. I told several persons that I would not be seen by that case; you never had a case. I have never in all of my legal dealings told anyone to leave the Island. The man was acquitted by Magistrate Griffith and he could have left the Island, but not by my advice.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The records of the courts are there. I challenge that the records be produced because I say

most definitely that the man was never put on trial because the hon. senior member for St. John advised him to get on a boat and he left the Island the same night. The hon. senior member for St. John told me that when he took the money to Mr. R. D. N. Maxwell to be changed, every single coin was counterfeit.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Would the two hon. members make a promise that if I produce the records that they would retire from politics if this man was acquitted by Magistrate Brandford Griffith?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Will the hon. senior member for the City proceed?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. gentleman told this man that he wanted to see me to discuss a matter with me, I said what he told me, He said that he never told me so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member get on with the Resolution?

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is relevant for this reason. After all, the hon. senior member for St. John cannot make a wild sweeping accusation like that. He pin-pointed this thing to the Official Opposition Party and he has done it for a reason.

Earlier this year, this same gentleman appeared at my office at the Bridgetown City Council and after he was talking so gibly on matters of finance and the like, he told me that he was only out here to see Federation go through. I listened to him and he asked me if I was opposed to Independence, and so on, But the relevance of that is this. We found that this gentleman had a Communist background and that this gentleman who was passing through with all this goodwill actually said to me that he had the greatest respect to actually meet a Minister to lend him $3,000. I did not listen to one single word from him. This gentleman sat and talked with me and tried to persuade me to do things.

As far as I am concerned, I cannot be opposed to Independence. It is a difference in our approach and that is all there is to it; therefore, I come to the relevance of that to say this. When the Hon. Premier had pontifically and dogmatically said that he knew £10,000 was paid out to my party.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When did I say that? I still want an undertaking from the two hon. members that they will come out of politics if I produced the records to show that this man was acquitted by Magistrate Griffith –

Mr. MOTTLEY: Are you going to allow that to me?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not address the Chair like that.

(A VOICE: Can you not teach him some manners?)

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that the £10,000 or $48,000 was offered to his Party.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You said £10,000.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Is that not $48,000? I appreciate the difficulty of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and this position which he has put himself in, but I do not want him to distort anything which I said during the course of the debate.

1.30 p.m.

The Deputy Leader of his Party did not understand what I was saying and I corrected the hon. member. If the hon. member did not hear what I said, he should consult the Official Report before he makes any pontifical statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the alleged point of order?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said whom it was paid by; the Conservative Party of Great Britain. If the hon. member wants to draw the inference he can do so. It is a matter for him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member will be getting up one thousand times today. The hon. member said that ten thousand pounds was paid out by the Conservative Party.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I have been reminded of the process that I used. I said that at that time the ten thousand pounds was not paid out to Mr. Norton whom both you and the hon. junior member for Christ Church met. My statement was that at that time the money was not handed over in Antigua, but I was not prepared to go into the box and give evidence on oath to the effect that it was not paid out in Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY: All you have to do is to try and destroy me.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Destroy!

Mr. MOTTLEY: Destroy whom? Carrion? You will get up a million times today.

Mr. SPEAKER rose and both hon. members took their seats.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When the hon. member mentions what he said, he thinks that as a lawyer he is clever. He said that these persons paid out this money here. We made a note of it here.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is wandering a bit and at this stage it is to be expected of him. It is a very simple matter. We will abide by the Official Report rather than by the note written here, I am not prepared to say that the money was not paid out in Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What would you say about that? *(ASIDES)* I mean the Premier. *(ASIDES)* You were born uncouth.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I take objection to the behaviour and the language of the hon. member. Anybody who is giving vent to his mind would be agitated. I cannot allow the hon. member to go on with his abusive language and when he says "I meant the Premier" that he was born uncouth.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if that is an offence I will withdraw it; but I still feel so.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, will you instruct the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: No one may tell me what to do.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I know that you will instruct the hon. member that his remarks were unparliamentary and that he will have to withdraw them without any reservation whatever.

Mr. SPEAKER: As to the remarks which were used by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I regard them as coming within the category of words which are mentioned in Standing Order 26(5). That Standing Order says this:-

"It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House."

In my view, it is insulting to say of an hon. member that he is uncouth even although in the present state of the debate, there are hard things being said on both sides across the table. I am asking the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to assure me that he has withdrawn the word "uncouth".

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have withdrawn that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member proceed?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Whenever he makes these *sotto voce* remarks he will be answered.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those remarks should not be heard by hon. members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was making the point that the hon. member referred to me and said that this ten thousand pounds was paid out for the purpose of preventing Barbados from going into Independence. He said that he knew this. If the Premier says that Mr. Sidney Alleyne said he was here for the purpose of seeing the island go independent, Independence in a Communist bloc. Further Mr. Sidney Alleyne told me that he was told by the Premier whom he could go to, what Minister he should go to.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is going to be allowed to go on and make hearsay allegations. That is a very clever way of making statements against hon. members by saying that somebody told them so. I ask the hon. member to stick to the question of Independence. I now hear that Independence is a Communist bloc.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you must not allow the hon. member.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot prevent any hon. member from prefacing his remarks with the words "I rise on a point of order." Sometimes what is referred to as a point of order is concisely spoken, at other times it is spoken at considerable length. However, I am relying on hon. members to see that they do not make lengthy points of order. Let the Hon. Leader of the Opposition continue on the subject matter of the Resolution.
1.40 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier in the course of his debate said he did not understand what we were debating, and he also said that he expected that the Leader of the Opposition would have seconded it. I should say in fairness to him that he accused me yesterday of making a lot of statements. The hon. member does not want me to speak loudly, yet he is cupping his ears to hear.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I prefer the dulcet tones which the hon. member was using just now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not sure that that is a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member accused me of making statements and of indulging in matters too high for me, and then he proceeded to read out the Minutes from the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. What I wanted to say to the hon. member yesterday and which I refrained from doing because I knew what would happen is that I repeated these statements from what was published in the Press to the effect that the Premier had walked out of the Conference. The hon. member inferred that I had told people I knew what had happened at the Conference. This was published in the Press, but the Premier has for the first time now brought to the public the real facts or what are supposed to be the facts of what occurred at the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. I am sorry he was not here at first, because there was a lot of extraneous matter which the hon. member indulged in, but he has never denied any of this.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is saying is far from the facts. When I make corrections of anything even as Minister in charge of Finance or as Chairman of the Cabinet, the newspapers in this country do not publish anything which I have said. I am saying categorically that on several occasions I pointed out that the newspapers were deliberately misrepresenting what had taken place. They were in no position to know what had taken place, because they were not present, and at several other meetings I told the members of the general public that it was untrue to say that any Conference had broken up as a result of my leaving the Conference Room. The Financial Secretary and I left the meeting between three to five minutes before the adjournment, and I read out about 27 items which were dealt with subsequent to that adjournment of the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. The hon. member is saying that I have never denied that. I have to deny things every day through the Government Information Officer, and in several cases when the newspapers deliberately misrepresented the proceedings or misreported what had taken place in Government circles, only in 5% of the cases do they condescend to put in their expurgated version of the correction which we have to make.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member has never denied this.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. and Learned member for St. John has said that he has denied it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am entitled to say he did not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not saying otherwise, but do not let us continue on for the balance of the day saying it has not been denied.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would say that the last hour of the Premier's Speech was the first time that he really enlightened us on any matters connected with the Conference on Federation. All the other things which he said was just abuse and harangue.

As I said, Sir, after the White Paper was laid in here, there was the question of debating it. The hon. member accused me of going all over this island and saying things about him as an individual when in fact I spoke at three meetings on this matter. I declared my policy on the matter and that was the end of it. As far as I am concerned, the hon. member laboured in here and brought forth a mouse. The general public knows our stand and the Government's stand in this matter. The Hon. Premier has regularly misrepresented the facts by saying that we are opposed to Independence. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is only a question of approach.

When the Report on the East Caribbean Federation Conference 1962 was discussed, I made certain suggestions and certain amendments. The hon. member said that if he had heard what I had said, he would not be in that position today. I discussed the matter with the hon. member, but I did not want it to be felt that I was encouraging anybody to oppose the idea of a Federation. We were not kept posted with all the happenings at the meetings of the Regional Council of Ministers after 1962, but it now suits the hon. member to point out that Sir Arhur Lewis said that it is not in the best interest to bring members of the Opposition and others into matters of this sort.

The Preamble at the bottom of the first page of the Resolution which we are now discussing reads as follows:-

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Barbados, reaffirming its dedication to the principle of Regional Association, will continue after Independence to work in close co-operation with the Governments and Peoples of other Commonwealth Caribbean Countries to promote by joint endeavour the complete political social and economic emancipation of all classes in all territories;"

Now after listening to and assessing what the Hon. Premier said yesterday about the various Ministers in the territories, you have to come to the conclusion that there is no good in Federation. He talked about these impoverished islands like Monterrat and St. Lucia, and he said he knew Mr. Compton all these years.
1.50 p.m.

If this Preamble is correct, which we all believe, and the Resolution itself says "And Whereas the Government of Barbados, reaffirming its dedication to the principle of Regional Association, will continue after Independence to work in close co-operation with the Governments and Peoples of other Commonwealth Caribbean countries....."

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I never suspected that the hon. member had such opinions of legal practitioners.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member make his point.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member has suggested that after I made certain statements about inequality of the other Islands that we were going on to say that after Independence we would go in for Federation. The paragraph in question says: "And Whereas the Government of Barbados reaffirming its dedication to the principle of Regional Association, we will continue after Independence to work in close co-operation with the Government and Peoples of other commonwealth Caribbean Countries to promote by joint endeavour the complete political social and economic emancipation of all classes in all territories."

Where does the word "Federation" appear in that?

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you call it by a different name, what does it mean? It says: "And Whereas the Government of Barbados, reaffirming its dedication to the principle of Regional Association, will continue after Independence to work in close co-operation with the Governments and Peoples of other Commonwealth Caribbean Countries to promote by joint endeavour the complete political.....

What does "Political" mean?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Political emancipation.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has the hon. and learned senior member for St. John risen on?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. senior member for the City quotes and comes to the word "political" and asks "what does that mean?" The word "emancipation" is after that.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. leader of the Opposition posed that question, I assumed it to be a rhetorical question.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Or, seeking information.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier has the idea that only they can interpret things.

Mr. SPEAKER: Everybody is entitled to have some idea.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier said that I do nothing else but go and consult Mr. Jack Dear. Does he want me to consult a bricklayer who lays brick or the lawyers of my Party?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can go and consult him so long as he gives him an appropriate Retainer.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What else can it mean? When you think of these "Whereas" and "And Whereas" in the preamble, how do you feel? If this was written by the Hon. Premier it shows you his tirades on these islands and their poverty. He is telling them what to do and what not to do. This reminds me that in Jamaica there was the question of a referendum. I agree with the Hon. Premier that we do not want any referendum, or proportional representation. The hon. member thinks that we are asking him about that. If he thinks so, he is making the greatest mistake in his life.

It is true that human nature is subject to change. The Hon. Premier said that one thing which can bolster his stand and his Party in that they should go for Independence is what the Governor in his Speech said. It reads like this on page 14:-

"The constitutional changes which I have enumerated now make the way clear for the achievement of Independence for Barbados, to which end my Government is firmly dedicated." The Hon. Premier speaks in this typical of a lawyer. It goes on: "In this connection my Government feels that Barbados can seek Independence either in a Federation, if a Federation is established on satisfactory terms, or if necessary alone."

My argument and my contention is that the Hon. Premier only read the first part. If you take the first part within the context it would appear as if he meant the achievement of independence for Barbados alone; but if you went on to read, it still appears as if the Government was committed to the principle of Federation. I do not think anyone would disagree with that. I do not think the Hon. Premier would object to that. You let it be felt that you started the whole idea of Federation, and therefore you were going along with it.

I cannot say it too often that we cannot be opposed to Independence. How can anybody be really opposed to Independence?

When Federation was first discussed, we found the Government was very strong on the matter as well as everybody in here to an extent. When I made a certain Amendment in opposing the Government's Resolution on the 1962 conference, the Hon. Minister of Education said then that he could not accept my amendment. If he accepted it, he would have to tender his resignation to the Cabinet. He was strong at the time on Federation and they voted against my amendment.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I am moving that the sitting of this House be suspended for half an hour.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

2.00 p.m.

On re-assembling,

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present, and I ask that the Bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for drawing that matter to my attention. Let the Bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was addressing the House on a Resolution which I will read again:-

"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."

Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition desirous of continuing his Address?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I think on the occasion of the suspension of the sitting one had made it abundantly clear, lest the reckless misinterpretation and the twisted and malignant remarks that my Party is opposing Independence for Barbados take any root, I will repeat what I said at the beginning. We are not opposed to Independence, although the touts would be opposed to Independence. It does not matter what hue, political complexion or pigmentation we may be, we could not be opposed to Independence. The Hon. Premier has referred to the entire background of this country, and what the Premier inherited we feel that those of us who have had the opportunity of handling the affairs of this country, are responsible for it and so, in this particular way, we are in a position to be a pattern for other colonial territories. There is one thing of which I am proud, and that is when I go through all these territories which are Crown Colonies, although we have had

housing in Barbados, we do not have that housing in the slums to the extent which is found in these other territories.

The Hon. Premier's speech was a sort of harangue and only in the last one and a half hours did we really get some information about the Federaton. Instead of objecting to things, he should have conceded more information on the situation as we would like to know. We are not opposed to Independence, but what we feel is that the approach should be a different one. The Minister of Education, when we made amendments to this Resolution, said that he could not accept any amendment and you will therefore see how strong they were in favour of Federation. The Premier said here that what he did not understand about me was that I was somewhat wavering on the question of Federation. If you put some sort of reliance in a man who contended strongly for Federation, would you not weigh his arguments and say that they are right? I have listened to all the arguments and the Premier said that Sir Arthur Lewis had said that it was not in the best interest to take members of the Opposition to this Regional Council of Ministers' Conference. I must emphasise and stress that the hon. member, for the first time today, said how he came down from the Conference. I was passing through the room and he asked me! "What have you got against Independence alone?" I said that I have nothing against it, but I have discussed this matter with my Party and we feel that we should make another attempt at Federation. They were behind closed doors and I saw in the Press where it was said that the Premier walked out of the Conference room. If he said that the Press did not publish it, how are you going to accuse us of knowing anything about it? He said that the Press did not publish it but we heard all about how this Conference was broken up. People were holding meetings as if an Election campaign was on. We did not agree with any Referendum being called for, and therefore we had no quarrel with the Premier about it. I admit that I was sceptical about Federation. I made amendments and I admitted what I said to the Hon. Premier; that is, I noticed that these chaps down the islands — I am not quite sure if they are continuing about this matter

It seems to me that the salaries would prevent them from leaving their territories and coming into the Federation and that would settle its fate as with Sir Grantley. The people who are running Barbados were never afraid of the Colonial Office. This was since the year 1639, long before the liberation of my people in Africa. Mr. Speaker, wherever you had the minority rule similar to that of Barbados, there was always trouble before we took over. I was shocked one night I went to listen to a meeting and people made mention of constitutional advancement and they came down to Sir Conrad Reeves. Who could say that Sir Conrad Reeves had not done something for the constitutional advancement of this colony? When you changed the life membership of the Legislative Council to the age of 75 years, there was a hue and cry; but that went through. One could quote from Sir Gordon Leacock who was a strong supporter in continuing certain reforms in the Legislature. One man cannot run this country. When it is said that "it is good for us to dwell together in unity", of course there is close racial distinction and distinction between families. We, in Barbados, are at such a turn over that we can agree that we could be a shining example for the other territories of the West Indies. There could be no question about that. When you get the hon. Premier pontificating and making people believe that what he said is that the all in all — he said that I was sceptical in this whole matter and, of course, I was sceptical.
2.50 p.m.

I could have made the same demagogic speech and done like Bustamante, but I did not do that. In the exercise of Independence, I realised my position and I could have brought people to harangue. I have seen a Minister drive up and a man with a placard get out of his car at meetings; yet you talk about people not encouraging this sort of thing. This exercise could have gone on in this country without any rancour or ill feeling, and fortunately for me I am *persona grata* and I move around people. You get loyal fanatics who will tell you stupidness, and when the hon. member says that if anybody touches the head of his Ministers there would be blood, let him know that if anybody touches the head of Ernest Deighton Mottley, there will be blood too.

I am going to quote, Mr. Speaker, from the *Official Gazette* of 12th February, 1963. I will not attempt to say anything until the Premier comes back in the House, or degrade any Minister whose duty it is to make notes for the Hon. Premier to refer to, although in the most unsavoury terms. The Ministers are doing what I think is right to be done, because if I were not here, I would expect my members to do that. I am not going to go into that gutter talk which the Hon. Premier has indulged in, and which can only be characterised as being near or in the gutter. I will quote:

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

That is the hon. senior member for St. John on the floor of the House in 1963. I was sceptical then, but this is what he said:

"Therefore, let us not get embroiled into any argument about who is going to have the industries because if one territory has all or if each has an equal number, it is not going to matter because we are going to have entrenched into the Constitution freedom of movement, and we are also having a common tariff and free trade throughout the area."

I will read part of the debate that was really shocking when I read it, and it shows how people can indulge in this hypocrisy and double talk so soon. He said:

"I can almost give you an undertaking that with the wider markets which will be created, with Customs Union and Freedom of Movement, I doubt very much whether we will have to go to the British Government asking for loans, because the upsurge of capital which is willing to come into this area for a multiplicity of reasons will preclude us from going to any country to ask for loans."

And on page 22, this is what the Hon. Premier says:

"To have an independent nation is a very laudable objective, but there is no point in having an independent nation of serfs, an independent nation living at low standards or an independent nation of unemployed people. It is far better for us to have a federal state with full employment than to have an independent island of Barbados with 26,000 unemployed people."

That is what the Hon. and Learned Premier of Barbados said on the floor of this House two years ago. Between then and now he has carried on this exercise. Those of us who were skeptical did not want it to appear that we were lending any hand to preventing this closer association of the units, because, believe it or not, from Jamestown on the mainland to Bridgetown which is the most easterly of the Caribbean islands, we have one thing in common, and it is that wherever there is poverty anywhere, it is a block to prosperity anywhere, and I did not think it would be right for me to engage myself in any exercise that would prevent the coming t together of these islands. They will have to come together some time. I understand that it was said at a meeting that I was in this Party for twenty years. I went into this Party at a time when I could convince the people I was among that the time had come to bridge the gap. I feel I have made my contribution, and if the hon. member wants to have my bones interred for having served this country, that would be a matter for him.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge any man to say that I have voted or done anything on the floor of this House against the progress or advancement of the masses of this country. The one exception was when I voted against picketing at people's homes and I would do it again because I do not think it is right and in the interest of the masses. There seems to

be some annoyance because of my association with people like the hon. member on my left who has a different pigmentation from mine, and the hon. member said that I picked up Mr. Leacock and sent him to the Senate. Of course I had the right to nominate and I nominated him; but you also nominated a man called Mr. Johnson. Well, you can look at Mr. Johnson and compare him with Mr. Leacock.
3.00 p.m.

I sent a man who as Chairman has millions and millions of dollars invested in the sugar industry. I have made it clear that I would never be able to run this country. I am accused of sending a man with ability, a man with University education there; but do you think that I am worried? You get all this talk. Lots of people got in here and said some funny things. The hon. member must learn. That type of behaviour should not take place in here. He said that they go behind closed doors and say whom they want to mix with. You just watch them privately and you will see what they want.

What did the Hon. Premier say? He said it is better to go on with this federation than to have an independent nation of serfs. If I were a man who did not have some regard and respect for the utterances of the Hon. Premier I would not care what he said of the Federation. Here is a man, Professor Arthur Lewis, who has devoted himself to the study of the economics of these islands. He has said, and I believe it, that it would be better to have a Federation.

I am not talking about what appeared in the Press. It appears that the Hon. Premier walked out of the last meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers and the meeting broke up. We felt, when we met in the interest of Caribbean unity, that we should do what we can to come together in this manner: but we are not opposed to Independence. We have been watching the Colonial Office, despite the fact that the Hon. Premier thinks nobody can understand anything in this – he alone can understand.

Now, because we have adopted a different approach to this matter, I have been told that I am insincere. Where is the insincerity? Mr. Speaker, I say that the mountain was in labour and has brought forth a mouse. Only at the last moment did the Hon. Premier do anything. In actual fact he told us why he changed his mind. He said that one morning he went to sleep and about four o'clock, he woke and found himself with a tremendous sweat. It was not until then that he realised that something was happening and he phoned and conferred with his Ministers. The Hon. Premier did not tell us what happened. He said that he was skeptical.

Sir, you leave Barbados; you are in opposition to the Government; but when you are at the conference in London, it is a question of your thinking what it means to Barbados first. It does not matter who the Leader of the delegation is; you are thinking of Barbadians first; therefore, when you see something that would operate against the interest of Barbadians, you must draw it to the Leader of the delegation's attention. If tomorrow I was called on to go, despite the rancour of the Hon. Premier, I would do the same thing.

You have this talk about having a Federation. Could the Hon. Premier say that he ever heard any member of my Party saying this? I challenge the hon. member that he has never heard us saying that. As a matter of fact, the hon. member said that that is absolutely untrue, and the statement cannot bear scrutiny about Mr. Bird was a carpenter and Mr. Bird was this-and-that. The Hon. Premier knows very well at which meeting that was said.

The Hon. Premier said that I was speaking without any advice at all. I did not come in here joining any Party. The Hon. Premier knows well enough that I do not want to go to England; but despite his rancour, if I were called on to go, whatever would be in the interest of Barbadians, I would vote for it.

Sir, I was fortunate enough to be successful in life. That is only a question of fate being kind to me. Do you think that I would want a free trip? If I wanted a free trip out of Government's expense, I would play the dog-in-the-manger for it. As I have said, the mountain was in labour and you have brought forth a mouse.
3.10 p.m.

You know, Sir, we had an idea of what the Embassies and the like would cost us. That never worried us. What we were worried about was this. When it comes to the question of industrialisation for Barbados the Hon. Premier accused us of lard oil talk, Hunte talk and that sort of thing. Of course, he will live long enough to get over that. We feel that industrialisation for Barbados is a "must" and industrialisation for Barbados came through this Party. Whether they like it or not, tourism also came through this Party and we had to fight it for years. Fortunately, this Government was then in the Opposition and they joined us in the fight; but it was this Party which brought forward the idea of industrialisation for Barbados. When the hon. member spoke about hon. members not doing their home work, he cannot measure people's gallon-pot by his bushel. We have never used that stupid argument, that small-time argument. The question is asked: what is the position of Barbados with 200,000 odd people when it has to pay $200,000 for Embassies. We are not worried about somebody getting a job: we have always argued about the big question of industrialisation. The Premier has said that he had hoped the time is not far distant when we would industrialise more.

On this question of Embassies, people might think about it as businessmen and of what it would cost to send somebody to England, Canada and so on. We say that while we are not opposed to Independence, we would certainly feel that there should be Independence in a Federation.

There was no denial that only 55 of the releases which have been sent by the Information Department to the Press have ever been printed. I hope that the Press will be decent enough to look that matter up and see if what they printed was untrue and caused the Opposition to take the stand which we are taking today. It was a revelation to us to listen to the things which happened. We had no representative up there, and therefore we could not know what was happening. As far as we are concerned, this matter of having another vote, another try, cannot hurt. Whether the Leader of the Government of Montserrat or the Leader of the Government of Dominica had an opportunity to go to the University or not, whether it is a matter of letters or not, I say that whatever the Premier of Barbados or the Chief Minister of Barbados might be, he is a humble man who has risen to a position of leadership and he knows the needs of his country. Therefore, there is no point in making statements which are derogatory to people. When we refer to Mr. Bramble, Mr. Bird, Mr. Bousquet and Mr. Bradshaw, we are human beings all over the world; and if you have a feeling otherwise, then you are closing the door against them.

Now, Sir, I quote this paragraph of the Resolution:-

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Barbados, reaffirming its dedication to the principle of Regional Association, will continue after Independence to work in close cooperation with the Governments and Peoples of other Commonwealth Caribbean Countries to promote by joint endeavour the complete political, social and economic emancipation of all classes in all territories:"

Does it seem to any of you that there is any intention of having any political association? I say that the answer to that question is absolutely "No". Unfortunately, the Hon. Premier is not in his place. We thought that we would have had some information on the constitution and what entrenched laws there would be. This is just going on to harangue anybody who is not prepared to say "Yes", or this is just another doubt of any person who was prepared to stick to his ideas. I say "Greater is he that controlleth his tongue than he who has made a nation." I think I have made my contribution to the debate. I understand that there is an amendment which has been proposed to the Resolution and I hope I will have an opportunity to deal with the amendment.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker there is no such Standing Order which would permit the hon. member to speak again. The motion for the amendment is already in, and it is inescapable for him to lose the opportunity for speaking on that motion. You look at the Standing Orders and you will see what is the position where there is any motion which is put in as an amendment to the Resolution, which seeks to omit a certain paragraph and substitute another. The hon. member is making an attempt to circumvent the Standing Orders of this House. The amendment which was moved by a member of his Party seeks to omit certain words and the hon. member has the opportunity to speak on this amendment. The motion is before the House now.
3.20 p.m.

I am not going to sit in here and allow you to come back and say you are speaking on the amendment which is before the House now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is directing you on how to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let not the hon. member attempt to make that mistake; no one can so direct. I am always grateful for the assistance of hon. members.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, you will realise that I spoke and made no reference to the amendment. Notice has been given of the amendment which has not been seconded, and you will notice what Standing Order No. 26 (17) says; so you will have to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: If and when the occasion arises, I will rule. I am fully cognisant of Standing Order No. 26 (17) — in fact of all the Standing Orders.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will just draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that while I was speaking I made no mention of or referred to any amendment at all. Further you will appreciate that the amendment before the House has to be seconded. That is my contribution up to the present time.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not going in for these sand-side arguments. I am asking Your Honour to rule now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no intention of ruling in anticipation. If and when the time comes, I will rule.

Mr. WALCOTT: I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that under these Rules, it has been suggested that no amendment has been put in. I am submitting that an amendment has been put in, and the question of it not being seconded does not mean that the amendment has not been proposed by a member to be seconded now. If there is an amendment, Your Honour would have to put the question for the House to take a vote on it; but to suggest at this stage that there is no amendment, is to suggest that what the hon. member has already put in and handed to the Clerk is nothing at all and therefore forms no part of the debate, and will have to be expunged from the records. The hon. senior member for St. Michael made an amendment and spoke on it before it was seconded; so no one can say that there was no motion because it was not seconded. That is only glorified ignorance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter has made his point which is clearly understood. His submission has been noted, and I will rule in due course if and when the occasion arises.

Mr. WALCOTT: A suggestion has been made that there is no motion because it has not been seconded, therefore the hon. member had no right to speak on anything he proposes until it is seconded.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who seconded the motion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for the suspension desire not to speak?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I should first of all like with your permission to make my position clear in this debate. As I came to the House just now, someone stopped me and told me that he heard that I was either going to abstain when the time for voting came or be absent. I told him that it was obvious he does not know me, because I am neither an abstainer nor a swerver. Anyone can be convinced that I will vote with my Party when the time comes as long as I am alive. Having made my position clear, I will now proceed to add what I can to this debate.

The question revolves upon whether Barbados should go independent within a Federation or whether it should go independent alone. The former view had been most admirably advocated by hon. members who now sit on the Government benches, and it would be perhaps a tedious exercise to quote from the spate of oratory which the suggestion that we go into Federation with the other members of the Eastern Caribbean provoked from them; but I will not indulge in that tedious exercise. At the beginning I will say, that I am not one of the people who have learned to trace the days' disaster from anybody's morning face, and so the question of my voting will depend upon my conscience and my mind which is already made up. It may be for others to vote according to how the wind blows or according to other temporary considerations which will influence them. I fortunately, Mr. Speaker, am not one of those. I will quote from Sir Arthur Lewis, distinguished economist, known world-wide, who says in his "Agony of the Eight":

"The maintenance of good government requires a federal structure. In a small island dominated by a single political party, it is very difficult to prevent political abuse. Everybody depends on the Government for something, however small, so most are reluctant to offend it."

Some people, Mr. Speaker, in small communities cannot even make up their minds for fear they may displease someone in the Government. He goes on to say:

"The Civil Servants live in fear; the police avoid unpleasantness; the Trade Unions are tied to the Party; the newspaper depends on Government advertisements; and so on.

This is true even if the political leaders are absolutely honest. The only safeguard against this is federation."

So spoke Sir Arthur Lewis, distinguished Economist, and one who enjoyed the favour and confidence of nearly all the Governments in power in the Eastern Caribbean territories.

At this stage in our development there is no one who would argue against Independence, and so to say that we who occupy the seats on this side of the House are against Independence is to foist a deliberate lie into the minds of the electorate. All we are asking is that we embark upon a form of Independence which economically and financially is likely to redound to the benefit of those who would follow us in this community.

It was the Committee of Twenty-four of the United Nations which insisted that certain forms of Independence or trusteeship should replace colonialism all over the inhabited earth. There were places where full independence met the need, places like Malaya and Nigeria; there were other places where full internal self-government was enough — the type of Government which has been recommended for the Windwards and Leewards; there were other places which were so small indeed that trusteeship was the only answer.
3.30 p.m.

Now, what is the opinion of people who have given this matter a great deal of thought as far as Barbados itself is concerned? What is your opinion as far as association with the other Islands in the Eastern Caribbean is concerned? Sir Arthur Lewis who has spent a greater part

of his life in economic and financial matters states that the Islands taken individually are too small for attention by the World Bank, the United States Aid Agencies and other sources of international assistance. All the principal agencies have indicated their willingness to support generally the Eastern Caribbean Federation and have indicated their unwillingness to become involved with each by those who are going it along and have declared their intention to take us into independence alone whether or not the people of Barbados would be abiding by this decision. We have to consider this matter calmly, and with the avoidance of personalities. But we will not adopt that attitude. We are asked by the public to argue this case calmly and dispassionately and show where the best future for Barbados lies.

Now, trusteeship ofcourse, is out of the question for small countries like Barbados. We already have full internal self-government. We are now deciding whether it would not be better for us to go into a Federation with such of the Eastern Caribbean territories as are still willing to go into a federation with us. Remember that Sir Arthur Lewis said not too long ago that if we went into a Federation with one Island, even two, it would be more than one, and he was prepared to go into a federation with one single island.

I have heard that from so eminent an authority. We are therefore able to discuss the possibility of our entering a federation with such of the Eastern Caribbean territories as are still willing. We must remember that the Chief Ministers of those territories have made one or two mistakes. They have been humiliated on the floor of this House; but people who are leaders of nations, however small, have to learn how to accept these things and come back with a smile and remember that the public good is more important than private revenge.

Now, the attitude adopted by the Hon. Premier accusing all those people who did not agree with the Government on every subject is the one which is taken, and one cannot help remembering the fulminations of the hon. senior member for St. John when he came on the floor of the House in respect of the Banks question. One cannot help remembering the slander that was spread about "work or starve" and very recently we well remember what was said about the West Indian Hospital Sweepstake. On all of this when the Hon. Premier found he was wrong, he hurriedly backtracked. We over here could only smile. To arrogate to oneself the power to being always in the right and try to deceive people - - - -

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member cannot make reference about people trying to deceive.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member completed his sentence. The hon. member made some reference to "deceive". I would like him to repeat what he has said to be satisfied that he is not infringing the rule of imputing improper motives against another member.

Mr. LYNCH: I went on to say, to arrogate to oneself the power to being always in the right and try to deceive people who know better,". That is as far as I got.

Mr. WALCOTT: That could not be in order, because reference was made to the Premier and it could mean that the Premier's conduct was one to try to deceive. The hon. member said that he tried to arrogate this to himself. If the hon. member is insisting that he said "he tried to deceive" it would be very bad.

Mr. LYNCH: I was about to restate my former remarks. If you want me to do so –

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to call for the official record.
3.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust hon. members are not under the erroneous impression that the sitting has been suspended.

After checking with the Official Reporter,

Mr. SPEAKER: I will now read the Official Record of what was said. This is what it said: "Very recently we still remember about the West Indies Hospital Sweepstake. All of this we have heard when the hon. senior member for St. John found that he was wrong and heard the back chat..."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the word used was "backtrack", not "back chat".

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in a very awkward position now because the Official Report has the words "back chat" instead of the words "back-track". Of course, before the Official Record is enshrined in Hansard it is subject to editorship by the Clerk of the House and it may well be that he will agree that the word used was back-track".

Mr. LYNCH: The hon. member's correction is right. The word "backchat" is not within my vocabulary.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Official Record continues as follows:-

"We over here could only smile. For one to arrogate to one's self the power to be always in the right and try to deceive people....."

There the Official Record ends because at that point the interjection of the hon. senior member for St. Peter appears. In other words, there is in the Official Record as I am advised an incomplete sentence which reads as follows:

"For one to arrogate to one's self the power to be always in the right and try to deceive people....."

There we have the interruption. There is no intended disrespect when I use the word "interruption" of the hon. senior member for St. Peter.
3.50 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Are you suggesting that the hon. member was not speaking about the hon. senior member for St. John when he said "one who tries"? He did not use the same name in each sentence. We have different ways in English of referring to people other than by their name. After he referred to the hon. senior member for St. John he went on to say that these are the things he did, he back-tracked and now he arrogates unto himself that he knows all, and he back-tracked and tries to deceive. He could only mean the hon. senior member for St. John, and I say that it is a positive coward who says that and when he is caught is not willing to withdraw.

Mr. LYNCH: Perhaps the hon. member would tell me what I intended saying.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am saying that you are not fit to use the phrase "trying to deceive" to any one in here, because we have positive evidence that we can bring with documentary proof to the contrary, and something that will name you if you talk about someone who tries to deceive.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as what was said is concerned, I could not agree more with the hon. senior member for St. Peter that if it is said in here of any hon. member that he tried to deceive, such would be a clear infringement of Standing Order No. 26 (7) and that it is an imputation of improper motives. In the context of the Official record, so far as the hon. junior member for Bridgetown had proceeded, he had said nothing more than that "for one to arrogate to himself the power to be always in the right do not, so far as the record goes, hold that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has imputed an improper motive to any member.

Mr. LYNCH: I mentioned no member, Mr. Speaker. I said for one to do so-and-so. However, I will continue. For one to arrogate to himself the power of always being

right, for one to try to deceive, for one to deny to others the right of criticising one's actions, these things would not be for the good of the public weal. These things, I repeat, would not be for the good .....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member, but since he has continued to speak and I have listened to him completing the sentence, if he is not referring to the hon. senior member for St. John, it is the most nonsensical thing I have ever heard. The whole point is this: The hon. member has recited certain incidents in the life of this Government with which the hon. senior member for St. John was involved. He started with Haggatts, then Banks Brewery and then the Hospital Sweepstake Fund, in all of which to some extent the hon. senior member for St. John – and I am paraphrasing now – back-tracked on whatever policies he enunciated on these three things, and when the hon. senior member for St. John back-tracked on them that side of the House could only smile. Then he continues the same contextual phrase to say that for one who can do this and do that etc. etc. If the hon. member is saying he is not referring to the hon. senior member for St. John, he might as well conclude his speech at that point, because it has no reference to anything at all inside or outside of this Chamber, and I am sure it is in his interest and he would not wish to be talking nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out that according to the Official record as supplied to me, the hon. member did not say "for one who arrogated" but he did say "for one to arrogate", and so far as the words "to back-track" are concerned, the record discloses that what was said was "found out that he was wrong, and heard the back chat".

Mr. LYNCH: I said "hurriedly back-tracked"

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not recall the word "hurriedly" was used, but I must say I am beginning to lose a certain amount of faith in the Official record if there are so many errors which occur within the space of so few minutes and words. The Editor of Debates must remain in this Chamber throughout so that when he is editing, he will have made sure of what has been said.

Mr. LYNCH: With Your Honour's permission, I will continue. Much capital has been made of the fact that Barbados is perfectly able financially to go it alone. This has been a recent change of fact if we consult the Debates of the House for Tuesday, 14th August, 1962, when the Hon. Minister of Education -- and I am sure he will remember it – went on record as follows:-

"Mr. Speaker, a double job has been put on this country and on this Government, and it is a job which has to be taken on simultaneously. You cannot neglect one for another. You cannot organise a nation on any proper basis unless the Barbadian economy is viable and strong, and you cannot make the Barbadian economy viable and strong unless it is set within the context of a national community."

This national community can only be construed to mean a federal community. This is the Minister of Education some months ago saying that you cannot make the Barbadian economy viable and strong unless it is set within the context of a national community. There was no mention about margarine or lard oil lobbies; there was mention only of strength within a national community. Why the sudden and desperate change of front? Why it is that we who are asked to use the oil of sweet reasonableness are accused of being criminals when they themselves have but shortly abdicated from the stand which we now occupy? We did not make accusations of that sort against them when they mooted far and wide arguments which I have adduced. We were more than charitable; but we who now take the stand which they formerly occupied are now criminals.

4.00 p.m.

To return to Sir Arthur Lewis; eminent economist, he said that another argument related to the staffing of public services, and the efficiency of public services upon which a great deal of the success not only of the unitary state but also of a Federation as indeed of any state must depend. He says that in these days there is a world-wide scarcity of good professional people, such as engineers, architects, doctors, agricultural specialists, statisticians and other technical people. A small island of 80,000 people finds difficulty in recruiting such people and still more difficulty in holding them, since it has no ladder of promotion to offer.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to know what page of the booklet the hon. junior member for the City is quoting from.

Mr. LYNCH: Page 18 paragraph 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry I have not heard the hon. member for St. Andrew. Did he rise on a point of order?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Sir.

Mr. LYNCH: I was saying that Professor Arthur Lewis said that a small island of 80,000 people find difficulty in recruiting such people, and still more difficulty in holding them, since it has no ladder of promotion to offer. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we must be concerned with consideration of this sort.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Again, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is attempting to mislead this Chamber and he has actually misled this Chamber when he quotes from Professor Arthur Lewis and is referring to Barbados being amongst those territories to whom there is a scarcity of good professional people. If the hon. member wanted to be honest - - -

Mr. SPEAKER: What has the hon. junior member for St. Andrew risen on?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. I am quoting from the same "The Agony of the Eight". Sir Arthur Lewis pointed out that Barbados was a special case. This island had always been financially independent; under the constitution, financial irregularities could not arise; its secondary education was so far advanced, and the numbers returning from university education were so large, that it had no difficulty in recruiting and keeping a technical service.

"Most of the arguments for federating the other islands could not be applied to Barbados.

"In recent months people have been saying that Barbados wants federation so to get the other islands into a federation so that it could dictate to them and exploit their markets. Nobody could say this who took part in these discussions in 1962 and 1963.

"Mr. Barrow was dragged into the federation of the eight. The problem arose within six weeks of his becoming Premier, when his mind was preoccupied with getting hold of Barbados affairs. He would have liked to postpone the whole question."

I continue to quote:-

"He came along because of a long-time friendship with some of the other leaders, especially Mr. Bird, as well as because of a life-long devotion to West Indian federation.

"The people behind him were equally lukewarm. The few potential industrialists welcomed a customs union, which might benefit a few manufacturers. But tourism will provide as much income and employment in Barbados as manufacturing industry, and tourism does not depend on federation."

That is why I pointed out that there was a deliberate attempt by the hon. junior member for the City to mislead this hon. Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the quotation which the hon. junior member for the City made, he directed hon. members to the point which he desired to bring to the notice of the Committee.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I happened to hear the remarks raised by the hon. junior member for the City. I consider such a sorry misdirection of the facts after the hon. member has stood and expressed his views and is trying to go down in history as trying to attempt to mislead the House, I propose to move a motion that the hon. member be suspended from the services of this House. I just want to serve notice on that.

Mr. BATSON: I just want to serve notice that I would be seconding that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for the City proceed.

Mr. LYNCH: I was quoting from "The Agony of the Eight". My advice is that Barbados is one of the Eight. The remarks made by Sir Arthur Lewis must have if not equal force then some considerable force in affairs of the island of Barbados.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I rise on a point of order. It does not speak of the island of Barbados. Sir Arthur Lewis was referring to the Islands of the Leeward and Windward with a population of 80,000 people. The island of Barbados has a population of nearly a quarter million people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Instead of the hon. member rising by way of a point of order, he should invite the hon. member to refer to the page and paragraph.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am referring to the page which the hon. junior member for the City is reading and on which he is attempting to build his address. What I am referring to is on page 16 and it is the opposite to what the hon. member has read. He read from Sir Arthur Lewis "Agony of the Eight". He said:-

"First the Colonial Office was fed up with the West Indies, especially after the islands had made such a mess of federation. It wanted to get rid of them as soon as possible.

"Secondly, the maintenance of good government requires a federal structure. In a small island of 50,000 or 100,000 people dominated by a single political party, it is very difficult to prevent political abuse."

This does not refer to the island of Barbados. I am just correcting the statement made by the hon. junior member for the City.
4.10 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of correcting a mistake does not arise in a point of order because the latter is simply to direct attention to the point which an hon. member desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chairman for decision.

Mr. LYNCH: I was at the point where I was interrupted -- page 18 paragraph 2 -- where Sir Arthur Lewis says that "the small islands find difficulty in recruiting professional people" and the people mentioned are engineers, architects, doctors, agricultural specialists, statisticians and other technical people. I am developing the argument that the same people, if not with equal force, with some considerable force, are required for Barbados. Barbados is a small island and has been, up to the time of this debate, one with a small population. Therefore, it would be inconceivable that we could attract here to Barbados, if we gained Independence alone, people of the necessary calibre to develop the island, as we would be able to attract them, if we moved into a Federation. That is the argument which I was trying to develop. If it cannot permeate into certain personalities, I cannot help that. If it applies to other small islands, then it will also apply to Barbados, which is also a small island. Any argument which applies to the small islands must also apply to the Island of Barbados. This is what Sir Arthur Lewis said: "A small island of 80,000 people finds difficulty in recruiting such people, and still more difficulty in holding them, since it has no ladder of promotion to offer....

I am advocating, and will continue to advocate, that every effort should be made with Barbados, according to the terms of the amendment, entering into a Federal exercise with such other territories as are willing to do so.

As the hon. senior member for St. John has said more than once, Barbados would be willing to enter into a Federation even with one territory. He is on record as saying that. Let him deny it. He said that two are more than one. That is the principle which I am advocating, despite the attempts at intimidation from the other side. Of course, they know that I am not one who can easily be intimidated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member imputing improper motives to other hon. members?

Mr. LYNCH: I heard some mention being made about suspension, Mr. Speaker, the fundamental issues in Federation are law and order, as the hon. member was careful to point out. The only way we can get knowledge is from those who are more intelligent than ourselves. I think that the impressions which come from learned people we can adopt. The palimipsest of the brain has impressions made upon it, and as time goes on they deepen. Of course, these are second-hand views; but the source of my views is Sir Arthur Lewis who is a distinguished man. This is what Sir Arthur Lewis says.

"The fundamental reason for federating these Islands is that it is the only way that good government can be assured to their peoples."

That goes not only for the smaller islands, but also for the big neighbour, as the Minister would have it, which is Barbados. Any argument which applies to the small islands must also apply to the island of Barbados. Of course, when referring to the small islands, you refer to the population and, of course, the island of St. Lucia is bigger than Barbados. Let us examine some of these islands and see what there is to be gained from coming into closer association with them. Take the island of Dominica which has a large amount of untapped water power; it has hundreds of rivers and hydro-electric power; it has excellent pumice stone and it may be a very fertile source of cement. No longer would we have to buy our cement from Venezuela, but we have a Caribbean Island which would supply us with cement. The hard wood which would take some 25 to 40 years to get it in, is there in primeval forests to be harvested. I know that there are a number of enterprising young men who are at the moment actively engaged on establishing a local company through which we would get citrus fruit. It is remarkable that in Dominica you can see limes, mangoes and mandarines lying in the gutters, whereas in Barbados you have to pay as much as eight cents for a lime. It is true that in England one of the enterprising Dominicans is having some of the fruit from Dominica canned under the name of Dom Fruit; but more could be attempted than what is being done at the moment.

Federation would be beneficial not only for the people of Dominica, but also for the people of Barbados.

Let us consider the question of sea island cotton. The Island of St. Vincent was at one time world famous for its production of this sea island cotton.
4.20 p.m.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in these days of synthetics, some people do not like products which last very long; but there was at one time a concerted move against the popularisation of St. Vincent Sea Island Cotton, and it has not been selling as well in recent years as it once did; but think of the future of such a product in a Federation if sea island cotton could be gradually put on the world markets. As is well known to members of this Assembly, it is an

almost indestructible product. Anyone who possesses a sea island cotton shirt can look forward to 12, 14 or 15 years of wear -- and I speak from personal experience. These may not be popular nowadays, with the types we get coming from the American manufacturers; but if this product is developed and placed judiciously on the market, then a great deal of benefit might well accrue, not only to St. Vincent, but to any federation in which St. Vincent found itself. This is true too of Nevis which also grows this product and which is in great need of some kind of economic upliftment.

Mr. Speaker, there are very many products in which some research ought to be made. There is the production of cane in certain of the other territories of the Eastern Caribbean where the marginal lands have not yet been used up as they have been in Barbados. Our economy has seen to it that nearly every possible square foot of land in Barbados has been used to the full; but there are marginal lands untouched in countries like Dominica, St. Lucia, Antigua and the like. Arrowroot was at one time becoming very popular and then that was practically killed by another product which had big money behind it. There is also the possibility of the canning of fish which is so super-abundant in the waters which wash our shores. Very little has been done about that. I am certain that this is known to many of the Ministers opposite. Japanese fleets have put out from the Island of Japan and have come as far down as the West Indian waters to fish, store the catch and carry them back up to Japan. They come as far down as these waters in search of fish for their fishing industry. There is a great deal that we can do, if we will only come together and decide that unity is strength, and not make scathing remarks about our brothers in the Eastern Caribbean. It is true that economically they may not have reached our standard; but to the great surprise of us all, only very recently they came politically up to our level.

It must be noted also that before any Independence is granted unilaterally, there are some very strange provisos which obviously will also be applied to Barbados. Let it not be thought that despite all the financial braggadocio which one may be forced to listen to in here, Barbados will not still have to conform to certain rules and regulations. There must be a two-thirds majority in the Lower House of a bi-cameral Legislature. Can you imagine any Government getting a two-thirds majority in this House?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is implying that Barbados would have to depend on a two-thirds majority for Independence. Again I say that is misleading this House, because the question of a two-thirds majority refers to the Windward and Leeward Islands.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been duly made.

Mr. LYNCH: I said nothing whatever like that. I said there are certain rules and regulations which might also apply to Barbados. I did not say that the rules and regulations are applying at the moment to Barbados; but the past can be the only index to the future. I pointed out that despite the financial braggadocio to which one is subjected at times, Barbados would have to adhere to certain rules and regulations. I began to cite what were the rules and regulations which applied to the new association of islands of the Eastern Caribbean. I said there must be a two-thirds majority, and I asked whether one could imagine a two-thirds majority in this House. Obviously the hon. member does not understand and wanted to reply, not realising it was a rhetorical question which needed no answer. I will ask the question again. Can any one imagine a two-thirds majority on the question of Independence in this House?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member referred to an hon. member over here who rose on a point of order in connection with the question of a two-thirds majority and he made a statement saying I could not understand. I just want the hon. member to know that I went to school the same way as he.

Mr. SPEAKER: Surely that is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that I did not understand what he was saying; but what I said is that I went to school the same way as the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again, that is not a point of order.

Mr. LYNCH: I was not accusing the hon. member of lack of understanding. I said he did not understand the point which I was making.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said there is no point which the hon. member can make that I would not be able to understand, because he is unable to make a point that I cannot understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: The allegation is that the hon. member is not capable of making a point of order.

Mr. LYNCH: I am not going to enter any personal dispute; it is not my style. If I may resume. On the question of the University, it has been found that there is a paucity of students from the Eastern Caribbean attending the University College which has been established in Bridgetown. The reason for this, I am told, Mr. Speaker, is that the charges for boarding and lodging which the students coming from distant Caribbean territories have to meet are sometimes too high for their parents to pay, and so the University is deprived of a great deal of ability. Because, let it be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that all the ability is not in Barbados. Indeed the author whom I am accused of quoting at second-hand, which I am proud to do -- Sir Arthur Lewis -- is not a Barbadian; and so it must be obvious that a great deal of ability is lost to the West Indian University when students from the Eastern Caribbean find it difficult to maintain themselves there.

If, however, there were closer association between these islands such as in a Federation, we would not have the spectacle of only, roughly, 180 students at the University College in Bridgetown, despite the frantic efforts of those in control of the University to encourage more students to take their education there; but it would be more in the nature of more than 300 students.
4.30 p.m.

I am told that students coming from the Eastern Caribbean are asked to pay as much as $100 a month for board and lodging. It may sound to us as a small amount, but in the case of many of the parents of these students, they are not wealthy and they are not able to pay it. There has been a definite clearage in the line of the demarcation between the people of the Eastern Caribbean and the people of Trinidad in the last Federation, and this gap has not yet been closed; so students coming from these terrotories will have nothing whatsoever to do with the University College students in Trinidad nor even attend the conferences at which they think Dr. Williams may be present.

We in Barbados are looking forward to the same thing.

The Hon. Premier talked about the large number of criminals which have intruded into our community from St. Lucia. If it is thought that one's brethern in one's community.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member, both directly and by implication, has made reference to the speech by the Hon. Premier yesterday about the large number of criminals which has intruded into this Island from St. Lucia. The Hon. Premier made no such reference. What reference to St. Lucia he made was that, statistically, he has information that 50% of the detected crime has been caused through the influx of people from St. Lucia. I think that the inaccuracy of the hon. member ought to be corrected.

Mr. LYNCH: Let me put it this way, Sir,.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as you know, I do not get into these wranglings: but this is something which I

must absolutely deny because the records are there and they can be examined, The Hon. Premier made reference to the detected crime, and he said that he could not speak of crime undetected. He never said that it was due to the large number of St. Lucians.

Furthermore, the reference which the Hon. Premier made to St. Lucians was in this wise. He said that there are roughly 17,000 St. Lucians who came to the Island, with 16,000 going back, the net increase was 1,000. But this had nothing to do with what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. LYNCH: Let us say that Mr. Crompton.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The hon. junior member for the City said that the Hon. Premier said that 1,000 people entering Barbados were St. Lucians, and they were responsible for the crime.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, it puts us in difficulty to make a check because it is quite impossible for me to secure a copy of the records. It may not be available until tomorrow; The hon. junior member for the City has stated what he heard, and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy has stated what he has heard.

Mr. LYNCH: Sir, no one would expect even the Hon. Premier to know the figures of undetected crime.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was pointing out to the Assembly -- I consider it wise not to particularise any particular island in the Eastern Caribbean -- that the statistics of our detected crime show that 50 per cent is committed by people from the other islands. But hon. members of this Assembly must remember that Barbados was accused of such a thing many years ago in the neighbouring island of Trinidad; therefore, why should we pass this accusation on to people who come from the other islands? We must remember always that, generally, University people and the worst people leave one community for another. There are several people who come to us from all the territories of the Eastern; therefore, at this point I consider it to be an ill-advised statement to make specific reference to people who come to us to stay here from the other islands of the Eastern Caribbean.

Hon. J .C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. How can the hon. member speak of an ill-advised statement if the records will not show that statement which he refers to is made? The hon. senior member for St. John pointed out that the records show statistically that 50% of the detected crime for the period is perpetrated to non-Barbadians. This must only be a matter of fact. If the records show it, they show it. This is different from saying that of the crime committed in Barbados, 50% is St. Lucians. That was reference to the detected crime -- and the Commissioner of Police discloses that over a recent period it was attributed to people who belong to the Eastern Caribbean, and not Barbadians.

Mr. LYNCH: I continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Perhaps the Hon. Minister might be happier with one of his own statements. It is to be found in the "Official Gazette", a report of a meeting of this House on Tuesday 14th August, 1962, on page 703, wherein he said: "It is just to discuss this White Paper in the light of these facts. The Federation is a divison of sovereignty and it little matters whether you ask for a strong Federation or a weak one It is the level of political awareness and attainment which exists in the entire nation which will dictate the strength or the weakness of the Federation."
4.40 p.m.

Are we to understand that the level of political awareness has dissipated to nought, that the same people who pressed for Federation are now acting as if the level of political awareness has dropped so low? If people will argue in the same way or do not act in the same way in which they once acted, the position is very confusing. The point which we, on this side of the Table are trying to make, is that it would be for the ultimate good of this community if we were to accept that we should hold out the right hand of fellowship to two, three, four, five or more of the other communities of the Eastern Caribbean. We are now making the same point which they stressed some time ago because we are convinced that, putting aside the question of markets which might cause us to be accused of selfishness, the future of Barbados, as they were careful to point out some time ago with such vehemence, lies in closer association with such other territories in the Eastern Caribbean as are ready to associate with us. Emphasis is placed on the fact that leaders in the islands who are Federationists did not speak on the platform of one political group or the other. Therein they showed their good sense because people do not interfere in the internal affairs of other friendly communities. There are some people who are misguided enough to do it, but not in the type of society to which we are now aspiring. It is not the usual procedure for people to leave the land in which they live and move and have their being, to tell the people of other territories what they should do. Sometimes they are met with a rude reception: but in fact the political leaders in the other territories who have spoken out and who are still Federationists at heart are awaiting the results of this debate on Federation. They do not come here and embroil themselves in the internal affairs of a neighbouring island -- and who can blame them for such propriety?

There are those of us who happen to travel up and down these islands for reasons other than political Conferences, and we are accepted at any time of the year in any of the islands. There are many of those who come under the welcome of that umbrella in that there are many people in these islands who are still strong Federationists and who would feel themselves very antagonistic indeed to the people of Barbados if we were to hive off and leave them as the colonies of Jamaica and Trinidad did. Their dependence has been on Barbados; and because of personalities and the impatience of someone -- as if the future of the nation could be decided on the whims and fancies of some people -- we are quite prepared to hive off and leave them to the mercies of their own inadequate economies. The foreseeable and realisable goal was for us to summon another conference with those people, and point out to them the advantages to be gained by having a closer association with us so that we might wake up out of the darkness of colonialism and enter the rich and happy uplands together. It would seem as if impatience is the order of the Day. Research will tell you that years and years passed by while matters of Federation were discussed in many lands. These Federations are now important nations which rule their own destinies all over the world.

It was not left to the decision of one or two people that these people were not able to federate; and some of them were trying to proceed in coming into a Federation. It was not a question of three and a half years; in many cases it was a longer period than that; but they knew that the nation into which they would enter would be more than repaying the time which was spent in bringing the Federal negotiations to a happy issue. We have to take Barbados into Federation because, if she remains outside, there is no future. Mr. Speaker, these are not my words; these are the words of the hon. senior member for St. John. These are the hon. member's words which are on record in the official debates of this House. He says that if Barbados stays outside, then there is no future for our people. What I cannot understand is the acrimony which is attached to anyone who should take the view which he so rightly stated. Why should personalities and snide remarks and the recommendation that some speakers should be hanged from the highest tree and remarks of that kind, be introduced?
4.50 p.m.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Here again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is making reference to the hon. senior member for St. John who is not now in his place. In what part of his speech yesterday or at any time did the hon. member hear a recommendation that somebody should hang from the highest tree?

Mr. LYNCH: Not in so many words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but reference was made to people like William Joyce and Amery and their activities during World War II. When the analogy was not only made but stressed, it caused some amusement above here, because as far as I know, this is peace time, and we came here by the same method of being voted for, and are at liberty to put forward our views as long as they do not conflict with the Speaker's ruling.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Again on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the hon. senior member for St. John was at that particular point in his speech and mentioned the names of Amery and Casement, he ended that part of his speech by saying that so far as he is concerned, he would not lay a hand on anybody who was guilty of that sort of thing; what he would do would be to hand him over to the tender mercies of the great democracies of the United Kingdom and the United States. He never said he would hang anybody from the highest tree, and it is really reprehensible of the hon. member to make such a distortion of a plain statement of fact, and really just as reprehensible for the hon. member who is now on his feet to deplore what he calls sniping remarks, when in deploring somebody for remarks of that nature.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That point of order has been made.

Mr. LYNCH: If we refrain from taking up certain people in what they say, they may think we are afraid of them. We are not going to do that. I cannot see the necessity for them having been made, and quite dispassionately, making reference to the remarks which were made in some way seemed to equate us with people like Casement and Amery. We do not like it and I am on my feet now saying that we do not like it. I am not making any remarks comparing anybody else to any villain or traitor.

The point was made also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that no West Indian should look to Europe for a political philosophy -- that is, of course, those of us who sit on this side of the House and who believe in free enterprise. What I would like the Hon. Premier, the hon. senior member for St. John, in his reply to say is where Socialism had its origins. I would like to know if it was born in Barbados or if it is a West Indian philosophy. Wherever you find Socialism, you are going to find Conservatism. Whether anybody likes it or not, it is a political philosophy to which some people will adhere, and no amount of ranting or raving is going to change the mind of anyone who has his own political philosophy, and the sooner that is understood the better. The louder one rants and raves, the stronger will adherents stick to their own philosophy. (Mr. WALCOTT: Some people are definitely criminals.) I am not going to take notice of asides I am a Conservative and shall remain so.

The question as to whether a matter of life and death should be decided by pettifogging officials is perhaps an important one, because it is to be pointed out to those who might misunderstand that war service in Barbados has always been voluntary. There has never been, so far as I have been aware, any question of conscription in Barbados. The people who went off to war for one reason or another went off of their own free will and volition, and I believe it will continue to be so. It will not be decided by pettifogging officials in Greatsmith Street or any other place that Barbadians should go and lay down their lives for the continuance of the status quo. When Barbados goes into Independence, whether it be in a Federation or alone, it is to be hoped and believed that war service will continue to be voluntary. So why should so much stress and emphasis be paid to this remark about the future of Barbadians? Why should this drama be drawn into it? To say that war service will depend on pettifogging officials in Greatsmith Street is to becloud the issue if the position is not put clearly before those who are within earshot. It is things like those which we have to clear up, because the mind receives one impression, especially the minds of those people who form their opinions from others -- and there are many people like that; and if the opposite opinion is not put before them for their consideration, they probably go off with the impression made upon their minds that that which they heard at first was the truth.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was just making a few prefatory remarks as I rose to my feet to second the amendment which, as you were not in the Chair, I will read for your enlightenment. It reads as follows:-

"To omit the words after "convene" and to substitute the following words therefor:-

"After the holding of elections in Barbados to decide whether Barbados shall proceed to independence, within a Federation comprised of such territories in the Eastern Caribbean as are willing to join in such an association, or alone, a conference representative of all political parties to arrange for the implementation of the decision taken and for the constitutional, financial, defence and other measures for the establishment of an independent nation at the earliest possible time."

"It gives me a great deal of pleasure to second the amendment. *(Cheers)*

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is nice to be here with you today and I am really only here because I am satisfied that my country, to say nothing of my Party, needs me on this historic occasion.
5.00 p.m.

It would probably be wise to say that I left the Hospital at three o'clock after a long session of X-rays at the X-ray department yesterday. I was told by the Sister that I am slated for an operation which would take place early next week. However, Mr. Speaker, it is supposed that this is a normal thing for me to explain. Maybe, I am suffering from a bleeding ulcer or from an inflamed stomach. These are the troubles and I have a calm manner of saying these things. However, you should not think of your own personal feeling; you should think of your feeling towards the responsibility of this country. However, I am called here on this occasion and I have no doubt that this day would probably be remembered by whispering voices down through the coming ages.

I would like to begin by saying that this meeting was called with what one would call indecent haste. The House was adjourned until the 11th of January. The Hon. Leader of the House had given Parliament the undertaking, sometime after the Resolution on Independence was given notice of, that he would appoint a day to debate the Resolution and, quite important, outside of these expectations, we were hoping to be given at least a week to ourselves to go into this question because of the number of things which have to be gone into. I wonder why it became necessary or what was turning in the minds of the Hon. Premier and the Hon. Leader of the House that they should force this date on us. Nowhere else on earth would expect that you would debate this question during the Christmas recess. A number of things which happened within recent days have indicated to us the reason for coming to us and asking us to debate this matter now. The Hon. Premier has found himself in a predicament and feels that he should rush this debate through and have this Resolution delivered to Colonial Office before the Spring Conference of the Windward and Leeward Islands.

One wonders whether the Hon. Premier who is the hon. senior member for St. John and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy have been so afraid that they now find their minds warped.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to say that I have no intention whatsoever of interrupting the hon. member, but he certainly cannot accuse other hon. members of having warped minds.

It is an infringement of Standing Orders and I ask Your Honour to invite him to withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The assertion is unfortunate and reprehensible.

Mr. MILLER: If the hon. Minister is unhappy about the remark, I think it is only too well that I withdraw it. Why are we rushing and forcing this? The way in which we are debating this advanced stage of our Constitution is regrettable. I am thinking now of the hon. senior member for St. John and what power, what right has he to assume that we should enter into a state of independence now without the atmosphere of Parliament and the people of this country behind him. Never in human history has such a thing occurred. I do not know where on earth you will expect any human being with any respect for the other fellow would think of doing a thing like that. Human dignity has been so often spared of man's indifferent attitude by those of us who think it is something so good to be close to the side of power.

The hon. senior member for St. John is seeking independence now for the people of Barbados without a Federation. This is a very simple and innocent remark, but I should like to remind him that no matter what he feels, the moment he crosses the rights of human dignity, he will find us very rigid and the spirit to fight will remain to the end.

Imagine the hon. senior member for St. John walked into this House just to interrupt the House on a point of order to tell the Speaker that he was giving notice of a motion that the hon. junior member for the City is to surrender his rights to serve in this Chamber! This type of dictatorship must never be, and we must continue in the clamour to fight against these pronouncements to destroy the right of christian democracy.

Sir, we are faced with a challenge, but I am not afraid. We have a responsibility in this country. The whole reason of rushing headlong with this is that he should go to London and hoping he gets there before the "boys" of the Windwards and the Leewards. Imagine reading the debates and reading of the Premier's haste! I do not think he is aware of the United Kingdom Government. He thinks that he is toying with some boy from Colonial Office.

This can be a relatively simple matter, but what is unfortunate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about this is the change in Constitution. We heard about this long before the last meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers was held. It was agreed by the backbenchers and the hon. Leader of the House that Barbados should go it alone.
5.10 p.m.

Imagine that in the middle of negotiations with the leaders of the territories with which you want to federate, you should insinuate desertion! Yet there is something big and great in the hearts of those men who realise the importance of Federation. Heaven knows that Barbados needs Federation, and a simple examination of the country's statistics would reveal the grim truth of the situation. In another 37 years we would have doubled our population, and this is no vain attempt to change the sympathies of those who support the Government. These are plain, statistical truths. As I was saying, Sir, in another 37 years we would have doubled our population. If we are in trouble now with a population of 250,000 people, let us look at what the state of affairs would be in another 37 years from now when we would have to support a population which would be double the figure of 250,000. The question is: How much land would have to be taken out of production in order to make provision for roads, schools, houses, shops and recreational centres. Think of what you have now for the accommodation of 250,000 people, and what you would require if and when you have twice that population. What I am saying is accepted by economists all over the world.

Wherever sugar is grown, the worker is tied to slavery. If we are tied with our sugar, how are we going to support a population of this size? There must be something referred to as national sentiment. In four of the seven territories, there were slaves who came from the same continent of Africa at about the same time. They are your brothers and sisters. There were intermarriages and relationships between these territories and that will tell you that you will never be able to separate us. Do you think that the Colonial Office would have any respect for the honourable and revered gentleman for St. John in his pressing for Independence for Barbados alone? I could not have anything at all against Independence; for all my life there has been that unchanged desire to be a citizen of a nation. For all my life that has been so. Do you think that the members of the Barbados Labour Party would ever say that they are against an Independent State? That could not be so because, for more than one hundred years, we have contemplated the coming into being of an Independent Federation.

As to the reference by the hon senior member for St. John to the Throne Speech, it was arranged that a Conference should take place in London in the month of July. These are facts and you cannot toy with them. We might well be reminded that if we make a mistake like this, it would take about ten years to correct it. We knew when Trinidad came out of the Federation what that meant to her; we knew also what it meant to Jamaica when she left the Federation. Dr. Eric Williams is regarded as a great Trinidadian, but I am quite willing to say that he is by no means a West Indian. I say that in spite of the books which he wrote and which I read about three or four times — "The Negro in the Caribbean" and "Capitalism and Slavery". When I see Dr. Williams, I want to salute him for his knowledge of West Indian History; but recent events certainly reveal that the man is a Trinidadian with little interest in the West Indies. I remember that Mr. Gomes did have some feeling about him when an attempt was made to close the Conference in Jamaica. The hon. senior member for St. Peter and myself went to Jamaica on another Conference and used our support to take Eric Williams into the Caribbean. I am quite sure, Sir that it must have been about 4 o'clock in the morning when I was in the shower that my good friend pressed his way through the door and asked me: "Freddie, where do you and Frank Walcott stand in this matter?" I said that we are supporting Eric Williams. Sir, I am probably thinking of ten years or so ago because he was sharing a crumb with our hungry brothers and sisters in the West Indies, he thought that he should leave us.
5.20 p.m.

We were really never obsessed with that tribal society sometimes so marked and clannish in that country. I remember Burnham joining with Jagan when it was first hoped that British Guiana would go into Federation. He said "no", British Guiana has a destiny, a destiny of its own. Now we are trafficking between British Guiana and Barbados to establish a trade area. These things are unusual, but now you are crushing him, like some nice smelling bouquet, to your bosom and attempting to negotiate terms for a free trade area with British Guiana, and ignoring those whom we love in the seven territories of the Windwards and Leewards. The whole mad rush of this debate is hoping to save face. That is the most you can hope for, but this is the Colonial Office that he is dealing with. He thinks he can be as bumptious or cocksure as Dr. Jagan to overturn the whole British Empire, who, I am told is negotiating for a place in Havana to open his dentist trade; he probably will practise dentistry in Cuba. Those are the things we want to understand.

What can the hon. senior member for St. John expect? He can only be left on a carpet. This is the Colonial Office he is dealing with, and if you want to see their attitude, just take a glance quickly at the White Paper proposals for the West Indies, and if you want to share with me the little chapter on human rights, I will quote from this document.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I enquire what the document is?

Mr. MILLER: It is a reprint of the White Paper by the Colonial Office on the proposals for the Windwards and Leewards which have been circulated to all members.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member knows that he may make reference to it, but not actually read it as part of his address.

Mr. MILLER: I am only too well aware, but this is a document which has been accepted by Parliament known as

the White Paper. All I need do is to ask the Clerk to allow me to read the document which he is bound to have. I just want to read the chapter on fundamental rights and freedom. This is just a reprint, an exact copy from the White Paper which has been circulated and which is a document of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me here and now say that I have not got a copy of that document. The hon. member can make reference to it, and making reference to it does not mean reading it as part of his address.

Mr. MILLER: If that is your ruling, Sir, with undying and .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I may explain further to the hon. member that I have seen other members with documents before them to which they made reference, and at the same time giving the date and reading them as part of the address.

Mr. MILLER: If that is your ruling, I will unswervingly bow to it. This is a reprint of what has been released to the territories.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to make it easy for the hon. member by saying that he can make reference to it, but not read it as part of the address.

Mr. MILLER: Now I have had the greatest happiness in my life in studying constitutions, and I believe that the British Government has written more Constitutions for Canada, New Zealand, Australia and all territories of Africa, and if there is a ruling power which understands how to rule, it is Her Majesty's Government. I have paid much attention to the Constitution under which we are now operating. I sat side by side with Dr. Cummins at the Conference and party to all that was said and done in the present Barbados Constitution on internal self-Government.

You will remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Abraham Lincoln in the Declaration of Freedom and Independence of the United States of America. Oh how lovely and how sweet it is to be reminded of what was pouring out of that man's soul when he wrote the Declaration of Independence – all men born equal under God -- but now never in any of the British Constitutions was this written, and to read it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is as sweet as listening to the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I want to remind the hon. member that I am not trying to present any difficulty, but if he reads the document it will have to be made a document of the House.

Mr. MILLER: It is so difficult to make reference to it. Why is this chapter included in the proposals? The whole idea in this is that the Colonial Office saw the need to protect and to safeguard its citizens.

"The Consitution will include a chapter which will prescribe the fundamental rights and freedom to be enjoyed by the people of the territory. These rights and freedoms will include the following:-

(a) the right to live;
(b) the right of personal liberty;
(c) protection from slavery and forced labour;
(d) protection from inhuman treatment;
(e) protection from deprivation of property;"

It takes a big heart who has paid some attention to Socrates' democracy to feel these things, and to say the least, to spell them out in a constitution. May I continue with your pleasure, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

"(f) protection against arbitrary search of entry upon property;
(g) the right to a fair trial in criminal and civil proings;
(h) freedom of conscience;
(i) freedom of expression;"

If I said "Grantley Adams", I would probably lose my head.

"(j) freedom of assembly;
(k) freedom of association;
(l) freedom of movement;
(m) freedom from discrimination on grounds of race, political opinions, colour or creed."

When these entrenched in the constitutional proposals I am sure that the Colonial Office was thinking of Barbados, and history and time along will confirm this. This has never been seen even in the African constitutions which I have found so much joy in reading.
5.30 p.m.

It has never been seen anywhere fundamental freedom is entrenched in the constitution. It is done deliberately.

I wonder if the Hon. Premier knows that we have given the Prime Minister of Rhodesia the surprise of his life; we have Jagan of British Guiana like a baby; the only thing he didn't do was to fire the Queen. Look what has happened to the Prime Minister of Rhodesia! You never get around a referendum or an election. Does the Hon. senior member for St. John understand this? Does he know that the Colonial Office knows that he has many Cabinet resignations on this specific point alone? Is he aware that the only Minister without portfolio in his Cabinet resigned with considerable loss to himself because he did not want to depart from a West Indian Unity and because of this mockery of Independence alone? Is he hoping to resurrect Federation?

Sir, you can talk on this for the rest of the night. What is the reason that we have not given the opportunity to the people of this country to decide this by referendum or by election? Do you mean that all they must do is to stand, form fours, salute and sing "God Save The Queen" and vote in favour of Independence? I repeat, does the Hon. Premier understand that Colonial Office knows the position where at least two of the member of this Party -- one of them a member of that Party before the Premier was a member – have resigned? Does he realise what was the position just before Christmas when three members of his Party out of the thirteen or fourteen he has in this House left the Party because of this? They actually signed the amendment. The Hon. Premier was in here a few weeks ago when the number of his Party was down to ten. He would have lost then. He should have had some measure of self-respect and resign.

What can he tell Colonial Office? I beg you, he would come back here a dejected soul. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not thinking now of my ulcers; this is my country and I am not afraid. I have the tenacity and the courage which it takes. The half has never yet been told, and to think of the ugly function when he reads this important debate and realises that all the people of this country does not stand by what he call his second eleven. The Hon. Premier himself did not come in this Chamber nor did he get on a platform and discuss independence to the masses before a group which he regards as his second eleven got on a platform and discussed it. On one occasion, in Baxters Road that group was discussing it and the Leader of the House was in the midst of a grog shop near by. It is that type of indignity which we must face. This is what the people of this country must be made aware of.

Sir, the whole burning truth is that you will have to satisfy the British Government about this question. The first question which they are going to ask you is: why do you not want a referendum? I wonder if the Hon. Premier thinks that Colonial Office would not remember the hundreds of former things which has happened since he begun his regime. The first important thing that happened in this House after he begun his regime was when the Marshal, a pious and simple person, was crushed. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you remember that.
5.40 p.m.

If you had any conscience of human dignity you would be silent. You will remember how he created it because

he thought he would destroy it. The country gave the Barbados Labour Party five seats in this House, and night and day there were fires. He delayed the appointment of the Leader of the Opposition for six weeks and then when our number was reduced by two members, he appointed the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I was saying Sir, that after the membership of the Barbados Labour Party had been reduced by two members, then the Leader of the Opposition was appointed. This decision was made in opposition to the wishes of the electorate of this country. After the Barbados Labour Party had lost several seats in the Election, the question remained as to which of the groups would be more likely to run the Government of the country. The great pity was that the present Leader of the Opposition for over four years made a childish milk and water attempt to oppose and he was just like a little boy sitting beside the lunch basket of his master. He ate the sandwiches one by one and when he got to the last one and opened his mouth, this is what happened. *(ASIDES).* It was only because the hon. member realised that he was in a strong position and the Opposition felt that it was in thier interest to play the boy and be able to surrender themselves. *(ASIDES).* This is something they wanted done. It was said that they would direct the Opposition against the Government. Do you think that any prevarication from the fundamental rights of the people could be regarded as a secret? Sir John Stow .....

Mr. SPEAKER: I should just like to remind the hon. member of Standing Order 26 (8) It says this:-

"Her Majesty's or the Governor's name shall not be used to influence the House".

Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you would remember the removal of respectable members from all the Boards because they were elected by the Barbados Labour Party. It was not a question of suitability or attainments; it was a question of the uncalled-for removal of these members. It was not a question as to whether the Boards could succeed. When you tell me that you cannot trust them -- you will remember, Sir, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education...

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. George has said that this Government has removed all the respectable gentlemen from membership of the Boards. Is the hon. member saying that all the members who are members of the Boards now are disrespectful?

Mr. SPEAKER: That cannot be by way of a question, but the hon. member has sought his point of order by way of a question.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, you know that we cannot change these things. You will remember the appointment of the Personal Aide to the Premier, Mr. Nigel Barrow. You will remember when that money was asked for in parliament. Do you remember these things? We could have saved that money; we could have served the country better by permitting that gentleman to come into the service of his own choice.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that what the hon. member is now saying is something which is off the point of the subject matter of this Resolution.

Mr. MILLER: We are talking about the Conference in London.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I follow that with unswerving devotion. You may be shocked to hear certain things. To me it was a matter of little moment to think of the hon. gentleman and the magnitude of his office and responsibility to his country. All of this would show up his conduct. One day when he was going up Crumpton Street, the Premier saw my car parked on the left hand side of the road. When he got to the gate leading to Harrison College there was a Policewoman on duty and she was called over to the side of the car and instructed to report Freddie Miller for parking too close to the corner.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that is totally irrelevant to the question now before the House.

Mr. MILLER: We are talking about the question of Independence which must only be, and can only be, founded on democracy. If you are prepared to do so, let us examine the concept of democracy to which I know we shall forever belong. If we are prepared to do that, we cannot, in any way attempt to push back the hands of the clock.
5.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member to forget the police, except in so far as an independent Police Force is concerned.

Mr. MILLER: It is clear that the Police Force is not under the direction of the Commissioner of Police, but the Premier; and when we develop a Police state, I do not know you will ever want to be associated with it.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that Barbados should miss this great opportunity of a Federation. All that could happen at the moment is a possible temporary suspension until the electors of this country in the interest of this country remove the hon. gentleman. Imagine Sir Arthur Lewis with shoes off and relaxing in shirt and shorts writing in "The Agony of the Eight" these words:-

"There is no fundamental obstacle in the way. All the existing leaders, with the exception of Mr. Crompton and Mr. Blaize, have been committed to this federation for the past three and a half years."

There are no insurmountable difficulties. There is nothing insuperable that could block a federation other than that Barbados as host country and with the Premier as host, walked out on the leaders of the territories, anxious to have a final discussion knowing that they were going to London in June for an Independent Federation. You will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that maybe when the delegation returns and no doubt in failure, this experiment will make this country poorer. What we are happy about is that the members of the other territories are still anxiously awaiting an opportunity for Federation. Even if it were possible that the Colonial Office should go mad and Lancaster House should fall in, we know from the dossier on the Government that he would not be permitted to serve in the Commonwealth of Nations, and if that was possible, it would not be three meetings before they asked Barbados to send an alternate delegate. This dwarf shell, haunted with the belief of being a little Hitler, would be dealing with huge continental, political giants, and we know that he could not meet on any of the Committees of the United Nations three times before Barbados would be asked to send another delegate; but he will never reach there. His record of four years does not indicate any respect. After the conquering nations had tottered, they still ran and joined hands with the British because of the traditional principles of the Anglo-Saxons in their way of justice. You will remember the last march of my friend, Napoleon Bonaparte, who retreated at the gates of Moscow. You will remember Socrates; but whatever was left of his work on democracy, it was Britain who swallowed, digested and applied it.

Mr. Speaker, you have a picture which he is likely to present to the Colonial Office. You are afraid to have the country say whether it should go to Independence alone. Mr. Speaker, I think I have satisfied my commitment to myself, to my country and to my Party. I will be back to vote. My task has not been an easy one. Most of the time, I have been in pain, but, Sir, I want you to accept this as a sensible response on so historic an occasion. Those whom the gods despise, Mr. Speaker, live on in smiles.

With those few remarks, I say "Thank you" and "God bless you" for giving me an opportunity to serve my country on this occasion. I thank you. (Cheers.)

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. George explained to this Honourable Chamber that he was in pain and agony, and despite that, he came here to serve his people, his country and his party. He has done something else. He has set us on this side in pain to listen to the garbled utterances which he has brought here this evening.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, will the Hon. Minister give way? I claim the attention of the House with a very simple request. Is the Hon. Minister discussing Independence for Barbados alone?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has just started, and he is making his introductory remarks. That is not a point of order.

Mr. MILLER: Then this is an introduction to Independence for Barbados alone?
6.00 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Resolution before the House is a Resolution in favour of Barbados going into Independence alone. The hon. junior member for St. George who claims to have left hospital to come here and speak on this Resolution has said absolutely nothing about Independence, whether Barbados should go into Independence alone or not. He has spoken of Federation, but he has not put forward any strong reasons why there should be a Federation. He just talked around the clock, like other hon. members on the other side.

Sir, I am going to pick to pieces some of the misrepresentations made by hon. members in this debate. I shall begin by dealing with the hon. seior member for the City. He pointed out in his remarks that for three and a half years the countries of the Eastern Caribbean had been engaged in Federation negotiations, and his Party knew nothing that went on behind the closed doors at Sherbourne. How, then since the hon. member's Party knew nothing of what went on behind the closed doors of Sherbourne could the accusation be made by hon. members on that side that it was because of the representation of the Barbados Government by the Hon. Premier that the federal negotiations have been broken up?

He contended that Mr. Crompton wanted to have 90% of the cakes, that is to say, 90% of the money to be spent on the "little six". That is what the hon. senior member for St. Michael said. He asked is it fair to ask Barbadians who are about the hardest working people in the Caribbean to work and contribute funds to the Federation whereby 90% of the funds would be spent on underveloped territories and thereby reducing the money to be spent on Barbados?

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never mentioned anything about St. Lucia and that we should spend 90% of our taxes on St. Lucia. I said if we were to do that we would only be reducing ourselves.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What the hon. member said was a point which I made. The Hon. Minister who is speaking does not usually speak in that vein. He said that my Party knew nothing of the White Paper because we did not know what went on behind closed doors. How then could we say that the Barbadian delegation to the conference was against Federation? I said over and over again that all we knew about it and what went on was when the Barbados newspapers came out with the headline that the Hon. Premier had walked out of the conference. What I did say was this, for the first time he said that "I stood out".

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: He never said so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I withdraw that he said "I stood out". Mr. Speaker, just give me a little chance, if you do not mind. I understood that the hon. member said so. I made it quite clear that the time we knew of it was when it was published in the newspapers and from this I said that the first time he told us of what happened was when the information was sent to the Press.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have not mentioned anything about the hon. senior member for the City. I said that I was speaking on a point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Michael, and these points were raised by the hon. senior member for St. Michael before the hon. senior member for the City was in his place today.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know if the hon. member, being a young Minister, is dealing with this Resolution. It seems to me as if he is replying. If he is replying, I would just like to inform him that the hon. members over here have not finished speaking yet. I would like to find out if he is speaking on the Resolution or replying to hon. members over here.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. junior member for St. Andrew in his speech makes reference to what other hon. members have said, he is entitled to make references on what the previous speakers have said on the last meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. The right to reply may be exercised by the mover of the Resolution. Let the hon. junior member for St. Andrew continue.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was in this Honourable Chamber long enough to know that every hon. member has the right to speak so long as he catches the Speaker's eyes. Is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph implying that I should not speak? Is he implying that he or all the hon. members over on that side should speak before I speak?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I was referring to the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. The hon. senior member for St. Michael referred to the fact that Mr. Compton wanted 90% of the money spent on the "Little Six". This is in the official report taken down.
6.10 p.m.

I am saying that it would not be fair to the taxpayers of Barbados.....

Mr. SEALEY: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I did not say that it was right to give Mr. Compton 90% of our money. I never said it was right for us to give that to him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am still saying that it would not be fair to ask the taxpayers of this colony to contribute 90% of the money when the bulk of that money is to be spent in developing the territories in the Leeward and Windward Islands. That is what the hon. senior member for St. Michael said in the course of his remarks. The hon. member also said that we were discussing Federation for three and a half years and he questioned why, as the Premier was so keen on Federation, was it that he did not give this country Federation in 1962. For the same reason that hon. members did not think that a trial should be made at Federation in 1962 when the last Federation broke up, the Premier thought that another trial should be made at Federation. We have tried at Federation; we have had Federal negotiations for over three and one half years and there was no agreement reached. Since we have fought to renew a stronger type of Federation for three and one half years with little or no agreement being reached, why is it that hon. members' time should be taken up in continuing with Federal negotiations when it was crystal clear that the Eastern Caribbean Territories had no intention to coming together politically? I contend that what the Eastern Caribbean Territories wanted, what is needed in the Eastern Caribbean Colonies, is Regional co-operation and that can only be obtained primarily through economic co-operation which the Government of Barbados, the Government of British Guiana and the Government of Antigua have decided to initiate by way

of a free trade area, not only for those territories but for all who wish to come into this Agreement.

We, I mean the Governments of Antigua, British Guiana and Barbados, came together and signed an Agreement because it was thought that since it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the territories to come together politically, what would be more beneficial for the area would be for them to come together financially. The preamble to the Agreement was published after our first meeting in British Guiana and it reads as follows:-

"The Governments of Antigua, Barbados and British Guiana

Sharing a common determination to fulfil, within the shortest possible time, the hopes and aspirations of their peoples and the peoples of other Caribbean countries for full employment and improved living standards;

Conscious that these goals can most rapidly be attained by the use of available human and other resources and by sustained development;

Aware that the broadening of the domestic markets from the elimination of barriers of trade between the territories is a prerequisite to such development;

Convinced that the elimination of such barriers to trade can best be achieved by the immediate establishment of a free trade area and the ultimate creation of a Customs Union and a viable economic ability for all the Caribbean territories who so desire it, have agreed as follows:....."

It goes on to say that this Agreement is hereby established and it goes on to point out the benefits to be gained from the establishment of a Caribbean Free Trade area. That is the approach which the Government has to Regional Co-operation, because after we had fought from 1947 for a Federation and failed and negotiations began for another Federation which continued for three and a half years without reaching any reasonable agreement, it was discovered that for these territories to come together they should first begin on an economical basis.

Hon. members who represent the Conservative Party have failed to allow the community to know that they are members of the United Chambers of Commerce and they are trying to establish certain trade arrangements among the territories. I had the occasion to speak to the Incorporated Chambers of Commerce a few weeks ago, and this has been the aim of these Chambers. Even in the remarks which were made on the occasion of the coming together of the Incorporated Chambers of Commerce, it was emphatically pointed out that the most desirable thing for the territories was that they should come together economically and that there should be one common aim where that is concerned.

6.20 p.m.

They praised the Government that actually made the start in establishing a free trade area; they acknowledged the fact that it was, if not impossible, highly improbable for the territories to come together politically, because over the years they have tried it. It has been tried time and time again with nothing but failure, and therefore it was thought that the approach to a Caribbean Economic Community or Caribbean Association is through an association in trade which would ultimately lead to a customs union, and the aims and aspirations of the people in the area would have been met to some extent. That is why our Resolution is framed in this way. After regional economic co-operation among the territories is achieved, the wicket is then rolled for further co-operation.

I referred earlier, Mr. Speaker, to the objects of this Caribbean Free Trade Area which are: "to provide for the expansion and diversification of trade in the area of the association; to encourage the progressive development of the economies of the area; to ensure that trade between member territories takes place in conditions of fair competition; to foster the harmonious development of Caribbean trade and its liberalisation by the removal of barriers to it."

Hon. members went to the length and breadth of this country saying that Independence for Barbados alone would mean a reduction in trade with the other territories of the Caribbean. They said there would be so much trade lost to Barbados; but I want to point out to hon. members that Trinidad pulled out from the West Indian Federation in 1962, and between then and 1963 trade between Trinidad and the Eastern Caribbean increased by over $1 million, and I have the figures here to prove it. How then could members say that Independence would reduce trade between Barbados and the other territories? Trinidad pulled out of the Federation and became an independent nation, and trade was increased from $8 million to $9 million a year.

Mr. SEALEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us where Trinidad got that trade from.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I sympathise with the hon. member. The hon. member will remember that in 1963 during the windfall period when Barbados was trying to sell some of its sugar to St. Lucia, we asked them to sign an agreement to take sugar after that from us, but they refused to sign the agreement with us who were then carrying on federal negotiations, and they bought the sugar from Trinidad. Yet these people walked about the length and breadth of this country saying that we should take Barbados' money and spend on St. Lucians and other people who have no uses for us. They should be ashamed. As recently as yesterday one of the best bands in Barbados went to St. Lucia and was well received by the foreigners who were there, despite the fact that certain hon. members went down canvassing the views of the leaders of certain territories.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the junior member for St. Andrew referred just now to the fact that some time within the last two years when St. Lucia wanted sugar, they bought it from Trinidad in preference to Barbados. I merely want to say that the price offered St. Lucia by Trinidad for that sugar was very much lower than what Barbados sugar would have cost.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, but it is a matter which may well be raised if and when the hon. member is speaking.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, you will always get that from certain hon. members. But the point I was making is that it is not fair to say that we are going to lose trade with these territories, because if they want our goods and we supply them at a reasonable price, they will buy our products, because they have raw materials which we have to buy from them. If they do not buy our goods, we will not buy their raw materials. They have raw materials which they have to sell, and in any area where prices are favourable, trade must continue, and that is how we counteract this. We are willing to have any of them in on an economic basis, but since they have failed miserably to come together politically, we have adopted a different approach, and our approach is to bring them together by regional economic co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue tomorrow.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until Thursday, 6th January, at 12 noon.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and MR. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

6.32 p.m.

On re-assembling:

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I observe there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member. Let the Bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, the Minister of Trade and Labour, was addressing the Chair.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I began my address yesterday by stating that it was my intention to pick to pieces the points made by hon. members on the other side. I have already dealt with the points made by the hon. senior member for St. Michael. I went on to state that what Barbados needs as the initial step to securing co-operation with the Eastern Caribbean is a sort of economic association, and I pointed out then that despite all that was said about regional co-operation, despite the writings of Dr. Eric Williams, despite the vain attempts to have regional co-operation by a Federation since 1947 and even before then, despite the fact that there was a Federation formed in 1948 which was killed by some of the associates and colleagues of members on the other side of the House, an attempt was made at resuscitating a form of federation between the Little Eight, which attempt lasted for three and a half years; but this attempt proved to be fruitless because of the inability of the Governments of the Eastern Caribbean to reach agreement on certain aspects of the Federation, and because of the fact that the British Government tacitly implied that the financial burden of these islands would fall on Barbados since the British Government refused to talk finance with the territories.

The surveys carried out by Miss Ursula Hicks and Dr. Carleen O'Loughlin have plainly pointed out to us in these parts what a burden Federation would be to the islands; and since the Government of Great Britain has refused to talk finance, it means that if Barbados was stupid enough to go into a federation with these islands, despite the fact that some members of the Barbados Government are dedicated to Federation and are full-blooded West Indians, we should put our house in order and see that a federation should not be overwhelmingly at the expense of the taxpayers of Barbados. When we consider that currently the grants-in-aid to the territories in the Eastern Caribbean by the British Government are approximately $7.8 million, and we consider that the British Government is not even making a contribution to the extent of the grants-in-aid which are now being given to the territories -- as clearly brought out in "The Agony of the Eight" on which members on the other side prided themselves and congratulated the author -- we can clearly see that the only answer to this is that Barbados would be saddled with this $7.8 million a year, in addition to whatever it takes to establish and run the affairs of a federal administration.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown is not in his seat, because he has attempted to represent his views on Federation by what Professor Arthur Lewis has written in "The Agony of the Eight"; but that hon. member seemed not to have read the entire booklet. He referred to certain pages in the booklet, but he failed to refer to the salient points which give nothing to Barbados but to step on to Independence. This booklet on page 21 points out that Barbados has little to gain from a federation with the Windwards and Leewards. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown spoke of the small islands, but he missed the bus, in that in one breath he points out that Sir Arthur Lewis spoke of the need for co-operation amongst these islands, when just two pages further he points out that Barbados is a special case.

12.10 p.m.

In the entire booklet the emphasis as regards Barbados is that the Premier of Barbados was dedicated to Federation and that Federation was almost thrust upon him. He points out that it makes little difference to the Colony of Barbados. Further in the "Agony of the Eight" Professor Arthur Lewis pointed out that political independence must be preceded by economic independence. He points out in the same "Agony of the Eight" that Barbados was financially independent many years ago, whereas these islands have had to depend on assistance and grants-in-aid from the British Treasury.

Now, the federal talks centred around an independent Federation; and if, as Sir Arthur Lewis puts it, and as the hon. junior member for the City pointed out, this gentleman is one of the greatest experts in the area and that he respects his views and so on, these other territories are not financially independent, whereas Barbados has been for years financially independent, then the hon. junior member for the City is confusing his own argument.

Sir Arthur Lewis points out that political independence must be preceded by economic and financial independence. The talks centred around an independent Federation. Do you not see that Sir Arthur Lewis was putting a case for the independence of Barbados? Barbados is the one territory which can only be independent politically. If the federal talks centred around an independent Federation and this is what the Seven or the Six or the Five wanted, it would mean that Barbados would have to make the other islands of the Caribbean financially independent. It would mean that Barbados would have to carry the burden of the other territories which wanted to come into a federation.

Is it fair to the poor taxpayers of Barbados who have made sacrifices to see that you have proper schools in Barbados, proper means of communications, proper roads -- is it fair to ask those taxpayers to make further sacrifices to make St. Lucia, St. Vincent and all the other islands independent? Sir Arthur Lewis is the authority whom the hon. junior member for the City has praised on economic knowledge academically, and Sir Arthur Lewis points out that we must be financially independent before we think of any political independence.

My point is that what Barbados is doing is to establish a sort of economic independence not only for Barbados but for the other territories when we resort to a free trade area, and I have read out to this Honourable Chamber yesterday afternoon what would be the benefits of a free trade area. The three territories -- Antigua, British Guiana, and Barbados -- have joined in the free trade area, but the other islands are not precluded from joining. As a matter of fact, they had been notified to participate in the discussion. St. Vincent sent observers to the first Conference on a free trade area in these parts. St. Vincent has done no more up to this moment, but the other territories have not shown any interest. They have not said that they are willing to participate in the free trade talks.

The establishment of a free trade area is more than the building of the economy in these parts. It means that industries in Barbados or in the other territories which form part of this agreement can be assured of a market in these areas that form part of the free trade area. It means that an industry in Barbados would have access to the Guianese market without any sort of tariff barrier. It means that industries in British Guiana would be able to enter the Barbados market or any other territory that joins this free trade area without any tariff barrier. Hence the amount of trade carried on between the territories in the area would inevitably increase and, as a matter of fact, they would have high tariff barriers against similar produce manufactured outside of the free trade area which are sold in the free trade area.

This is the first step towards economic co-operation, economic association or regional co-operation in the territories. Dr. Eric Williams was projecting an economic community for years in these areas. Despite the fact that he has written about it and projected it, he has not taken the initial step in establishing an economic community within the areas. Instead, Dr. Eric Williams has withdrawn from what he considered was a waste of time in the Federation which was dissolved in 1962. At the same time he was projecting a sort of Caribbean economic community and he has withdrawn from the political association. He sees the need in these parts, as any intelligent person would see, for an economic association.

Sir, I cannot understand how hon. members on the other side can state on the floor of the House that there will be a loss of trade in the area if Barbados goes independent. How can there be a loss of trade when we are encouraging the same territories to come together in the free trade area?
12.20 p.m.

There must be an increase of trade. There may be a question of zoning of certain industrial development in territories which are most suited to a particular type of industrial development, but the position is that trade must increase. Despite the fact that Trinidad went independent, some territories which the people on the other side say we should join in a Federation with, have pulled away from Barbados and they have increased their trade with Trinidad. That is what hon. members on the other side have been preaching for months now, and they would say that we should go back to the country and say that they are representing the people in their best interests — a bunch of hypocrites.

Mr. SPEAKER: As to that expression which has been used by the hon. member.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am referring to the people who have been preaching.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But not, I assume, to any member of this Chamber.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am referring to the people who told the people of Barbados that there would be a loss of trade in the area. After all, Sir, if you are accustomed to eating bread and somebody offers you cake, you would necessarily go for the cake. When you consider the fact that Barbados is much more advanced than these territories, when you consider the fact that Barbados is different from these territories, you must consider that there must be an influx of people from these territories to an overpopulated Barbados. We have that already. I have some statistics from the Labour Department which show that at least 25% of the people who are registered at the Labour Department as being unemployed are not Barbadians at all. They are people from outside the colony. They are from St. Lucia, St. Vincent, St. Kitts, Dominica, Cuba, British Guiana, Bermuda and Grenada. They are registered at the Labour Department for employment in Barbados. They are not employed in Barbados now, but the taxpayers of this country are asked to feed them. We are asked to feed able-bodied men and women who want to live on the money of the taxpayers of this country. That is what hon. members on the other side of the House are asking us to support. It is all right for a member of a parish to come down here and when he sees somebody in this parish he shouts: "Look at my Daddy" because that person feeds him. I am not opposed to the money of the people of Barbados being spent on Barbadians; I am a Barbadian first and anybody else after. I did not sit at the Federal talks here because I was sceptical about that. We have people who are too proud to go and beg someone for a meal; but other people who are willing to work cannot get any work to do because of the people who have come to this country. They are the people from the territories which we are asked to federate with, and when a domestic servant says that she will not work for $12.00 a week those people will work for $6.00 a week. The same people whom we are asked to federate with come to Barbados, and instead of allowing the people of Barbados to get a respectable wage for their work, they will tell you that they will work for $6.00 a week when employees in Barbados are asking for a wage of $12.00 per week. The result of the influx of these people in Barbados has resulted in a lower standard of living for this country because what these people can live on, Barbadians cannot live on.

These people are not represented by the Barbados Workers' Union. They encourage all sorts of immoral practices in the colony, and the Barbadians are not getting any work. You have an industry established in Barbados and how many people, how many Barbadians, are employed by it? We have to consider the standard of living which has been secured for the people of this country; I do not begrudge the average Barbadian who is demanding what is his worth, but the employer prefers to employ a worker who will work for less wages. Hon. members on the other side of the House have not got any shame, and they are telling us that we must federate with the people of these islands. Mr. Speaker, the only thing that we can get from a Federation with these people is a reduction in the living standards of the people of this colony.
12.30 p.m.

We have made a pledge to the people of this country to improve their standard of living which they are proud of, not to reduce it. If you take a look in the Castries area, you will see the housing conditions under which the people who come here live. Go in Nelson Street and see how they live, with twenty of them in one 2'X3' house. Public health must deteriorate in this country, and every year we have got to increase the vote for Public Health, and provide hospitalisation for a lot of foreigners who come to Barbados and reduce the standard of living and the standard of Public Health. Some do not know about going to a water toilet, but are accustomed to going in the yard, and this is what some of them do; so the children of this country must suffer. We have not had a recent case of typhoid fever; but if we encourage these standards, we will have an epidemic of typhoid in the area where they live. We will suffer from hookworm and other social diseases because of the fact that they have brought their poor living standards to this country. Yet people on the other side in the Opposition Party are walking about this country telling people that we must federate with them.

Mr. Speaker, Barbados is economically viable to go to Independence, and to Independence we will go.

Now the hon. junior member for Bridgetown has gloried in the fact that he is a Conservative and will remain a Conservative. I am not saying that the hon. member is a stooge for the white Conservatives of this country, but I do not consider anyone who is a stooge for the Conservatives to be a Conservative. The point about it is that I do not see how a black man in this country can profess to be a Conservative. He can be used by the Conservatives, but he can never be a Conservative, not when he considers what the Conservatives have done to the black race of this country and in the Eastern Caribbean.

Hon. members on the other side spoke about the loss of trade which Barbados would suffer by going independent alone. Let us ask ourselves one question. Who carries on the business of this country? Then let us ask ourselves another question. Whom do the members on the other side — some of whom profess to be Labourites — represent? Are they representing the masses of this country when they talk about the loss of trade to the White man or the Big Sixes of this country who have dominated and want to continue to dominate the country? We are not interested in them. We are interested in the fact that every Barbadian should be a man in his own country. Every Barbadian should have a country, and Barbados should be that country.

Let me go back to history and think of some of the kings in the Middle Ages. Let us think of Henry II. Do you know why Henry II had to be dethroned in 1258? It was because he took foreigners into his country and made them his favourites. In 1258 the Poiteirus, the Provencals and the Husignals were in England and were favoured by King Henry II of England, and the result was the dethroning of King Henry. The result of the campaign by members on the other side would therefore be an expulsion from the House of Assembly when we go back to the polls, because they are doing nothing but selling out the masses of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member referred to members on the other side. Is there any member of the House who is selling out the masses of this country? I will tell the hon. member that I regard that as language which contravenes our Standing Order No. 26 (7).

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when one encourages the selling out of the masses of a country, do you think that person is fit to represent the masses of that country?

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am dealing with is the phrase "selling out" in reference to an hon. member of this Chamber.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, and put it this way. A person who goes throughout the length and breadth of this country preaching Federation, because certain people of the plantocracy and the businessmen of this country have been encouraging them to preach Federation, is a traitor to his own country, and to the people who went to the polls to elect him. It is clear as crystal that some of the people who claim to have the interests of the people at heart, and who claim not to have done anything which was not in the interest of the people are only paying lip service. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown said yesterday that he has never voted against anything which was in the interest of this country. Ask him what happened when the Tenantry Bill was introduced in this country. Ask him if he did not try to stifle debate on it and whether he did not want it postponed so that the notices served on the people in Richmond Gap would have come into effect before the passing of this bit of legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member imputing improper motives to any member?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not imputing improper motives; I am giving the facts. The hon. member said there was only one Bill he was against, and that was peaceful picketing. He inferred that this was something not in the interest of the masses of this country. How could he say that he never voted against anything in the interest of the people of this country when he voted against peaceful picketing, and had his name recorded in the Minutes of this House? One does not always have to vote against anything which is in the interest of the country. One can come in and speak against it and not vote, as some will do on this Independence Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to hon. members?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Do you think hon. members would be stupid enough to vote against this Resolution? They could not go back to their constituencies. Already some of them have been thrown out of their constituencies and have to go in at night when the people are asleep.

In continuing, Mr. Speaker, I will refer to the speech made by the hon. junior member for Bridgetown who spoke of the arrowroot industry and what could be done for that industry if we federated with these islands. I wonder when the hon. member last went to St. Vincent! I wonder if he knows that it is not economic to grow arrowroot in St. Vincent or those islands where arrowroot is grown.
12.40 p.m.

I wonder if he knows that the arrowroot industry is dying if it has not died already. I wonder if the hon. member knows that it is difficult to find a market for the arrowroot industry, and because of the increased price for labour it is not economically feasible to grow arrowroot any longer. The hon. member says that he can do something with the arrowroot industry. The present state of development in that area does not make it feasible for the people in that area to concentrate on arrowroot when there are other developments which are more feasible than the arrowroot industry.

The hon. member spoke about the pumice stone in Dominica and said that some people would find employment, and so on, but he does not know that the Virgin Soil in Dominica is most difficult to get at, nor is he giving any consideration to the cost involved to develop the virgin soil in Dominica. On the other hand, take the amount of Virgin Soil in British Guiana and take the amount of resources there where the free trade area is. As I pointed out in the preamble, the establishment of a free trade area is the first step Customs Union, and this would mean that at some stage or the other there would be some freedom of movement among the people involved in the free trade area. That will be one of the reasons for the association of these territories, when the people of Barbados can go to the territory of British Guiana where only one-third of the area is developed. If we have the choice between going to British Guiana and Dominica for development, it is a better choice to develop the territory which would take less money than to develop the one which seems impossible to be developed.

The hon. member spoke about cement. I wonder if the hon. member knows that cement is produced in Trinidad and that Trinidad is still trading with Venezuela. The point about it is where you can have the cheapest form of development and where the people can have the cheapest commodity, that plays a very important part in any form of industrial development in an area.

I find it difficult to understand the premises on which hon. members on the other side have been arguing this question of Federation. I sat here and asked myself this question: "Do some of us have a conscience?" Some of us do not have a mind of our own. Some of us have a mind that we must be the slaves of the Big Six of this country and that we must always fight for them and put their cause. That is what some of the other hon. members on the other side have been doing. They come here and fight the cause of the Big Six today, and tomorrow they are kicked in their rear parts by the same people whose cause they have come to the House and championed. They champion the cause of those people. Let them lose a seat in the Legislature and you would see what will happen to them. They would be passed as if they were never known. Black people like myself can say that they are championing the cause of this business community and the plantocracy, when other coloured people in this country have had to fight against those people for years! The entire coloured community of this country is aware of the struggles which have been fought against Capitalism and the keeping down of the masses of this country by their fellowmen; yet, you hear some of them saying that they are Conservatives. The only reason why they are Conservatives is because they are championing the cause of people who have no uses for them. Ask yourself the question, if they were not who they are, if they could go and enter the front door of the people whose cause they are championing. Why is it that some of their own brethern cannot go to the front door if they want to have a conversation with them? When they want to have a conversation with them and they go to their homes, these people tell them: "Sonnie, come around to the back." The black people like myself are saying that they are Conservatives.

Sir, I would tell you a story. Conservatism was thrust upon me in 1956. I was on a pasture teaching some children and giving them some training in athletics, although some hon. members do not think a school was initiated by me in those days. I was known from training those poor black people like myself, and I was introduced to two gentlemen and I was told that I am now a Young Conservative and I would be a co-Chairman of this Young Conservative group. They had a white man on one side; and because I was depending on certain people for a living, I was forced to be co-chairman. Sir, I do not interfere with certain people; but when they come to insult me, I will let the cat out of the bag. In 1956, I did not know what being a co-chariman would have pushed me into, but now I understand; and anythink which the hon. member can raise in here, I have the ability to understand.
12.50 p.m.

Every night a car with a white man would come to my door and carry me to some part of the country, but after 1956 they did not come. I was unknown after the campaign in 1956. They did not know that when they wanted to do something for the masses of the people, I was thinking more of the job and I was thinking of my conscience. I am not ashamed to confess that, Mr. Speaker, I am still speaking on the Resolution relating to Independence for Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad of that assurance.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: They are saying that they do not want Independence for Barbados, but they want Independence within a Federation. They want that because the Capitalists of this country are afraid of Independence for Barbados alone under the present leadership. That is

all it means. They are saying that they are not against Independence, but they are against Independence under the leadership of Errol Barrow. Do you want the people of this country to be where they were 20 years ago? We do not want that. We feel that the things which are now enjoyed by the plantocracy should not be denied the masses. We want to make every Barbadian feel that this is a country which belongs to him, and it does not belong to six groups of people who have been for years dominating the Capitalists group of this country.

Some time after Barbados issued a White Paper there was some stir. Certain members who were at one time associated with the Government, took it upon themselves to go down the islands saying that they are canvassing the opinions of the Chief Ministers. I was in Dominica when it was told Mr. LeBlanc that certain people, who had been cut off from association with the Democratic Labour Party on the issue of Independence of Barbados alone, said that they were going down on the Federal Boats to see these Chief Ministers to put them up against these Barbadians by canvassing. He told me that it was his intention to declare any of them who came to Dominica a prohibited immigrant. He failed, however, because when he heard about the matter next morning these people were in Dominica already. Mr. Joshua, the Chief Minister of St. Vincent, complimented Barbados on its decision to go Independent alone and so did Mr. LeBlanc. Those who were opposed to the White Paper which was issued by the Government of Barbados, were going to these Ministers in order to canvass their opinion, and these same Chief Ministers of these islands have complimented Barbados for going into Independence alone. We want to have our representation overseas looked after by Barbadians, and not by people who do not know Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago we were suffering from the lack of doctors in Barbados. Because the recruitment of doctors had to pass through the Colonial Office, several doctors who would have been appointed by the Civil Service Commission of Barbados, were not made available. Eventually Barbados had to go without the services of these doctors who were appointed by the Public Service Commission of the colony. That is what people are opposed to, and so they must be kept tied to the political strings of England.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying earlier, it is a fact that a Federation with these colonies mean an influx into Barbados of people of the working classes who would undermine the employees of Barbados. Barbados has about 18,000 unemployed, according to the statistics which have been revealed by the Labour Department. What hon. members on that side would like to see is that these people remain unemployed whereby they would have to depend upon them for a daily living at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, and when an Election comes along, they will be able to say: "My Daddy gave me a meal when I was not working." However, Sir, they do not see the foreigners are coming in and working for small wages for which Barbadians would not work. It is a fact, Sir, that if these people were not in Barbados some of the unemployed Barbadians would be employed. They do not see that a further influx of people from these Caribbean territories would mean that Barbadians would be put out of work; they do not see that more Barbadians would be placed on the unemployment list and these unemployed Barbadians would be placed or thrown on the mercies of politicians and they would have to see after the interests of these people at Election Time.
1.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the more you can keep people depending on you for a living, the more secure you feel your position is; but we on this side think differently. We feel that every Barbadian should be able to buy himself a meal. We believe in public assistance only for the infirm and sick, but we do not believe in public assistance for able-bodied people, and we are tackling this question of assistance to the aged by introducing either later in this month or very early next month a Social Security Bill, to which social security scheme the employers who are represented by some members on the other side will also have to contribute. They oppose Barbados having Independence, because if they are successful in having their amendment passed, social security would never be introduced in this country, and the employers would not have to contribute to the welfare of the masses. This is the real issue. It is not a question, as some hon. members have said in their remarks, that they are not really opposed to Independence, but they feel that if the Party now running the Government is dethroned, lots of things which are on our programme will be pushed aside, because they would not be in the interest of the plantocracy and the Capitalists of this country. That is why there is this big campaign against Independence for Barbados. Barbados is the only place in the world where I have heard the people say that they want Independence, and some people have the effrontery to say they are going to oppose Independence for their own country. British Guiana says it wants an independent country.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but the hon. member is lapsing into the mistake, whether wilfully or not, of saying "those on the other side" – which would include members of the Official Opposition – "are campaigning against Independence". The hon. member could not be characterised as a person.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the point of order be made.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Other people made points of order and were allowed to make preambles. I am making the point of order that the hon. member is lapsing into the mistake, whether wilfully or not, of saying that we are campaigning against Independence. The hon. member would have heard all that was said, and having heard my speech as Leader of the Opposition Party, he should not attempt to mislead people in that way. We said we were opposed to Independence alone and made our position clear; so the hon. member should be decent enough in making his remarks to say how we are opposed to Independence. We are not opposed to Independence as such, and he should not continue saying that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for saying that members on the other side went to the length and breadth of this country preaching against Independence for Barbados alone. Are they going to deny that?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member did not say that. He said we are opposed to Independence.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will repeat, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members went the length and breadth of this country preaching against the Government's proposals for Independence for the country. Independence for Barbados does not mean Independence for the territories of the Caribbean; so when you oppose the Government on its White Paper for Independence for Barbados, what are you doing? It is universal knowledge that the Government of Barbados has been opposed on its policy for Independence for Barbados by hon. members on the other side. We have asked for Independence for Barbados because it suits our purpose to be independent.

As I pointed out earlier, an hon. member used "The Agony of the Eight" as a basis of argument on the question of Federation, but I will repeat for the convenience of the hon. member who is now in his seat that the same Sir Arthur Lewis said in "The Agony of the Eight" that before a people can be politically independent, they must be financially independent, and he pointed out that as Barbados has never been a grant-aided territory, and has been handling all her financial affairs in the past, it could not be placed in the category of these islands, and therefore Barbados was a special case.

The point I was making is that Barbados is ready for Independence; and despite the intrigue by certain people in this community, despite the fact that they have kept people out of their beds for hours slandering the members of this Government, as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would put it, they cannot stop the current. Barbados will have Independence this year and they cannot stop it. The position, Mr. Speaker, is that when they attack the Government on its Independence policy and certain Ministers took it upon themselves to resign from the Government, they thought the Government would have been

defeated in the Legislature, there would have been an election and the Conservatives would run this country again. Never again in the history of Barbados will Conservatives run this country.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am serving notice on those who are now preaching Conservatism that if I have to run against any of them, he will lose his seat in the next elections.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough to defeat the arguments put forward by certain members on the other side and to convince them that the thing for Barbados is Independence, because "We shall overcome."

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when I should lend my voice to this debate. I am going to hurt some of my friends, and I do not think that after I have finished speaking, there is going to be any need to keep you punishing in the Chair any longer.
1.10 p.m.

Barbados is a society of smug hypocrites, a society of make-believers, a society of political dish-washers. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a man whom I regard as a friend of mine; but he is the biggest political anachronism in the Twentieth Century that we have ever seen. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleague, the hon. junior member for the City, made what I regard as the most shameless speeches -- shameless in the extreme -- for men of colour. For the hon. member to shamelessly state that owing to his origin and his beginning, he owes nothing to his own colour, how could he be any fit person to be a representative of the people? The hon. member has betrayed every bit of education he has got here on the basis of trying to redeem something that is unredeemable. The hon. member is a man who prides himself to be a schoolmaster with thousands of underprivileged children whose destiny he is holding in his hands, and he has the effrontery and brass to say that he will always be a Conservative. The people whose destiny he has the honour to preside over do not feel that where the destiny of their children is concerned, it is in the wrong hands. I say that he is unfit to give to those children under his control the teaching which they should have; he is unfit to give the means of a proper education to the young people who attend his school; he is unfit to be a man lofted to the position he holds; and he has the brass to say that he has not to look back at his own regime and say but for the grace of God he is where he is; but he is saying to those who have praised him, 'I am one of their greatest standard bearers!

The hon. junior member for Christ Church will speak for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not necessarily.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. junior member for Christ Church is fit to be a Conservative. I have been in this Chamber for 21 years and have found him to be the same man. He is fit to be a Conservative because when you look around this table, you can see that we have completely liquidated politically every person in this Island looking like him holding a seat around this table. But whom has he got as his standard bearers? He has as a shining light the hon. senior member for St. Michael who made a speech yesterday on this matter. He knows as much about this debate which we are engaged in as I know of the astronauts who went up in the air. He is a political fool in so far as this debate is concerned. He is an absolutely political nonentity to this debate.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like the hon. senior member for St. Peter to withdraw his remarks of calling me a fool. I think it is unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: The qualification which was used by the hon. senior member for St. Peter -- "a political fool" -- is not in my view an unparliamentary expression.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. senior member for St. Michael should know that I would not say that he is a complete fool because he is a successful business man. He is a man who has risen to a position in business that is worthy of comment for the mere fact that he has risen in that manner, and has risen to that height; but when he made a political decision and made that type of decision which he has made, he can only be classified as a political fool, because only a political fool can make that decision after rising to his position in a community like this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do invite the hon. senior member for St. Peter to pay less attention to the individual and more attention to the subject matter under discussion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am going to pay attention to hon. members of Parliament and all that they have spoken. I am going to pay attention to what they said and what they stand for.

The hon. member made a scathing remark about Socialism. Has he reached the stage in life that social life means no social justice?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not know that Socialism was social justice.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry; I have not heard the hon. member.

Mr. LYNCH: The point that the hon. member is making is that social justice emanated from Socialism. I was wondering if you would point out that this is not the case.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that is not a point of order to direct any answer from the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: This shows the puerility of mind of members whom we have in Parliament. They get up and ask Your Honour to give an interpretation of what is Socialism.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that there is such unfortunate precedent.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, there is precedent; but by what kind of Parliament?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not responsible for all hon. members of Parliament.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not have to join with them. What I do say is that the hon. junior member for the City has made some very scathing remarks about Socialism which he despises, and he believes that Conservatism is something very good. But in this debate, I would like to let him know that those of us who subscribe to the political philosophy of Socialism believe in social justice.
1.20 p.m.

We do not believe in any privilege; we do not believe in class; we do not believe in any favouritism being given. We believe that men are born free and that they should be given every opportunity to develop their talents. Socialist philosophy underwrites that every child which is born in any society should be given the opportunity of developing its talent to the fullest capacity without hindrance by the State or otherwise. If these tenets of Socialism cannot find favour with the hon. junior member for the City, and he is scathingly talking about Socialists as if they are flakes which come down to this planet, those of us who are Socialists are willing to demonstrate that if it had not been for Socialists entering this century and the latter part of the last century, men like the hon. member and myself would not be adorning the seats of this Chamber now. Instead of that, we would be wending our way in the respective canefields in Barbados and working among the Conservatives. *(Cheers.)* Political history is nothing to the hon. member. The hon. member believes that the world has come into fashion; I believe and I feel that, as a slave, I have, in

duty bound, to fight for freedom. If I cannot fight for freedom, then I am not deserving of the freedom which I now enjoy.

This Resolution which supports Barbados stand for Independence, cannot be side-tracked by the ignorance which has been used against Independence alone. It is only an ignoramus of the highest order who would begin to use any other phrase than "Independence alone" when he is speaking about Independence for Barbados. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition unfortunately does not read enough; he is too wealthy a man to take time off to read about Federation. The hon. member has never travelled in these Federated islands; he was placed in the invidious position of leading an opposition which he had no right to lead because he did not win the Election. That is the unsavoury part of the matter. He has no more right to lead the Opposition than I have to fly a jet plane because I know nothing about it. The hon. member is leading the Opposition by false pretences.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to remind the hon. member that the appointment of the Leader of the Opposition was made by His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not have to bring him in the debate. I have great respect for him. I was saying, Sir, that the hon. senior member for the City won no Election so as to be regarded as the Leader of the Opposition. He was in the minority and he will always be there. He was elected to lead the Minority Group in this island for personal reasons.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member interjected his plan for Federation, and what did he say? He says: "I am not against Independence" but what is he against? Is he for Independence? The hon. member is a Barbadian churchgoer. I would say this: this day you must decide where you stand. Are you for God or are you for the Devil? A man who had fallen did not know what prayer to make. If he goes to Hell the Devil was civil, and if he goes to Heaven, it is the Good Lord. The hon. member says that he is not against Independence, but he is more than against Independence. He went on platforms time and again and spoke against Independence for Barbados. I want to say, Sir, that if it had not been for Independence, the hon. member would not have been here today. I would say this:

> "Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself has said
> This is my own, my native land."

Hon. members who have no self-respect or political sagacity are not fit to be representatives of the people in 1966. We are at the beginning of a new era. They want to run this country on a certain basis. I believe in what is right, not who is right. That is one of the tenets I believe in. Unfortunately, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a man who believes too much in who is right and not what is right. If a man is right, then you should say that he is right: and if a man is wrong, then you should say that he is wrong. Many of us stood up in this island on behalf of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he was elected for Bridgetown and the parish of St. Michael in the first Local Government Election. We did that against the onslaught of those who were saying a lot of things, fancy and otherwise. To that one man in Barbados the Mayoral chain would have been a memory. He would never live long enough to put that chain around his neck. If it had not been for those whom he now opposes -- we stood up boldly in public and supported the democratic principles because we believe in the ballot box, so that you do not tell us that we are afraid of an Election. All the forces of the Barbados Labour Party at that time with their makeshift arrangements and with their power did not create enough to invalidate the will of the Electorate. What we said had the support of the Electorate. Do not let us therefore talk about any democratic principles. But there are strange political bed fellows; the Conservative Party and the Labour Party can now join hand in hand in defence of Federation, and to deny the right of the people of this country to go on to Independence!

1.30 p.m.

I know it was the spirit of those of us who believed in democratic principles that stood; and had it not been for those of us who were not afraid, it would not have mattered who was right. As I said, I will never ever hold the political philosophy of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, because it is anathema to my soul. For me to be a Conservative is as much as asking the Archbishop of Canterbury to go at Harry's Nitery and deliver sacrament on Christmas morning. I am not here to consecrate the Conservatives.

The hon. member has a memory for which we will have to get a tape recorder when he makes speeches and play them back for him to hear, because he said that no one made speeches. The hon. member's memory may be short, but I do not miss. This is the sort of thing he would not like to remember, but I have a good memory and I am going to remind him and his colleagues of several things before this debate is finished. July in this year will be twenty-one years I have been in this Chamber, and I have seen a lot of changes take place with persons who thought they were very clever. Some have come here as seat warmers and voted; some have made contributions; but I would say to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that if he is taking his vote today in a debate like this, to use it against the people of this country in going towards a rightful constitutional destiny, my job is not only to expose this shallow thinking which has been put forward in the speeches, but also to demonstrate that men like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, men like the hon. senior member for St. Michael and men like the hon. junior member for Bridgetown have nothing in common with the political tenets of Conservatism that reigned in Barbados for the last 300 years, and I am going to be at pains to demonstrate that if they have something in common with that, then they are some of the biggest stumbling blocks to progress.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church is a member of a family that is a successful business family, and I have the greatest respect for them. They have demonstrated among themselves an affinity and a loyalty that some of us of a different ethnic group would do well to emulate. The fact that they were fortunate or unfortunate to be born as they were in Barbados gave them the enter into the financial and economic area that was denied his honourable colleagues. For that reason, by association, by upbringing and by life the hon. junior member for Christ Church, being a Conservative, always had something to conserve within the context of the economic and financial security and built-in area that they were living in as distinct from the open air of poverty that the other three hon. members found themselves in. Yet they are telling me that they have the same philosophy as the hon. junior member for Christ Church who found himself in a completely different area. It is like one living in outer space and the other living on earth, and both say they can live together. You know that before they get up there, they will disintegrate and disappear.

Living in a plural society like ours, we have to appreciate that the hon. junior member for Christ Church has a right to live here and enjoy all the freedoms and all the protections that any of us enjoys. I do not subscribe to the belief that a white man has no right to enjoy the freedoms that we have and the protection of the police. My people also have the right not only to enjoy these freedoms, but also to enjoy them in the economic security which the community has to offer; and if they are not prepared for that sort of society, then they are not prepared for the kind of Independence we are going forward to.

Let us be quite frank. Conservatism maintains and holds fast to the narrow and superficial obstacles that have been created by colour, class and creed. Conservatism creates class and privilege, and how you were born, as if you have some control over how you were born. The economic and biological processes that produce the species is beyond the comprehension of the species that had been produced then. To be blamed for that accident is one of the things that Conservatism puts as a plank, and often you hear the hon. junior member for Bridgetown say that conceit in a politician can be very dangerous. Nobody would understand what he says or what he means when he says he has been so

blessed with knowledge, as if that is something that was kept in a special area waiting until the hon. junior member for Bridgetown found his way on this planet. Those are the tenets that Conservatism breeds. A Socialist feels that all men have the right to go to school.

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have never said at any time that I was blessed with any knowledge which was not available to others, as the speaker said. I do not know if he is referring to the fact that it was a Socialist party which kept West Indians out of Great Britain.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if you accept that, all I will say is that when I am finished with the hon. member, I am going to strip him naked politically. I will take off all his political clothes. If he knew anything about political history, he would know that had it not been for the Socialist party in Great Britain, West Indians would not have been flocking to the United Kingdom, because prior to 1945 and before the Socialist Government came into power, Great Britain could not satisfy its own people, let alone look for people to bring in. It was the socialist Government that gave them full employment, and they are now in a position to take in people. That is No. 1 lesson for you to learn from your Socialist notebook.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is still addressing the Chair, I hope.

Mr. WALCOTT: When the hon. member talked about political history, I would say that too many people in this small island are playing politics by air.
1.40 p.m.

You had a Socialist system for thirteen years without the Conservatives changing it. Now the hon. member is telling us that these Socialists are on a different basis. I am not a British Socialist. If the hon. member is a British Conservative, I am not a British Socialist. Even in Socialist Parties, there are some kinds of Socialism with which I do not agree. The British Labour Party pretends that it is a Socialist Party, but I do not agree with every thing they do.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church has been representing his constituency since 1948 as a Conservative. He did not campaign as an Independent or anything else; but there are some people in this island who without any ethnic reasons are going to vote for the hon. junior member for Christ Church and they do not regard it as something wrong or racial; they regard it as a civic right of their position as the minority in the community. They feel safe putting their lives in his hands. I do not accuse the hon. junior member for Christ Church of anything because he is what he is, and because of that, people vote for him. But do not tell me, if some of my own people demonstrate the same feeling towards me as they do towards him, that I am looking only at that. That is why I say that when you get the hon. junior member for Christ Church and these three other hon. members of the Official Opposition in the same Party, the House would have to come to the conclusion that he is either a fool in one breadth because he is trailing with the majority or that the other three are not aware of their true political position in life and what they mean to the people who put them there.

Now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition did a most uncharitable thing to the hon. senior member for St. Michael who is a member of his Party. He did not have the courage to come in here and lead off for the Opposition in what you would regard as a memorable debate, but left it to the hon. junior member for St. Michael into whose hand he pushed an amendment to the Resolution. I do not know if he was making a political fool of him because this is near Christmas time; it is not yet twelve days after Christmas and the same Christmas atmosphere is prevailing with your celebrating the Babe of Bethlehem and the Babe of Belmont is introducing an amendment to the Resolution.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition did not have the parliamentary decency to second the amendment to the Resolution, but he thinks the other members over here are political idiots and did not know what he wanted to do; so he got up and said: "I am speaking on the main motion, I am not speaking on the amendment." What kind of leader are you that you are going to put an amendment in the little Babe of Belmont's hands? I am going to use the phrase "these Machiavellian politics" are the only politics that the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows. Sir, in cricket if you play down the line, it shows that the wicket is not turning; it is playing easy. You can play forward; you do not have to play on your back foot. If you think that I am not giving you good advice, ask the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition who used to be a bit of a cricketer. You play on the back foot when you are not sure. What do you find? The bowling is not too fast, but the little Babe from Belmont comes in here with an amendment to the Resolution, and his leader comes in, watches the strange political move and says: "I am speaking on the main motion; I am not seconding his amendment." This is a Party of four members. Three of them have not spoken yet, but the Leader of the Opposition does not second his own amendment; as a matter of fact, nobody has seconded it yet. (A VOICE: That is not true. The hon. junior member for the City did so.)

I understand that the hon. junior member for the City has seconded it. The hon. leader of the Opposition believes in these sort of political Machiavellian methods. The reason why he did not second the amendment is because he is going to talk on the main motion and come back and talk on the amendment. I do not have to look for a second wicket to come back on to bat.
1.50 p.m.

Those of us who believe in Independence for Barbados are going to vote for it. We are going to vote for Independence for Barbados not only as registering our intention to vote for it, but we will take our responsibility to demonstrate to the public that we are fit to be the representatives of the people of this Island and have to carry out their destinies. We are not going to mince any matters about this.

Mr. Speaker, when I realise that the hon. junior member for the City and the hon. junior member for Christ Church are in a society — I would like to analyse the people who are in that society politically.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: The word "people" is not used in a sense other than "hon. members". I do not seek to denigrate hon. members from this position. I realise that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is living in a plural society and is a member of the minority in that society; but it is the most financial and strongest economic sector of a society with a democratic situation prevailing in order that hon. members like the hon. senior member for the City and the hon. junior member for the City can be there. Therefore it is convenient for the hon. junior member for Christ Church to have with him people of that pigmentation so that they can have a front and a facade. What I have said is without any affront to a white man. A Party of all white men standing up politically has as much chance of winning the Electorate as a cow has to go to Sunday School. The hon. member is a Conservative user. You find an area for convenience. The hon. junior member for the City is different from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is an unrepentant, political anachronism, but the hon. junior member for the City cannot claim to be so old in this political life. He is a man who has been born in the emancipated era; he has lived a life through an emancipated era and he is a man who is capable of evaluating what is taking place in his time and among his own people. He is a man who writes books, and therefore he subjects himself to some sort of discipline. Any man who does that, who subjects himself to mental discipline and with his analytical mind, when a man comes out with that brazen bold-faced statement about Conservatism within the context of Barbadian society, within the context of his

beginning, within the context of what he has grown up and seen, he is not a confirmed anachronism; he is just a political -- well, I cannot use the word. His political conduct would be most unethical. For a man like him to have read as he has read, to have lived as he has lived and cannot find a haven to rescue his poor struggling brethern, but he can only find a haven of rest around an area of people in Barbados who belong to the possessors, the plantations and merchants who, for centuries we have been struggling to get through - that is the only area where they can give protection to the poor, struggling masses of our country. In the evening of our time when we are moving from Colonialism to Independence we find them dragging at the door of Colonialism and lecturing as to how good it is to be here as subjects.

I remove the hon. senior member for St. Michael from this category. He is a political innocent; he knows as much of what he is going about as to ask the two people in Sputnik to tell us what is going on.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. Speaker, I have some indications that it is time to give you relief in a more definite and positive way. I therefore beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for half an hour.

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

The question that this sitting be now suspended for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly"

2.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, when I commenced my speech, I made mention that we live in a plural society, and by that I mean that we have in our society people who can be regarded as White people and people like myself. I am glad that now I am making this point the hon. junior member for Christ Church has returned, because I did not know I had liquidated that side so early. I felt I would have liquidated them, but that it would have taken a little longer. However, I should explain that in a plural society like ours, Independence does not mean that we are going to banish people. Independence does not mean that we want to change from a White aristocracy to a black aristocracy. We do not want the worst elements of the black society to take over from the worst elements of the white society. We do not mean by Independence that we are going to put white men under our feet and say that this is a reprisal for what their grandfathers used to do to our grandfathers, and therefore they have to get scared.

The meaning of Independence in a plural society like ours is for the best on both sides and in all elements to come together and make their maximum contribution to the country to which they owe a loyalty. *(Cheers).* And I will say to the hon. junior member for Christ Church as much as I say to myself that our first loyalty is to Barbados and not to St. Lucia, Grenada or Dominica; and if his first loyalty is not to Barbados, then he is not a fit person to be a representative in the General Assembly of Barbados. It is the Barbados community that gave us the right and the opportunity to be able to express our political views; it is the Barbados society and the people of Barbados that gave us this authority; so we owe it to our people first to create for them and to build for them an edifice that has the first loyalty to our own people.

Mr. Speaker, Federation cannot be the first loyalty to the Barbadian. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as the English say, plays he is a half too smart, but he is not a half too smart in Parliament; he is a half too smart when he is outside; but when he comes in here, we pin him down to parliamentary behaviour, and this damp squibb amendment is only to give the hon. member an opportunity of talking again, because he does not possess the political acumen in a debate like this which would make him capable of making one's speeches comprehensively to cover all the facets of the case. He has to play by air; so he has to listen to hear what one says. He is playing an ordinary drum which you do not have to play by music; so you only have to beat a bass, the only old bass you play to any melody. Mr. Speaker, I am not going down that line of vulgarity to say who went to gaol and all that. You can deal with all the prisoners and all the gaol-birds outside; but today let us deal with why Barbados should go independent or why it should not.

The gravamen of the argument of hon. members who spoke against the Resolution seems to be only personal, and not on the basis of what Independence means, because the Leader of the Opposition started off by asking who said he was against Independence. Whoever said he was for Independence? For that reason, I want to quote because I do not want to be misunderstood for many reasons.

At this stage of our history, Independence is very vital. The newspapers of this island do not help the progressive cause, and for obvious reasons. The progressive cause is never the cause with money; the progressive cause is always to help the under-dog without money, and the newspapers always go along with the ones that can keep advertisements going. I will say *en passant* that only a couple of days ago I saw in a newspaper a columist writing an article denouncing most vehemently the average road worker. We know that some of them are lazy, but you would never find a corresponding article by that same sort of man who is out of the same class as the road worker condeming the lazy manager or businessman. He does not know that there are some good for nothing busness managers who instead of being at their business, find themselves at Bathsheba drinking rum and getting drunk and running down the business; but you will rarely find an article saying that the failure of some business was due to the inefficiency, callousness and indifference of the manager. They project the manager as a symbol of virtue and efficiency, and a poor man as a symbol of laziness and inefficiency. They do not know that the poor man can be a symbol of efficiency too. The fact that there are more poor men than managers is no excuse for the lazy, and may I say here now in parenthesis that one of the fundamental elements in Independence is that all of us have to work hard, and even harder than we were working before.

Mr. Speaker, I am not projecting Independence as a panacea for all our ills, that we need not work anymore, that the day after Independence the sun will not rise in the East anymore, but will come up in the West and bring with it gold and we would not have to work. I know and I believe that the mere fact that we are going to run our country independently means that we have to work harder, and we have to introduce new dimensions into our thinking to grapple with all the problems that Independence brings — all the lag-overs from Colonialism, all the lag-overs from people awaiting to have something done for them. These are the things we have to project, and those of us who are responsible for leadership have to do these things. I would say therefore to the hon. junior member for Christ Church that I am not vexed or embittered because he is a Conservative; I would be surprised if he were not, and I would look upon him suspiciously. I feel that your political background, your economic and financial position put you in the position to hold on to something.

Mr. SPEAKER: To whom is the hon. member referring?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am referring to the hon. junior member for Christ Church. That remark could only be applicable to you, Mr. Speaker, within the financial and economic context, not within the political context, and I would say that even if you were a Conservative, it would be excusable, because it would be understandable that an affluent society sometimes produces affluent persons. For persons with the affluence of the hon. junior member for Christ Church,

family affluence and family financial ramifications, it is expected that their whole political philosophy would be on the basis of being cautious. Some people see Conservatism in the context that all of us are Conservative in the literal sense that we conserve our health; but that is not political Convervatism. When we speak of political Conservatism, we mean our political philosophy.
2.45 p.m.

Now, I do not say that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is a rapacious Conservative because living in a society like ours, he has to live along with certain elements in order for him to make peace not only with the people of his own ethnic group, but also the rest. In a plural society like ours today you will find people like the hon. junior member for Christ Church stemming the tide and feeling that they do not have the right to enter the political arena. They feel that they have the right to contract out of politics and leave it to their black brethern. I loathe to see the day when member like him get back into politics. However, because of the peculiar working of human nature, there are people who feel that unless they join with the hon. junior member for Christ Church they are not doing the right thing, and you have these people who are bordering in this society. That is why the hon. junior member for the City is saying today that he is not ashamed to be a Conservative. That is why I said at the beginning of my speech that we have a society of hypocrites. We have a lot of political hypocrites, and at this stage of Independence, we have to lay bare people who are not sincere.

I believe it takes a man and woman of ability, integrity and courage to make their maximum contributions to our society, and those are the people in my opinion who should come first. Conversely, there is no rule over privilege, crass ignorance, corruption or cowardice. We have no room for it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the hon. junior member for Christ Church, would be willing to defend his leader.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope the hon. junior member for Christ Church would be willing to defend his leader who is not in his place. At one stage when this Government first came into power, the hon. Leader of the Opposition said that this Government may be in power for the next three years. He challenged me on one occasion. I remember on one occasion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I criticised the Hon. Premier on the Bank's Brewery matter and, as you know, I mince no bones of my criticisms. If I feel that you are wrong, I say that you are wrong. I am different from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Before the Leader of the Opposition makes up his mind whether to criticise you or not, he has to take a stroll before he can make his decision. He has to go to his shrine of worship before he makes his decision.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. An allegation has been made of the hon. Leader of my Party. The hon. member says that the hon. senior member for the City has to take a stroll before he comes to a decision. That is not true. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition always has his ears to the ground and he knows all the time how things are going.

Mr. WALCOTT: It certainly is not hard if he has his ears always close to the ground to know the feeling of the people. I am sure he has sufficient signs on this question about Independence already, and if his political hearing had not failed him, he would not have come in here and talked about an election. At the end of this debate some of you who are talking about an election will find out that it was not an election which you wanted. Now, be careful. It generally happens that the same fellow who asked for an election finds out that when elections come off he says that he asked for something else.

As regards the question of Bank's Brewery, I criticised the Hon. Premier of his actions and I reminded him of his mistake. What did the Hon. Leader of the Opposition say at that time? He said that it shows that the Hon. Premier is a big man, and it takes a big man who can make a mistake and come back and say that he has made a mistake. I do not know what was happening in those days.

The Hon. Premier brings down a Resolution for Independence now, but everybody in opposition is saying that "I am in favour of Independence, but Independence within a Federation."
2.55 p.m.

Let us examine that childish statement. The members of the Assembly are implementing a matter for themselves, but some of them went back and stated how the Colonial Office fought for the Independence of Barbados even in this very Chamber before these people knew what democracy was, as we are now understanding the terms if it. As you know, Sir, democracy has different meanings at different times. The Press in this Island fought the Colonial Office for the handling of this island, and this Chamber fought to retain certain things for Barbados years ago. Two hundred years after, the products of the masses are subjecting us to an exercise that if we fought for the political emancipation of our country, that is something which we are doing in the wrong way, and it is something which we should do first and foremost by asking for a Federation; but none of the colonies with which we want to federate, has asked us to come into Federation with it. Are you stark mad? You in Your House of Assembly, find it incapable for you to argue your own right and you say: "Well, we want to go with our family in the other territories." It is these political misfits which we have in Barbados who are looking for an area of agreement to join them together. All over the world there are many people who do not like others, and that is why there are so many people in the world. It seems to me that the reason for arguing against Independence for Barbados is not based on any rational grounds.

The hon. junior member for the City read a lot about Sir Arthur Lewis, but I would remind the hon. member that Sir Arthur Lewis was a Socialist, and not a Conservative like the hon. member. The hon. member is using a foremost Socialist in the world within the context of a particular argument so as to satisfy his mind that we are wrong to go in for Independence as against going into a Federation first. The hon. member is forgetting that this is not an exercise of Federation versus Independence; This is an exercise of Independence for Barbados. This is like two people who are going to play cricket and football, and one of them wants to know if the other will put up his wicket sticks before he puts up his goal posts. Whenever they have finished speaking and arguing, there will be Independence for Barbados; we will live in here and we will accord them certain positions too. In Independence you will not get a one-way ticket to go to Mozambique, Bechuanaland, Basutoland (Mr. MOTTLEY; Ghana.) Ghana is not suitable for you; the economy is too rich. Hon. members on that side of the Table are fighting for human rights and independence, and we are now having a debate as to whether we should have Independence in 1966. Some of those hon. member thought that the vote would have been different, but now they have found it is not different. Some of them talk about going to England. The hon. member says he has money, but has he got money as compared with Rockfeller? And he is still Governor of New York State. When you begin to say that you do not want cheap political power, political power means something to a person who is in politics. Now when the vote is going against them they come out with this dance ticket. The hon. member will get back up and talk about who went to gaol. The hon. member cannot answer me because these things are indefensible; the hon. member cannot defend his political position.

These are emancipated days, and what the hon. member should be doing is to be joining forces with the people who are fighting for the emancipation of the masses. Do you want to preside over the destiny of a poverty-stricken community or do you want to create an atmosphere in which people can work for a living? If your mentality is one in which you glory in having alms for the poor and not for the emancipation of them, that is your way of thinking. Does the hon.

member want that? It is not a question of retaining the slums; we have to think in terms of removing poverty. We do not want to have any more poor people.
3.05 p.m.

What virtue is there in poverty? Those who are not poor believe there is a lot of virtue in poverty for them to be continually saying that had it not been for the Grace of God, they would not be where they are; but they are not there. Had it not been for the grace of God, I would be there too. It is all well and good to go and look for a sick person and offer your sympathies; but I would prefer to go and sympathise with the person than to be on the sick-bed receiving all the flowers; so you can keep all the flowers and the sympathy and let me walk about.

My criticism, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is more an analysis than it is because I am embittered, because if a man has an undying love for money and financial position, and anything in his political life would cut across these ambitions, then he would avoid it. The reason why the hon. junior member for Bridgetown made that bold statement about Conservatism is because in a community where economic power resides in the hands of the few, he is a blue-eyed boy among the money classes; he can get credit more easily than some of us who have made a greater political contribution than he has, because he is making a statement that reinforces his position of power. As I said already, if you made an analysis of the people who have mortgages and overdrafts in this country, you would be able to understand the reason for their political philosophy. If some of these things were published, you would understand why some of the people in this country talk the way they do. It is because these financial involvements in which they have been engaged over the years have so entangled and chained them to these things, that it becomes absolutely impossible for them to break those bonds and free their people who are not entangled in these things.

The masses, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have no mortgages or overdrafts; they live from morning to morning going to the market place, buying this and that. I have said on a platform and I will repeat here that the people whom the hon. junior member for Bridgetown says he is representing do not live in the Orleans or the other villages. The people in the villages that voted for him are not people with sentiments of Conservatism; so when he goes to them, he goes as Jekyll and Hyde, because if the others went themselves, they would be rejected. They have taken him because he looks like them. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown is a Conservative user, and that is what those who say they are Conservatives have done to this country. The danger about this sort of political life is that there is no hope for young men; if they see that people like these three hon. members can be elevated to political position and then they hold this financial position and power, they feel that that is the best course for them. Sometimes young men doubt whether it is wise to go in on the progressive side, because it looks as if you suffer too long and you get no reward. Politics is a very unrewarding game.

Let us look at the words of the hon. members who say they are opposed to the principle that is being enunciated here, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

"To omit the words after "convene" and to substitute the following words therefor:-

"After the holding of elections in Barbados to decide whether Barbados shall proceed to Independence.....

Now they want an election. Do you mean that since they have been elected, they do not know if Barbados should proceed to Independence? That is true; they are in the minority; so they do not know. Nobody has given them any power. Did the hon. senior member for Bridgetown go back to the people in Bridgetown and ask them if they wanted to be cremated when they died, or did he and his group decide this is the next step to take because the cemetery is getting small? I am an elector. When did he ask me if I wanted to be cremated? I see that he is going to ask the Bishop. Does the Bishop speak for me? Did the hon. member have a referendum? For all these years we have been accustomed to putting people in graves, and people come and cry over the grave. Did the hon. member ask anybody about this change? This is the old time political stunt each time there is an issue.

Before we had adult suffrage they used to say that the masses of the people could not vote; but now they will come back and say you have not got a mandate from the people. How can you get a mandate from a man who cannot vote? The man who cannot vote cannot tell you if you want to vote or not. Do you think that somebody has Independence covered down as if he were cooking food, but it is not opened yet and we have to go and ask if we can have it? This is not a minority Government like Ian Smith's in Southern Rhodesia that is declaring Independence. This is Barbados where all of us have been elected on an adult franchise basis, and are you telling us that with all the potitical developments that have taken place in the last twenty-five years, the people of Barbados are in doubt about Independence? The viciousness of it is that too many of the opponents of Independence went around the country giving people the impression that Independence is going to make them lose their freedom.

Any person who is Leader of the Opposition holds a responsible position; and if I were in his position and I had to say on a platform that it was mooted within the Government Party that they intended to lock up somebody, I would come in here with a Resolution of "No Confidence" because we could not have confidence in a Government which was going to take away our freedom and liberties. The things that have been said outside should be said in here, and let hon. members answer to them. If hon. members are saying that their liberties and freedom are going to be jeopardized by Independence, why not say it?
3.15 p.m.

I would like to see the Hon. Premier taking away my freedom. I am sure that somebody would get killed. Therefore, what is the point of somebody going to take away my freedom? It is political cowardice that we have people walking about with these silly ideas telling other people that you do not know this man and what he will do. It is political cowardice in those who are walking about talking about these things. Sir Grantley Adams has his bad ways like all of us. He is laid aside now, and all of us would be laid aside one day.

We are living in 1966. When the Hon. Premier came into power, Sir Grantley Adams said that the Hon. Premier's Party was a Party of wild boys. In one breath you call them wild boys, and in another breath you say the people seem to be richer under this Government of today.

Sir, I have an article in my brief case which a Canadian brought to me from Toronto and it demonstrated the viciousness of some people. We have some vicious people in this island, and their viciousness has no bounds. The article which I have here is a photostatic copy of an article in the "Montreal Star" and it contains a photograph of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the hon. member to make that a document of the House?

Mr. WALCOTT: If you request it, I will do it; but so far it is just a photostatic copy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am just asking the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: Why are hon. members requesting me to make it a document? The Clerk came to Your Honour and drew something to your notice. Why did he come to you?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Clerk came to me at my request. Does the hon. member intend to make that a document of the House?

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like to be treated as other hon. members of the House; but if I am going to be a guinea pig, well, I want to know why I am a guinea pig.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have just asked the hon. member if he is going to make such copy a document of the House. I did not ask him to really do so.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have no such intention.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, keep it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Thank you very much. I do not intend to read all of it. My mind is not geared to read long articles. Another reason why I do not intend to read it is because I understand from the Hon. Premier that this article is sub judice owing to it being the subject matter of some Court proceedings that is to be carried on. I therefore do not think it is proper to read it at this stage, but this is the sort of thing which has emanated from people in Barbados. We have to trade and do business with people in Canada, and that article is creating the impression and the image that Barbados is likely to become like Ghana and similar places in Africa and, therefore, you have to be afraid when we get Independence.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I heard on a political platform people talking of the Trade Union and myself. I would like to ask hon. members at this stage, which one of you can put me under your thumb. How can you imagine that I am under somebody's thumb? I have been in here for 21 years, and I am still like Noah's ark ... I do not have any money; I do not boast about having any money, therefore, I can talk in here or anywhere as I like. If I bought a property and am paying for it, or I do not have any money to pay for it, you have to wait on me. Therefore I feel that is my business.

Therefore, I feel that all those persons who made those statements against the Hon. Premier made them as a means of trying to bring down to disgrace the Hon. Premier. But what do you find? In order to bring down one man, the whole argument is being used against Barbados going for Independence alone. You would have to pity some of those people who are opposed to Independence for Barbados when you take up what they have written in the Press and said in here.

I do not go in for the local political machinations because nobody can come to me and ask me to do something which I do not intend to do. My organization supported Independence for Barbados on the 29th August, 1965 and we finished up with a member ship on the 31st December, 1965 of 3,377 members more than what we had last year. Therefore, if you have said that the organization which you have for people have rejected you for doing something, I say far from doing so, the same people have shown that they are willing to support the stand which I have taken.

We of the Trade Union, represent the highest block of people in any one organization, more than any other single organization save the church, and the Church does not go in for politics. The Trade Union movement is a Twentieth Century institution, and that is what we have to teach you in the context of 1966 Trade Unionism.
3.25 p.m.

Here it is, an organization is supporting the Government, and we are not supporting the Government as an organization to be given anything by the Government. This is an organization which is going to celebrate its 25th anniversary in November of this year. This is an organization with which I have the honour to celebrate my 21st anniversary on the 1st January, 1966. Therefore you can see that my association is with an organization like that; my years with that association and my years in Parliament would give me an excellent opportunity to know that we are symbolising something which the people in Barbados desire or do not desire.

Let us analyse this amendment. This is what stands between them and the people of Barbados. After the holding of Elections then the people of Barbados must decide whether they will have Independence within a Federation. This is what the amendment says:-

"After the holding of Elections in Barbados to decide whether Barbados shall proceed to Independence within a Federation, comprised of such territories in the Eastern Caribbean as are willing to join in such an association or alone.....

They are saying that we must go to the polls to ask the people whether we shall proceed to Independence within a Federation. Look at this ignorance! How are you going to know after an Election. (Mr. MOTTLEY: And you win.) with a single member constituency you say you do not want a Federation. *(ASIDES).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter only.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. senior member for the City cannot keep quiet when he is not speaking. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we go to the people, what are the issues we are going to put to the people? You say that you believe in Independence within a Federation. When you are elected do you say you have a mandate to ask Bousquet, Bird or anybody else if they want to come with you? You did not really win the Election; you want something to forestall Barbados going into Independence. *(ASIDES).* As soon as you talk about any sort of marriage, there must be the question of willingness. Presumably every marriage is a sort of willingness. As soon as you talk about this sort of marriage — well, I do not want to make any anti-Federation speech. I have the honour and privilege to represent Barbadians on a wider basis than anybody else. I represent the I.C.F.T.U. on one side. I represent from British Honduras down to British Guiana — countries 2,000 miles apart. Therefore, I have the confidence of more West Indians voting for me than any other hon. member of this Chamber. I go through the West Indian Territories more than any other hon. member of this Chamber or as much as any other hon. member of this Chamber. I know the spirit of West Indians. Therefore I am not making any anti-Federation speech, but I will make a broad Independence speech. We must be factual in all our life. We cannot create political institutions in the abstract or in a drawing-room; we can only create political institutions in the hard and fast rule of political life. If you find that you cannot get people to join with you in politics, if there is anything that you cannot deal with in the abstract, then you have to leave it out.

This is an exercise which we have been going through since 1947. It is now 19 years since then, and we have not got any Federation. The one which was started got broken up. Barbados was given a constitution which is superior to the African, the Jamaican and the British Guiana constitutions or the Trinidad Crown Colony, and today we are the only people who are putting in an amendment to Independence for ourselves. Is it not shocking? It is not an amendment from the hon. junior member for Christ Church where you could say that vested interest is entrenched. Whenever vested interests fail, when the political conflicts are open, they may move on because somebody is coming to hold on to you. Since Ministerial power has been given to Barbados, we have quickened the pace of life in Barbados, and the commercial life has kept pace. I am glad that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is here with his colleagues.
3.35 p.m.

In a society like ours, it is not only good enough to have these members sitting down with you in the House of Assembly; we want to see the economic and financial translation of this community so reflected that people like the same hon. junior member for Bridgetown and people looking like the hon. senior member for Bridgetown would be in the hierarchy of business houses in Broad Street, and not be placed in any condescending position. They should be in a position where they can direct and be able to reflect some of the things they hold dear. If they want to postpone this, that is what they are postponing.

What I want to ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is what are the political motivations of the three hon. members who sit with the hon. junior member for Christ Church. Do they possess the same political motivations, the same driving force that put him in politics? I say unequivocally "no". How could they possess the same motivations? The political motivation of the hon. junior member for Christ Church would be a matter of maintaining what he was born into and saw. When he was a boy, this House reflected himself; it did not reflect me; so his motivation would be to come to some place he had a right to come to. My motivation would be to break through and get in; so I would not have the same motivation for coming here, because he could not be coming here to undo; he would be coming here to play safe.

Mine is a critique of these political misfits, and I am going to say in the name of a plural society that we are going on to Independence in a plural society; nothing is going to stop us from going on to Independence in a plural society; but we are saying to those with economic power that belong to a different ethnic group not to regard that we have second class citizens in our community, and the only way that can work is for the Government to put the level on private business. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown, the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and the hon. senior member for St. Michael have no power; they sit in no citadel of power to influence any of these breaks-through in decisions, because they are not men with that sort of motivation.

In Barbados there are enough boys and girls going to Harrison College and Queen's College, but what are the highest positions they hold? Somebody talked about N. E. Wilson; but he runs such a business that you can almost call him one of the Big Six. But neither Musson & Dacosta nor A. S. Bryden nor any of these big firms have seen fit yet to elevate a black man to the Board of Directors. I am not talking about somebody that would pass for white, or if you told him he was black he would charge you for slander; I am talking about the unmistably black man with ability. We have some ignorant white people here, because some of them are ignorant enough to say Mr. Walcott does not like white people, as if white people are something to eat. You know if you kill a turkey at Christmas, some people ask for the white sections. I do not belong to that class that do not like people. I like everybody so far as human beings are concerned, and I do not despise anybody in the narrow sense of colour or race.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in an Independence debate like this, I would be failing in my duty if I did not make it clear that the plural society we live in must undertake a role that is in consonance with the society itself, and all of this nonsense that if you put a black man in a high position he will carry away your money or carry out your secrets must go by the board. The time has come in Barbados when we can have a black Bishop or a white Bishop, a black Manager of a Bank if we have them; and therefore among the races there must be this common understanding that both of them have a right not only to live, but to enjoy and acquire any position in this country that the wealth will provide. I know there are some pussyfooters who are afraid to say this, because somebody will say they are preaching race hatred. I do not have to preach race hatred, because it is not necessary; but it has been practised in my lifetime in the community in which I was born, and I am not in a position to decry it.

On the eve of Independence, I will say that I am not going into Independence with any idea of reprisals; I am not handling out guns to anybody to look for white babies to kill or white men to paint black, nor do I want a white man to play he is blacker than I am, because there are some white hypocrites who, as soon as they see the tides changing, want to become blacker than I am, and will tell you that their great-grandmother was black. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown says he is not a swerver. I could never be a swerver. I could never be a swerver because I have been for too long identified with the Socialist cause and with the cause of representing the workers. You have black people who are so for money, but a white fellow is going to be so for security. He is afraid; and as soon as a man is afraid, human nature being what it is, his preservation is the first law of nature. The hon. junior member for Christ Church will forgive me if I make so many references to him, but there are references to him because he is the only man of that ethnic group in this House. It is nothing personal, because the hon. member knows I have a great respect for him as a man and in his business and all that goes with it. My respect for him cannot however dim my view about the general situation in this Island which has to undergo a change. Some of the tensions that people speak about are tensions that they know are true; and some of them are afraid. If in a general way you raise matters pertaining to your constituency, some people want to say that you do not like white people. As soon as you say you do not like something, they say you do not like white people. I do not have these things in my mind, because I will say that there are some people who will say these things in a general way; but as soon as they get an opportunity, the only people they want to see are the same people.
3.45 p.m.

I hope the hon. member does not think that this is an indictment against the people. What I should say on behalf of the people is that some of them are very tolerant, but I do not accept tolerance as a substitute to commonsense and fairplay. I would say in a general way that this society shows a remarkable potential for change. There are some young people of this country today who are appealing to the more affluent of our society, and they are beginning to understand that they have to live in a society like ours with everybody. This basic element which is growing up is the one which we have to encourage.

But we have to build up a society without fear. They have to wait to make their contribution to society. It is only a couple of weeks ago that a young lawyer, Mr. Waldo Ramsey, represented Tanzania at United Nations. Here it is, you have a young Barbadian, not representing Barbados, but representing an African territory at United Nations. What are we looking forward to if young, intelligent Barbadians are not prepared to make their contribution to our society? Are you prepared to put up with a colony in that a decision is made by Mr. Bousquet, Mr. Compton or Mr. Bramble before young, intelligent persons can make a decision for their own country? I say "no".

Sir, I do not agree with the nonsense which I hear that we must go through the exercise of the amendment to the Resolution which is only for the purpose of giving the member the opportunity to talk again.

The amendment reads as follows:-

"To omit the words after "convene" and to substitute the following words therefor:- "After the holding of elections in Barbados to decide whether Barbados shall proceed to independence, within a Federation comprised of such territories in the Eastern Caribbean as are willing to join in such an association, or alone, a conference representative of all political parties to arrange for the Implementation of the decision taken and for the establishment of an independent nation at the earliest possible time."

Now, Sir, one politician talked about defence. What defence are you talking about? Because Barbados is going to become independent, does it mean that you must get an army and navy? Are we going to start a war with St. Lucia? To capture what? Avenues? Or are we going to start a war with Antigua? To capture what? Filaria?

Sir, analyse the practicability when the hon. member talked about trade. When they talked about trade in the West Indies because of the number of people, do you realise that if it was because of numbers, China would have invaded this country already? China alone has 900 million people. That is 25 percent of the total world population. With India, if it were a question of population, they could have all the trade; but it is not based on numbers.

Some people say that you are not going to benefit by large numbers because these areas are not high potential areas. They are areas of the same kind. If there is not the possibility of our coming together with the other islands, or that it is not imminent, the mere fact that we are able to come to an agreement with British Guiana over trade, should make us support our Government.

What do we see as regards the people who served in the West Indies Federal Parliament? After four years the members who served in the Federal Parliament got substantial handshakes. I think that I have qualified now for a good pension after my service of 21 years to the Island.

Therefore, Sir, when hon. members want to use this amendment as a means of having elections before Independence, all that they really want to do is to postpone the date of Independence. Sir, what have I told them? Go on with Independence now. Make up your mind now what are you going to do for an independent nation — not for an election, because an election does not make you independent. Do you know why they said that they were in favour of Independence but in a Federation? They thought that they had led the people into believing that Independence without a Federation was going to carry away their fowls; or if you had a goat, as soon as you got Independence, you would have to pay taxes for your goat. They built up all these "Aunt Sallies" around it.

Now, Sir, there is a gentleman who said that he would be back. I think it is general Mac Arthur. The hon. junior member for St. George coming out of hospital yesterday is only a little bit of drama because you know, Sir, that he is a political buffoon. This morning, there appeared a picture of the hon. junior member for St. George in the "Advocate" with somebody putting on his jacket. He is an actor and it is more picture taking with him. He came out of hospital with the thought that this is something to create sympathy. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph should be the leader now of the Barbados Labour Party which is comprised of three -- I would not say three blind mice.

3.55 p.m

The Labour Party of Barbados has dwindled down to three — I would not say three blind mice or three sleeping beauties, *(Laughter)*. I would say that they have dwindled, and the hon. member has not got sufficient political courage to say to the Deputy Leader of the Party that he should hold forth, but he came out as if he were on some grand mission of sympathy. The hon. member came to tell us about Jack Leacock and the people whom he had saved. There is nothing which you could do with a soul like that; you have to think of such a thing as a memory. He feels that we were better off in the colonial days than we are now. I pitied the hon. member; I thought that he should not have been here. Democracy can be flouted. The Speaker should never have allowed him to come into the House because if he dies as a result he would feel as if he died a martyr. If you feel that you could get in front of a bus and the driver would stop, but he did not stop, and you think that the death which ensued is the death of a martyr, that is to think as a fool.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that is a general observation and not anything which be a discredit to the Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT: That was only a description. The Speaker could not stop him ....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know what the hon. member means, but I wanted to get an elucidation of it.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am pleased that you have asked for that because I did not want any misrepresentation to be given. Are we seriously saying that in 1966 the price of freedom is measured by the cost? Are you telling us that the way in which you can have political freedom is by somebody giving you something at cost price as if you are building a house? If you did not have representation, if you did not have this attitude of metropolitan countries plunging through the world, we would not be where we are. What are you telling people about a colony as if it is some God-given right that somebody has something and when we say that we want to be free it is a question of our breaking away from the Deity? Why should we be asking the Colonial Office for this? No secretary of State for the Colonies can tell us if we are to have Independence or not. The Secretary of State for the Colonies cannot even tell Rhodesia that. If you want me to get rough I will say this. Is this as much as Harold Wilson the Prime Minister ..... they have a plural society in Southern Rhodesia with 200,000 people who are white settlers and 4 million Africans. I was in the House of Commons when Wilson returned from Rhodesia in November. I went to the House of Commons and sat there and I heard the longest statement which has ever been delivered by a Prime Minister of England; and he said to a packed gallery in the House of Commons that he was not going to use any force in Rhodesia because of what the English people said. I think the concensus of opinion was that they were using force against their brethren in Rhodesia. He said that the Rhodesian Government is a break-away Government, it is illegal and he is treating an illegal and break-away Government as if it is a Civilian.

In the War you had sanctions on Italy against Abyssinia. They suspended the Constitution in British Guiana; but where we are crushing a minority they take away our power. But where you get the reverse is that they say it is illegal because we have no guns to use. Do you want the Secretary of State for the Colonies to tell us if we want Independence or not whereas the Rhodesians have declared their own Independence? The last Secretary of State for the Colonies had more sense than this; but do not allow office boys to tell you what to do and he can make his own decision. It is time for us to understand, when we have power, how to use it.

Under the Constitution they can put in as many amendments as they wanted to put in, but people who have commonsense knew what the position was. Because the Constitution is written in this way, it is not carried out like that.

4.05 p.m.

The Government in power was elected by the people in Barbados on a broad basis in 1961. It is only ignorance on the part of those who do not study the events of time to talk about a Federation, because Federation only became an issue with this Government subsequent to the elections. So they did not have a mandate when they went to England. When the Hon. Leader of the Opposition went to London for the Federal talks, did he go back to the people and ask if they wanted a Federation? Did he say he is not going because he is not having Federation? All these were broad issues. But what do you find? Now that the Government has brought down a Resolution based on Independence, they are saying: "Let us have another election" as if there was not an election.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have here a vicious article written by a gentleman whose name is John Crocker, and I will read part of it to show that we have some vicious people in this community. The article states:

"The fear is that if Mr. Barrow leads the country into immediate independence, he will also make it a republic with himself as Life President, that there will be no more elections, and that Parliamentary democracy will cease to exists."

What kind of fool that person could be? Even in Russia there are electons. I will go further.

"The seriousness of this growing alarm at Mr. Barrow's supposedly dictatorial tendencies has been underlined by the recent resignation of two important members of his Cabinet -- W. A. Crawford, Minister of Trade and Labour who was also Deputy Premier, and Erskine Ward, Minister without portfolio.

Mr. Ward was Speaker of the House of Representatives in the former West Indies Federation and is a man of vast experience in both the political and judicial field in the Caribbean.

Both told me categorically that if Mr. Barrow is permitted by the British Colonial Office to take this island into immediate independence, it will be "goodbye to freedom".

That is what the man wrote. Imagine the hon. senior member for St. Philip on my right meeting a man coming from Canada and projecting that sort of idea for a Canadian or any man to write in a newspaper. That is why I talk about gaol. Normally when a man can do that damage to his country, where should that man be? Prison is too good. These are vicious statements to send abroad. When a person does that, he is not doing any damage to the hon. senior member for St. John; he is doing damage to Barbados. He has broken with the Party, and he says that if the country gets independence gone are elections. This has been written in the "Montreal Star", a very important paper.

He can say those things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I do not believe that the hon. senior member for St. Philip had any love at any time for the Hon. Premier, because the day after the elections in 1961, I said this was a new era and the hon. member who is on my right, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, asked me why I said so. I read the article and I read the names, and the hon. member is here and can speak for himself; These are the vicious things we have in our community. There are some people in this island that will join with any person when they are opposed to another person, and I have sufficient evidence to prove that. I see that strife is being raked up in this island on the basis of who wants a job, and who gets compensation, and members of the Government were trying to create strife to see what they would gain. I have been in politics long enough to know people. We have had a certain amount of industrial peace in the sugar industry until some people walked about the country and tried to influence people that the Union wanted to deprive them of something. When we go to Independence, we are not going with the worst elements; we must go with the best; and if we cannot go to Independence with the best, there is no point in having Independence.

The people of all classes in Barbados should be made aware that Independence does not mean exclusion; it does not mean contracting out. Independence does not mean reprisals on minorities. I saw some article talking about minorities not having any rights — minorities in Barbados that have no political power. I would hate the day to come that in setting up an industrial board you refuse to include a businessman because he is not a member of the House of Assembly or of the Other Place. I would hate the day to come that a man because of the colour of his skin cannot go and serve the public wherever his talents allow. I feel that a black man, a brown man, a blue man, even a man who has drunk the wrong medicine and has the wrong colour, any man of whatever classification has a right to be represented in public institutions.

4.15 p.m.

I am not a member therefore of that group of narrowness who would say: "Oh! look, let us exclude any group." It is not that I am not strong in my views in my Socialist philosophy. These hon. members who say that they are political Conservatives -- at the same time I do not deny political Conservatism -- are only joining one with another to win a seat. I feel deep down in my heart that they are only running to get a seat. I would hate to see the day when you have an independent nation which is comprised of a plural society and you exclude part of that plural society from playing its part in the community. I am sure that none of us would have any objection to every segment of our society participating to the full. The hon. junior member for Christ Church has the right to participate with as much interest as any of us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been told that it is time to give you rest as you cannot get any relief; therefore, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for 15 minutes.

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

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

4.20 p.m.

On Resumption,

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I notice that there is no quorum and I ask that you instruct that the bell be rung.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung, and a quorum obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When this sitting was suspended, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that one of the salient features that one should bring into a debate like this at this time is not the negative approaches that I have heard that the cost to the community is going to be burdensome, and it would be better off if we would be associating ourselves with the people of the other colonies. For example, the hon. junior member for the City raised the point about what Professor Arthur Lewis said to this in relation to any Federation. This is not in relation to this Federation: but whatsover Professor Arthur Lewis said, I am sure we would be willing to admit that all federations all over the world have become very difficult to work. Even in the United States Federation, the Swiss Federation — all of them have found great difficulty in working them and to start them.

There is no point in going into innumerable exercises year after year like what we are going through when each time that there is an election somewhere, after somebody wins the elections they want something else. You get this sort of thing going on all the time. I do not think it is necessary for us to be continually pondering over these things.

What we have to be concerned about is whether Barbados is capable of entering into Independence for the people of Barbados, and if we can do for the people of Barbados not less than what we are doing, and thus free ourselves from the shackles which a Colonial territory has. We have better roads, better schools, a better social service than our neighbours, and our *per capita* income is higher. Therefore all of the aid that will be forthcoming, we will not be using it; the other colonies will be using it.

As regards the size of our population, it is a burden; but the size of the population does not give you wealth. There is no economic growth fostered within the other territories. The population of a country itself does not mean economic growth. Economic growth must take place within the Colony or with the group. If the economic growth of the other Colonies is lower than your own, there is no benefit. Let us examine those countries of the European Economic Community, their size and their population. There is higher wealth obtaining in these countries than it is with 900 million people living in China. If that were so, China would be the richest country in the world because of its vast population; but unfortunately that is not so. Therefore, the expectation of your selling more and your doing more to improve youself is not based on population; it is based on purchasing power. If the purchasing power of the people is increased, then it means that we can do more trade.

These are arguments put forward. Even on trade, your gaining Independence does not preclude you from trading with the other people. Trinidad has Independence, but it trades with all of the other territories. It does not work out that way; people just do not say that they are not trading with you because you are independent. Trade is done on a competitive basis. If Barbados can compete better in trade matters, well then, the people in the other territories would trade with us. The President of the Cham-

ber of Commerce mentioned the fact that here in Barbados the landing charges for goods to Barbados are cheaper than anywhere else in the neighbouring islands; so it means that your intransit trade would be always attractive.
4.40 p.m.

The position of trade in Barbados is based along these factors. The quality of your business depends on how much you spend on your education. We spend a lot on education, and therefore we are producing more people who are capable. The hon. member spoke of Sir Arthur Lewis and this is something which is wider in scope where he was analysing the African scene, and he gave his reasons as opposed to the one-Party state. When the hon. member referred to Sir Arthur Lewis he would see what Sir Arthur had to say about big areas. When you are operating a democracy in a society like ours, it has to be borne in mind that you are not operating a very easy type of Government.

I quoted from this newspaper for the purpose of demonstrating something. I would say that more damage has been done by opponents to Independence than has been done by the proposal to have Independence for Barbados. Not one member of this House has said that he has been challenged about the elections. One Trade Unionist has said that he wanted Jamaica to be a Republic. The feeling that some of these Commonwealth territories will be affected as a result of the Rhodesian affair has made some of these territories say that we will have a Republic. The minute you begin to talk about freedom — well, let us examine one of the pillars of freedom in our society. When we come to the Press, we have two daily newspapers in Barbados, together with a few weekly rags. Can you say that the Press in Barbados with all the exercise is free? What is it free to do? Some sections of the Press are free to slander people, some are free to track people down and the others have entered into vulgarity. There is no Government newspaper in Barbados. As regards the daily Press, you will find that very few of the policies which should be projected are projected. Both of the daily newspapers which we have in Barbados have given no objective situation about Independence for Barbados. What do you find? If the monied class want to get something done, an Editorial is written in support of it. Look at the feature writers and take an analysis of them! I challenge hon. members to find in these newspapers any critical analysis of the businesses and how they are conducted in this island, or an analysis of the finances and how they are conducted in this island. All you will find is that these boys are sniping at some political Party or institution. Have you ever read any article in any of these newspapers projecting that the close-fitting policy of business is inimical to the best interests of this community and that the time has come when that policy should be on a more open basis? The Press has been checked so that when you hear people talk about freedom, how free are we in a society where the economic control is so hamstrung in the hands of a few people that if anybody wants to buy so much of anything he cannot get it? I really do not understand what people mean when they talk about freedom because I do not see any. I am saying, Sir, that some attempt is being made at this stage to give the projected image that if we get Independence the present Premier of this island will take it to his feet and ride roughshod over us.
4.50 p.m.

I am glad the Leader of the Opposition is there, because I want to ask him how much has the Premier changed from the time when he said that his Government should be in power for 300 years? If he has changed a lot from that, is it a change towards him or towards the people? Is the hon. member measuring his change as a change towards him or a change towards the people? Has his basic political philosophy changed, or has your friendship waned a little and therefore these things would come about?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not dealing with the person; I am dealing with principles. When I criticised the Premier on the Banks Brewery issue, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that it takes a big man to make a mistake and then come back and say so. That is true. Well this is the same man who in such a short time has become this Frankenstein. The hon. member is joining with others to say these things about a man whom he said should rule for 300 years. When the hon. senior member for Bridgetown came back from the Federation Conference in London, he told me himself what a terrific man the Premier was at the Conference. Now at the eleventh hour you find not only the Leader of the Opposition, but some of the Premier's erstwhile friends saying these things about him.

I would say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are lots of hon. members in this Chamber who are not ready for Independence, but the people are. That is the fundamental difference. The people are more advanced than the leaders, because we have some shilly-shally members in this Chamber who do not know how the wind is blowing, and they have to put their ears to the ground. As soon as you are a political leader, you have to be able to lead if you are capable of doing that, not put your ears to the ground. I have a beautiful example of seeing some of them at work; some of them are just ordinary political corks, just suitable for stopping something down until you are ready to open it; but so far as usefulness is concerned, they are no use at all. I am waiting until election time comes to see if some of them are going to face the polls again, and then they will know because so far as their duties to the people of this country are concerned, they do not pay any interest in them. You can go and read Hansard and see how much they have contributed in this House. What you get from them is a whole lot of intrigue and manoeuvring; but when it comes to a serious issue, you get speeches bandied about the country as to who has money and who is getting money. There is always a lot of money knocking about this place, and everybody right and left accusing people for getting money. I am not going to accuse anybody for getting money because nobody offers me any. I have to work very hard for mine; but I do know that politics sometimes makes strange bedfellows, and when I see certain associations, I become suspicious. Imagine that people of a different political philosophy can join so closely on an issue like this! You join with them for reasons of a personal character; otherwise you would not be Leader of the Opposition. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Leader of the Opposition means nothing to me!) There was political chicanery for you to become Leader of the Opposition; but if I were in your position, I would have to be elected based on an election. I have examples here. There are people who want to be Speakers, and whenever elections come about, there is a group of you lining up to see what you can get, and some fellows are left at the gates with the bits in their hands.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot accuse me of lining up anywhere, because I line up at the Union every morning. When you want political power, you have to make exchanges. When you are running a Party, it is understandable. The hon. member is a leader of a Party; so two Party leaders have to go in for shuffling. They shuffle the cards and take what comes out in the deal. It is not that the person might not deserve it as compared with others, because in my opinion it was Tweedledee and Tweedledum. The election was over, a Party was in power and therefore it was a question of agreeing to a Leader of the Opposition. I could have been Leader of the Opposition, because there were three Independent members, four Conservative members and three Labour Party members; so there were ten leaders on the other side. However, I will not be diverted into that channel.

I would say, Sir that these political manoeuvres take place whenever an important issue seems to be looming, and we have the important issue of Independence looming. This is not a question whom you are going for independence to. You are not going for Independence to Mr. Barrow; you are not going for independence to the Democratic Labour Party, or to the Barbados Labour Party or the Barbados National Party. This is independence for the people of Barbados. The question is: are the people of Barbados entitled to live in an independent country? Yes or no? The answer is for you to give. Why should we now want a Resolution to determine after elections whether Barbados should go for independence or not? Why did we not have an election to have Ministerial Government? I was a member of the

Executive of this Island, and I heard all that nonsense going on; but some people are looking for an area of comfort and an area of opposition too.

I am certain, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if the present Premier had brought down a Resolution for Federation, I would hear all the same arguments against federation. *(Cheers)* There are some people who are looking into the old waste-paper basket of forgetfulness for arguments to use. If he had brought an angel, somebody would be looking under the angel's wings to see if they were put in right. They have reached this stage of opposing for opposing's sake, because they have these built-in fears. We have these lukewarm, tepid-water politicians who are not fit for these crises and issues; and as soon as there is a man who has some sort of courage and guts to stand up before them, they back off and go into the wastepaper basket looking for bogus arguments. If I have to disagree with the Premier, I tell him so. I have disagreed with the Premier on many issues; but when I disagree with a man who holds my political philosophy, it is a different thing, because I can disagree with him on one issue and find agreement on something else.
5.00 p.m.

Therefore, I do not run around the country and say that the man is not any good. We are Barbadians. Is it symptomatic of Barbadian character that you tell a man that you will have no more elections after you get elected? But where would you live? Even in Russia, they have elections. They have some people who are not in the Government who would like to have elections tomorrow. Imagine that I have had all sort of intrigues in elections! Nobody has been in more political intrigues than I.

When it comes to this question of trade on your gaining independence, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked us if we have preached against Federation. I do not like to read these articles in the Press. They had an article written in the "Barbados Observer." Part of it stated – and Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not ask me to make this newspaper a document of the House. As a matter of fact, it is part of a newspaper. It was dealing with the free trade area. It states:

"This, however, is no time for mutual recriminations, but it is important to reaffirm the position of the Barbados Government. While committed to the idea of establishing a federation in the Eastern Caribbean it has never given an undertaking to dissociate itself from other Caribbean governments. The Free Trade Agreement in no way contravenes any agreement or undertaking made with the Governments of the Windward and Leeward islands. In fact, they have been invited to join in this Trade Agreement. If they hesitate or refuse, Barbados cannot be blamed. The first duty of the Government of Barbados, until it becomes a unit in a Federation of the territories of the Eastern Caribbean, is to the people of Barbados. It is still ready and willing to enter a Federation on just workable terms. It will, we have no doubt, continue to try again for the achievement of the objects set out in Command Paper 1746, but it cannot allow itself to be forced by the unreasonable intransigence of others to acquiesce in an indefinite stalemate. The interests of this island demands action."

Now, when you get these political hypocrites telling us that our first duty is not to the people of Barbados but that our first duty is to the Federation, not to Barbados, what do you think? If your first duty was to the Federation, it means that your first duty would be to let the people in those territories elect you. Our first duty is to our own people because our people gave us the right to come here, and we owe the electorate a similar pledge to put their duty first. No one in London pays any interest in your argument about 'elections should come first'.

Now, in all these articles which we have read, none of the writers has the courage to get up and say that Barbados is not fit for Independence. Do you know why? The bells are ringing now and they are afraid. If they dare say what they were saying yesterday that they do not want Independence for Barbados, because Barbados is too small..... (Mr. CRAWFORD: I never said so.) I meant you all.

They started off with that nonsense. I go further. The Leader of the Barbados Labour Party said that it was nonsense to have eighteen year-olds voting. I went to a political meeting at which the son of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was addressing the people. It is true to say that he is a fledgling in politics. He asked: "Do you want Federation?" The people held up their hands. He then asked: "Do you want Independence?" The people held up their hands again. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition should tell him that you should never put a question like that. The way he put the question he got the wrong answer.
5.10 p.m.

These things I see in people. That is why I say that these young people should take an interest in the life of the community -- which is good for the community. I hope that they will continue to come out in public life under Independence and not take the position of sniping. It is disgraceful for people to be walking about with these whispering campaigns and say that they tackled you on the telephone. Sometimes you take up a telephone, the lines are crossed and you hear a conversation, but you do not know who is at the other end. This is a community of gossip and you can hear the ignorance of people. A lady said to me very frankly: "I see that you are supporting the Government. Some people say that I am going to be Ambassador to Washington. They tell me that seriously. A lady told me: "You are going to be an Ambassador". I asked: "To where?" And she said: "To Washington." That is the sort of thing you are hearing.

When the Hon. Leader of the Opposition won the Municipal Election, I publicly said that he won the Election and now he tells me that it has not come out to anything. The consensus of opinion supporting the idea that he should be the Mayor of Bridgetown was because some of us felt that way. If the hon. member won the Election, nobody could push anybody else from the side. You won the Election and we gave you what was due to you. We did that and the hon. member knew it. That is the first lesson which the hon. member should get when he talks about fighting for Independence. When you hear the hon. junior member for the City speak in the way in which he had spoken, do you think that he should run a pipeline from his school through Harrison College so that he would be in contact with the Headmaster of Harrison College? This is like a sweetheart who has gone – and you could as well look for another sweetheart because Federation has gone. *(Laughter)* You should now fall in love with Independence. *(Laughter)*.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to travel any more on this ground. I hope that the hon. junior member for Christ Church will take back to his colleagues and friends the fact that it is not a question of taking up their tracks from here and going to Australia, Canada or New Zealand. This is our country. I am saying that the hon. member has as much right to live in this country as anybody else. We have as much right to live here as you have. However, we want you to know – as a matter of fact, we want everybody in Barbados to know – that we are going on to Independence, and we expect from every citizen in our community that he will do his utmost to make this country a better place for us to live in than when he arrived in the country. *(Cheers)*

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to join in this debate. I should like to do so as a member of a law-making body, and as one who has witnessed the improvements which have taken place from time to time to what has led up to the present Constitution. I, too, think that Barbados will be in a position to become an Independent country. I cannot acknowledge the plaudits of the people outside this building because they may be applauding too early. I have not been going through the country and making my views known of what was taking place, but in my constituency I have been in daily contact with numbers of my people and I communicated to them that my stand is for Federation. I have my reason for that. Years ago, before this generation was on this scene, this idea of Federation has been proceeding. Some people fought for things from time to

time. The Leaders of these islands have been unable to come together to form a Federation and it seems to me that the idea is all forgotten. I am one of those people who never talk when I think the wind is blowing the stongest. I can stand alone.
5.20 p.m.

I am *not courting anybody's friendship in this matter.* I have talked very candily with people who have conversed with me during the past three months, and I have not swerved from my opinion. I listened for a long time to the Hon. Premier in his marathon speech which, I think, had very little to do with Independence. As a matter of fact, it is only when he came somewhere near the end that he began to talk on the Resolution, and I make a summary of some of the things he said, and I think it would be fair to him and to myself if I told this Chamber what I think of some of the expressions he made.

After an introduction into the early history of this Colony, beginning from its setting up and reaching to its present state of constitution, the Hon. Premier just digressed. He was not interrupted, but he was not convincing. As a matter of fact, I believe in democracy and in all the safeguards of democracy; and if I voted against this Resolution, I too regard that I am voting for the people of Barbados as much as those who vote for this Resolution believe they are voting for the people of Barbados. Do not think I am voting for the people of St. Lucia or Antigua. I am voting for the people of Barbados, and time will tell who voted carefully. I am unnerved and I am as calm as a cucumber. I have not been influenced by any supposed threats in this Chamber, and there have been many during the course of this debate. I have maintained my balance and will continue to do so throughout this debate, because we believe that owing to the manner in which the regional talks ended, the idea of a Federation must still be pursued. We also believe that the people of the area who think so would not be deemed as traitors to Barbados; but after reference to things like treason, I am beginning to be doubtful. What sort of Independent state am I going to have to live in if we go Independent now?

Let nobody think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I would not be proud to be a Barbados Citizen; but we have so much in common still, apart from the inability of our own leaders to get together and produce a working formula, to usher in a federation with the other Leeward and Windward Islands. I believe that a West Indian Federation, no matter how big it is, is the real answer to the economic improvement of these islands.

If we had enfolded our less able brethren to us, I am saying that the people of St. Lucia and Dominica could not be so beguiled, after three years of the Federal exercise, by people who worked with them and told them almost nothing until now. If that Tenth Regional Meeting had not broken up, I do not think that we would have been told that even the most insignificant among us would be called a giant in the other islands. One thing is certain, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it is that if in this part of the Twentieth Century a political federation cannot begin to work, as time goes on, there will be need for a West Indian Federation. What is more, even in the very Preamble of this Resolution we are told that it is the intention of this Government to work in close collaboration with these islands. Although we are being asked to forget a political Federation, there is a hint -- and more than a hint -- an intention, a declaration, a promise, an offer that we should see, magnanimously or otherwise, to the development and assistance of our lesser brethern in an economic way. So you never get away from the idea of a Federation anyhow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a lot has been said about the presence here of St. Lucians and Dominicans. The Hon. Premier was joined by the Minister of Trade and Industry in saying that they are responsible for about 50 per cent of the social diseases in this island, and one Minister even said more. I do not know if he spoke authoritatively as far as these social diseases were concerned. That Minister went on, and as I listened to his references to our unfortunate brothers from St. Lucia, I could have imagined that I was listening to some Teddy Boy in the United Kingdom making reference to West Indians, including Barbadian immigrants there.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I object to the hon. junior member for St. Peter referring to me as a Teddy Boy.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I never did that.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Beside the Hon. Premier, I am the only Minister who spoke on this matter. I referred to the fact that the filthy way in which some of the people who come to this country live -- and I did not isolate St. Lucians in this case -- must result in an increase in things like hooworm and the introduction into this country of typhoid fever.
5.30 p.m.

Because of the filthy way in which some of them live -- some of the people who come to this country -- it shows that they are not accustomed to the social amenities which we have. Because of the filthy way in which they live, there is an increase in things like typhoid fever: and the greater the filthy state in which they live, we are in danger of having an epidemic in this country, either of hook worm or typhoid fever.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter has referred to me as a Teddy Boy and I object to that. I now crave Your Honour's indulgence to ask that he withdraw that remark.

Mr. HUSBANDS: May I continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I am a man of peace. I sat listening to the Hon. Minister's reference to our lesser fortunate brethern, and I said that I can imagine listening to him just as a Teddy Boy with reference to a Teddy Boy in England. I regret that you did not hear me so well. I said, listening to the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour, to his reference to our unfortunate brethern who are not as rosy as we are, we have migrants in England; and I can imagine I was listening to a Teddy Boy making similar reference to West Indians in England, including Barbadians.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask that you have the record put straight and find out what the hon. member said. I am sure that the hon. junior member for St. Peter in his address made reference to me as a Teddy Boy and that is what I object to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your objection is that the hon. member actually called you a Teddy Boy. The hon. member repeated what he did say; and from what I hear that he has said, I cannot entertain any objections on that ground. I have ruled.

Mr. SMITH: *(Sotto Voce).* Sit down.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: You cannot tell me to sit down. Are you an idiot?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall call on the Hon. Minister to withdraw that remark. I have heard a member across the floor of the House saying "Sit down" and I have heard the hon. Minister, across the floor of the House, in a loud tone which I cannot resist hearing to make use of the words in reply "Are you an idiot". I will ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw that remark.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the greatest respect, I withdraw that statement.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The Hon. Premier made mention of the fact that in the Manifesto of his party which was published in the daily newspapers and to which the public has access that there was mention of the possibility .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sitting here and I cannot hear because of the noise outside which is coming into this Chamber. I will call on the appropriate authority to do something about it. Members of the House must be heard.

After a pause,

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, if I may continue, the Hon. Premier in his address made much of the fact that the D.L.P. had a Manifesto, and it made mention of the possibility of this country going Independent this year without a Federation; therefore he regarded that as having a mandate from the people. As a matter of fact, everyone knows that during the last election campaign little or no mention was made of Barbados going it alone. The electorate of this country did not expect that Barbados would be going it alone. That is known through the length and breadth of this country.

The Federal exercises got underway early during the regime of the present life of this Government, and that continued for three and a half years; but it has come to an impromptu end and the White Paper was published. This White Paper gives us an account of what had taken place up to the time of the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. I think that up to that moment we were completely in the dark.
5.40 p.m.

I am not going into what I have heard. It may be that hon. members who are more competent than I am may deal with that. If this White Paper tells the country that it is now the intention of the Government to seek Independence alone, then it must be understood that the whole island will want to know why that is so. I did not take it upon myself to go through the length and breadth of the island to say what the position is. I held no public meetings and I attended none out of my constituency. I attended three meetings in my constituency, and I listened to what people of varying opinions had to say. I was very active myself in alerting the people of my constituency as to the position, and it is still my opinion that I am no traitor to the people because I unswervingly feel that I have a great preference for Independence within a Federation. The mere fact that the idea of Independence within or without a Federation was put forward in the Manifesto of the Government Party, the mere fact that the exercise of the Federal discussions was going on for three and one half years and that two Ministers of Government have resigned — the Island must take note of that and begin to ask why did these things happen. These things are of some moment. These Ministers have held public meetings, and the mere fact that the Chief Minister of St. Lucia is reported to have entered conversations with a man who was the Personal Aide to the Hon. Premier — this is no laughing matter. We have a man of the calibre of Mr. Ward who is an Ex-Chief Justice; he is a man who would be respected anywhere in the West Indies. He is also the Ex-Speaker of the former Federal House of Representatives. He is therefore, no fledgeling or self-seeker. Therefore, I say today, I have to be very candid and I must analyse very carefully all that I have heard from Speakers on the Government side.

The mere fact that the Manifesto of the Government Party said that it wanted one thing or the other, and since it is a Government which had committed itself to these Federal exercises for such a length of time, we have remained in the dark. Something went wrong. I am asked to vote for an alternative, I am expected to vote for it, and I am being dubbed as a traitor to Barbados if I do not vote for it. I am dubbed as a man who has no aspirations if I do not vote for that alternative. I would never ascribe to any of them on the other side any improper motives. They see now that there is a united Opposition, and therefore they are trying to pick it to pieces bit by bit. They are attacking the Conservative Party and they hold it up to ridicule. On an occasion like this when I see people who are taking that stand, who are attacking that party, I say that when you have an argument you do not have to begin with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. junior member for the City and the hon. junior member for Christ Church and say what they are *vis-a-vis* this Resolution. You want to side-track something, and we say that there is no coming back on the side track. There is no vilification of the unfortunate brother.

Yesterday when the Hon. Minister for Trade said that the people of St. Lucia have showed their apathy and disregard for wanting Federation and they would refuse to buy Barbados sugar, the Ex-Minister of Trade and Industry, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, the hon. member on my left, got up and said that the position was that they had been offered sugar at a price cheaper than that of Barbados. When responisble people accuse others of misleading the House and make such statements, they should be refuted instantly by one who holds the portfolio which that Minister held.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but he has misquoted me. He said that the people of St. Lucia in apathy to this Federation have refused to buy Barbados sugar. I said that while the people were negotiating for a federation with Barbados -- and I was making out a case that Independence for Barbados would not reduce the trade for Barbados with these territories. I said that when Trinidad went independent, the same island of St. Lucia, which was then discussing Federation with Barbados refused to buy Barbados sugar and wanted sugar from elsewhere.
5.50 p.m.

If he wants to quote me, let him quote me correctly.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has not contradicted anything that I said; so I will proceed. Our difference on this Independence question is greatly influenced by the manner of approach by this Government to Independence. We do not consider it to be the normal manner of approach. As I said earlier, we have witnessed the steady growth and improvement of our Constitution. Anyone knows that we have as full a measure of internal self-government that easily qualifies us for Independence. The latest addition to the Constitution by the Letters Patent came into effect during the regime of the present Government. We are very independent today, but we do not appoint our own Governor. Apart from the Preamble which mentioned the failure of the holding together of many federations -- and that was of course put in purposely — the Resolution reads:

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House request 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."

The Hon. Premier asked if Trinidad went to the people by means of a Referendum. I do not think the need arose for that, but definitely the Colonial Office knows by now that on this question of Independence alone for Barbados there is a great division not only among the people, but among the elected representatives of the people in this House of Assembly. Normally, the Hon. Premier would have consulted with members of the Official Opposition and even with members of other Opposition Parties, but nothing of the kind has been done. Some mention was made by the Hon. Premier on Tuesday last that immediately after some meeting at Sherbourne he consulted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but he did not tell the House on what. The Leader of the Opposition has never let it be known that he has ever entered any consultation *vis-a-vis* Barbados going it alone, nor has the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party nor any other member of the Opposition; so I think that this is one of the strongest of approaches to the assumption of nationhood within the history of Colonies. I say that quite openly. I see the Hon. Premier is not in his place. If he were here, he would have the chance of replying to me when he has his turn to reply.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it looks as if these talks had been broken off, a White Paper whipped up overnight and published, and of course a Resolution rushed down to this

House three months ago. I differ, Sir, in the manner of approach to this subject. I do not believe that Barbados going it alone means as much as if it went independent within a Federation. I have heard responsible Ministers of Government say that attempts have been made to bring about a Federation on two occasions. That is the sort of talk that uninformed people spread about, but I do not appreciate that sort of talk coming to me from responsible Ministers of Government and at such a late hour. They would have a lot of arguing to do to convince me that they have just understood that. How long ago were they acquainted with these facts? How long ago have they seen that a federation is quite impossible? I have heard mention of the lack of financial integrity of Ministers in the other islands. I think they knew that before. As a matter of fact, I think that that sort of behaviour in those islands is due to the fact that their audit system is quite different from ours. If they had a system of audit as we have been practising in Barbados for many years now, I think the accusation of lack of financial integrity could not be ascribed to a Minister. But that in itself is not argument enough for me as to why we should not further pursue a Federation.

When people say that we are arguing more for these islands than we are for Barbados, I do not hold that view. Every hon. member is rightly entitled to his own opinion, and I think I am just as rightly entitled to mine. It is just a difference of opinion. He sees it one way and I see it another way, and I do not think he would easily convince me that I am wrong, because I have heard nothing but accusations. You will remember that I am not as informed as he is, and, maybe, he shouts and rants, and thinks this is an argument, whereas it is not an argument. It is just a loud-mouthed statement based on I do not know what. I do not ascribe impure and improper motives to hon. members of this Chamber, not even outside.

So much has been said that is irrelevant, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is very difficult to reply to the speech made by the Hon. Premier. I was at pains to take notes at times, but I have been actually disgusted and would give up, and then I would jot down something, but it was nothing to do with independence. I was waiting to see how he would be able to convince me that I should vote for this Resolution, but he has not done so.
6.00 p.m.

He thinks that it is a very entertaining speech. Any way, you sat and heard that it is not a question of emotion.

Finally, I say that there are some things which you cannot disregard. When we were thinking of Federation, we knew that money mattered. We were told that the sum of $7 million was needed for grants-in-aid to the lesser islands. We were told that the moment we were responsible for them $7 million would be needed. The British Government did not commit itself to any figure. We knew that, because we read certain reports that the United Kingdom Government would not make up its mind.

Surely, Sir, we regret that, but I do not think that was the failure of the Federal exercise. That does not impress us that that was the failure of the Federation. The difficulty is with one of the islands, or even some; but sooner or later, sheer commonsense would drive these islands together. Sheer necessity would cause them to do so; and if we do not make ourselves more viable as a big wealthy brother with the industries which we have in Barbados, we would have to look for markets as soon as possible, and Jamaica would have to look further afield.

The Hon. Premier has said that since Trinidad has gone independent, its trade with the Eastern Caribbean has increased. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you make a statement like that, you have to be very careful. That statement does not convince any intelligent people. Some people are always in good shape to make a speech. Some times, they have a gullible audience. Here it is not so.

I would say this. Jamaica is independent, Trinidad is independent, and Barbados proposes to be independent. Let us say that within the next five years Antigua, St. Lucia, Dominica, Grenada and St. Vincent become independent. Now, this is what it comes to. Let us say that Barbados goes independent, or even before Barbados goes independent that there is an industry which formerly used to export to Barbados - that is to say that the producer in Trinidad formerly exported his goods to Barbados. Barbados may get a similar industry. The producer in Barbados of the similar product may seek Government's protection, and as a result the tariff goes up in respect of the goods coming to Barbados. The producer of those goods in Trinidad comes here and set up the industry. There you have it. Less employment for the people of Trinidad because the industry is set up here. Now, the same thing can be in the reverse. If the producer from Trinidad comes here and divides the business, the manufacturing plant here manufactures at a loss. The hon. member said that it is not politicians who make trade. It is the investor, and the investor always seeks to enjoy the best political climate he can get for his products. That is to his advantage. When you have all this fragmentation and bits and bits, I think it is not true to say that the people of Barbados are going to get the best. Political independence is not all. You have to see both sides.

I have heard remarks to the effect that if we do not get Independence in 1966, we would never get it; it is now or never. I make no apology for saying this. Those who said that they receive a mandate from the people, I wonder if they are afraid to go back to the people. I say they are.
6.10 p.m.

Being here today, tonight, or the day after, is not the end. I am not one of those who will refuse to fight because I think the odds are against me. I have watched the fluctuations and I have had inducements, but I wi ll remain in one way. Nobody can say that I am a mercenary. I will get on my campaigning platform in St. Peter and say this when the time arrives. Do you think you could begin to influence people and begin to curse them, vilify then and tell them how black they are? I have never seen such bad happenings displayed on a matter on such an important occasion. I have never seen such happenings displayed on such an important matter. It is not a question of personalities; we are not ganging up to fight against this Resolution because the Hon. So-and-So has brought it up. If they say that, then Hansard will give them the lie. We are not a number of people who have ganged up because a member of that Party has brought forward this Resolution.

I do not agree with the hon. member when he says that this is Barbados, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies cannot do this or that, that the Secretary of State for the Colonies cannot ask them to do this or that. I do not agree that these things cannot apply to them. We have Letters Patent but we have one comprehensive Constitution. The Hon. Premier has said that he was much in favour of a written Constitution.. As a matter of fact, I have always thought that a Constitution which included conventions and, of course, Statute Laws and Letters Patent was quite good enough; but to tell the honest truth, I am fearful and I would like certain freedoms guaranteed in any Constitution for Barbados. I am saying that in Parliament and it is not intended to be offensive. There is freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom against forcibly entry into homes and many other freedoms which we have enjoyed for years and years; I would like to be absolutely sure that these freedoms will continue.

It is only yesterday that I had my thoughts shattered in this Chamber, The Hon. Minister of Trade and Industry told this Chamber that the hon. junior member for the City was sleeping in the House and there were some exchanges. Soon after that the Hon. Premier rose to his feet and said that it was his intention to introduce a motion to bring about the suspension of the hon. junior member for the City. Believe you me, Sir, if the Hon. Premier had the power to do so, he would have done it. The hon. member has been bluffing his way. According to the Standing Orders of the House, he could not make a motion for the suspension of the hon. junior member for the City just like that. I believe - I solemnly believe - that the Hon.

Premier regretted that he did not have the power instantly to make that motion so as to have that hon. member suspended. That is a serious pointer for me and I would not like my address to conclude without mentioning it. I fear no man. Let nobody go on with the tide. Why do you constantly tell us about William Joyce and treason and that he did not do this and he did not do that? Do you think that I, as a self-respecting Barbadian, would entrust my destiny and that of the people to go on these threats?

If I had come to vote for this Resolution yesterday, after seeing that demonstration of the hon. member, I would have thought of changing my mind. A lot of things have happened in the 20th century which I believe people thought could never happen. I will not deceive myself that these things cannot happen in Barbados, that they will not happen really. As diminutive as I am, I will fight until the sun goes down. (MR. WALCOTT): Man, you will cry; you cried already.). A man like me might have to cry when he sees that he cannot defend himself. That is not crying on the surface. The Hon. Premier has been seen to cry. Bigger men than you and I have cried. Impermeable characters who have been hurt to the core may not be able to cry, but a person like me might cry.
6.20 p.m.

Unrelenting people do not cry and you can ask the police. (MR. WALCOTT: Speakers do not cry!) I never cried for that. It was the unfairness behind it. I was asked recently and refused. You talk about intrigue, but I have seen a lot of intrigue, and I talk what I know.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to continue, so much has been said that was intended just to bluff us into voting for this Resolution, that it has left us removed. We come to put our own viewpoints. We thought we would have heard arguments being put forward; but we have heard vilification of Parties, degradation of our friends in the other islands and similarly in this Place. These will not in any way influence our decisions. It is inevitable that we will become independent, but I want in no uncertain manner to know that all the freedoms that we have been enjoying are guaranteed and will be retained; but I would prefer to be in a Federation that has a chance of developing the Caribbean area, that has a chance of benefitting all the peoples of the Eastern Caribbean islands, and very consequentially the people of Barbados. Federation is now a one-way street as some people suppose.

The Hon. Premier went out of his way and has written in paragraphs 78, 79 and 80 of the White Paper how tenuously certain Federations are held together, how there have been attempts of secession in others; but the federation of Nigeria has held together - one of the most viable countries in the world. The United States of America is a great Federation of States; they hold together. In a Federation of the Eastern Caribbean we could not have all the raw materials to be fully industrialised; but we have a lot that, if developed, would redound to the benefit of all the islands.

Now we are seeking a trade pact with British Guiana, and Antigua is coming in. From time to time that pact may extend to others. As no one can see into the future, within the next ten years everyone of these islands might be independent. The breaking up of the Federation has put them back to the position that they have to come back to. Had the federation succeeded, they would have begun with an independent status. Let us not lose sight of that. If the Federation talks had proceeded amicably till it reached some practical result, on the declaration of Independence the whole area would have been independent. As a matter of fact, a Federation has to be that. You cannot federate with somebody of inferior status. That is why I think the other Federations in some measure could not hold. The breaking up of the Regional Talks put back the clock for the islands. If these talks had proceeded smoothly, they would be at the end of these talks - each and everyone of them an independent state. As it is, it is still going to take some time to become independent if they want to be. We know the conditions now. It is not as easy as some people were telling us. It is no simple nodding of the head as they have said. There must be a two-thirds majority in the lower Chamber and a majority in the upper Chamber and a majority by a referendum.

I am hoping that we are not rushed into this business unless we Barbadians know that these guarantees of freedom are present, because I have seen some funny things happening. I have seen people threatened, and that is a bad thing, especially since it has been demonstrated during this debate on Independence. Some people so lose their balance of reason that they show their true self on so slight provocation, that it could not be truly said that they are the people who should have the destiny of these things in their hands at such a critical time. I am very glad that these things have been manifested, especially during this debate. It gives me a little more grist for my mill, and nobody should attempt to deny me the right of saying that there is absolutely nothing wrong in having the people judge for themselves. Are you afraid to return to those whom you say gave you a mandate? Is there any reason why we should be afraid to go back to the electorate? I do not think that it can truly be said that the Constitution of Jamaica, when they went with a referendum, was inferior to that of Barbados.
6.30 p.m.

It is not a fair comparison to mention Trinidad because I do not think there was a difference in parties on this question. In Barbados there is a difference of opinion on this matter, and we in the Opposition, just like those of the Government, are elected members. That is a fact which cannot be denied. As a matter of fact, at this stage, it would be a controversial political issue. It could not be done without a referendum, without any involvement or a change in Barbados as far as the Government is concerned. As it is now, it is such a divided issue that I think the Government Party well knows that the electorate may decide not what they would want them to decide; therefore, I say that they have not the confidence which they would make you believe.

You say that we are traitors to the people. Who are the people? Do you think that the forty hirelings whom you have outside there are the people? They are not the people at all. They are a very small fraction of the people. Some people think that they are the people. They are not the people all over this country, and the people all over this country are not coming out of their homes to be molested or to be insulted by paid hirelings.

If this debate had been broadcast to the country, the people would hear what the representatives here are saying. They would hear the voice of every speaker on this controversial issue here. I say again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that some paid hirelings outside are not the electorate. I have had my applause and I have had the jeers too of the crowd outside. It does not matter to me in that nobody can depend on that sort of thing. It is one way today and one way tomorrow. It is just like politicians. They give praise to some politicians today and tomorrow they vilify them. I have heard that the Hon. Premier actually wiped the floor with one of them. I have heard that. I have sat across the Chamber and saw people moving around with such antics as their mouths puffed up. This is because they are empty.

A lot has been said in here today - some of it said very casually - but their efforts have been wasted. Things have been tossed across the Chamber on this side very cleverly to divide this united Opposition. I know that when hon. members on this side address the Deputy Speaker today that there would be silence. However, we do not depend on those antics; what we say we mean. We do not say a thing for applause. We can truly say that we are in a minority now. We are glad to be in the minority because we believe in what we are doing. We do not hope to benefit from what you are doing. We do our respective jobs and attend to our political chores, if allowed, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Nothing of the glamour we expect to have. Who gets it, gets it. We prefer to mean what we say, and the people know it: and we know that the people are not going to call us traitors because we say what we mean on this occasion.

Some people dare to think that we should not come into this Assembly and vote against this Resolution. We have come here and we are prepared to take this bold and open stand with not even the wind blowing behind us. We are in the minority, not in the scene of all things. You can look around and see that when the vote is taken, we would be among those who would be in the minority. I am even anticipating that. However, we shall maintain the stand which we have taken and we are prepared like any other hon. member sitting elsewhere in the Chamber to go back to the people.

You can easily whip up emotional feelings - even that. But that is not the right thing, Sir, you know that for years and years, what has kept the practical work of the Federation in action is the possibility of getting these countries viable. I will not mention Puerto Rico on this occasion. I do not think that we are with Puerto Rico in this context, but I say this. We say that pursuing Independence within a federation is better for us all. It is better for us not only as individual states of the West Indies, but even as far as economic viability is concerned, better living conditions would be obtainable eventually.

The West Indians in England and in the United States of America look to Barbados and to the several other islands from which they come, hoping for light and hoping that some day they will get together. The people in the United States of America are affected by all the pettifogging antics which we are doing in this Island; so it is not only Barbadians, St. Lucians, Grenadians, Dominicans, and the people living in Montserrat and the other islands. Those abroad are also affected. Are we going to close the door to Federation?
6.40 p.m.

Are you going to close the door to them now? Must we close the door to them now? When we go to Independence alone, do not let us deceive ourselves, because that is actually closing the door. Whether we realise it or not, it will be a very difficult job. Twenty-five years from now there will be a yearning and a strong desire for Federation again. People like the idea of federating. I take a long distance view of the matter and I am looking forward to the time when there will be no more but West Indians on the scene. I am surprised at the one-sidedness of approach to this matter. May I call it the selfishness of approach in 1966? Because one Federation was broken up - we do not know why the second Federation was broken up. I do not want to ascribe any improper motives to the Minister because the Government or the Delegation which represented Barbadians at the Regional Council of Ministers - well, there is a lack of information; and even the interpretation of what took place has not impressed me because along with it there was too much personal attack, not only on personalities, but there was the condemnation of personalities and people in Parliament, on such an important matter.

The biggest joke of all is that they expected to influence the Opposition. Sir, the entire thing is unique; nobody has gone into Independence like this. This is a question of U.D.I. and I do not think that Barbados will get away with it. This will be a horse of another colour altogether. We have already expressed our feelings on this matter in Rhodesia. This is the West Indies and we have a representative form of Government beyond that which obtains as far as the franchise in Southern Rhodesia is concerned. This whole bombastic talk is not going to go down very well everywhere; as a matter of fact, it cannot go down well everywhere. I cannot even make an impression on certain people in this Island. When you have to use vilification and make certain remarks in your presentation of any matter, you never have a good case. Let me say this; I compliment those hon. members who have spoken in favour of this question. (A MEMBER: You have missed the bus). Our numbers are not large enough to win. I sincerely believe that in a matter of this sort, this is the last stage, this is the topmost round of the ladder. This Resolution says that we can assume this Independence, but, on this matter, the presentation does not convince me.

This is not doing either my country or the people of the area any good, particularly at this time, to be in a state of Independence. There is so much which is unsavoury which has happened that we should show some toleration in this matter. We have had the injection of the race question entering into this matter, but how does the race question come into this matter? For these cheap things to be heard outside and to enjoy the confidence of 30 or more hirelings will not do us any good.
6.50 p.m.

Bringing in the race question in this debate is serving this debate no good. I deplore it. It is a cheap ruse and has not gone down well. This is 1966 and not 1937 or 1939. That sort of presentation might have had some effect and influence many years ago, but not now. Today we have a much more intelligent electorate; we have extended the age of franchise down to eighteen years, and in Barbados I think information flows reasonably well to all sections of the community, information about what is going on in the country politically and otherwise. We have a Radio Station, a Television Station and daily newspapers, and all eighteen year olds are well informed; so, as a matter of fact, the community is quite self-sufficient, and nobody has to go after associating with any group.

The situation of bringing up this question so suddenly would appeal to the forty hirelings in the yard who really give us trouble when they make their applause and annoy this Chamber. I think the Government would have done better if they had put the loudspeakers in places where we could do our work with better comfort, but they are put there for a reason, a poor and shoddy reason. It means nothing to this country and less to themselves.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we, as much as any hon. member on that side of the House, proud of the advances we have had in our Constitution, would enjoy a state of Independence in a Federation with far greater relish than going it alone. We think that Barbados would have more to get. Some people look at this thing from one side. When they tell us in one breath that you cannot look at money, and in another breath talk about $7 million in Grant-in-aid and only $3 million in trade, what are they looking at? They are not even logical to the end. It is half an argument- which is worse than no argument at all. You are either looking at money or you are not looking at money. I do not think that in the long run the hon. member is really a good economist, because Barbados will have to find markets for any goods we manufacture here.

I heard an hon. member say that the attitude of other West Indians, notably St. Lucians, has been changing towards Barbadians.

That is true, Mr. Deputy Speaker; but again it is a half truth. The question is how long this has been happening. This has become so since we talked about going independent alone. Two druggists representing leading firms in Barbados have told their friends that they go down the islands advertising goods for business houses in Barbados, and before this talk about Barbados going it alone they had an entry to the best homes in St. Lucia, Dominica and Grenada. It is not so now. If this hostility arises on the social side, it is not a good sign of things to come. You talk about Malta with 95 square miles. That is of little strategic value; but we are an agricultural community. You talk about Palestine with an artificial economy prompted by American millionaires turning a desert, literally speaking, into a land metaphorically flowing with milk and honey. That is no comparison. We are not people without experience and knowledge of these matters.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the arguments that have been adduced by those who are backing this Resolution serve no useful purpose. No arguments have been given, but there has been a lot of cursing and side talk. Therefore my personal stand in this matter remains the same, and I am prepared, whenever the amendment comes up for voting, to throw my vote with that amendment, because I

am very jealous of the liberties which I have inherited, and I do not want any elements that are dictatorial, honest or otherwise, to rear their ugly heads in Barbados, because I will offer my life in defence of what I know, and I do not have very long to live now. That is why I am here on this scene now. There will be no silent vote for me. 7.00 p.m.

Let me express what I have to say in as calm and cool a manner as possible. I am not interpreting any statement made by hon. members on that side of the House, nor am I twisting anything they have to say; but there are one or two things that I cannot help saying to them. I would not like to see a Constitution that does not have specific things enshrined therein. The things that we are already enjoying and have already would have to be specifically mentioned.

Sir, the suggestion has been intimated to me that I should move the suspension of the sitting now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The question for the hon. member to answer is: if he thinks he may finish in the next twenty minutes he may go on and finish.

MR. HUSBANDS: My impression was that there would be a suspension at this time.

HON. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member thinks he is nearly finished, he may conclude his speech.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am going to take more than fifteen minutes.

HON. J. C. TUDOR: Well, then, move the suspension of the sitting.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for forty-five minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On resumption,

HON. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum and I ask that you instruct that the bell be rung.

MR. SPEAKER: I am grateful to you for reminding me. Mr. Clerk, let the bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, I was advised that the hon. junior memeber for St. Peter was addressing the Chamber.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, one statement which was made by the Hon. Premier during the course of his address has set me wondering. If I can quote it verbatim, he mentioned that we would have to evolve our own form of Constitution. I think I have interpreted the remarks of the Hon. Premier correctly.

I think that such a remark coming from him would provoke much interest.

In the course of his remarks he mentioned constitutional methods, and he said that people look with pleasure to the day when circumstances prevailed in the community for which they had the courage to offer new patterns. It is common practise for most people who believe in political science regarding constitutions usually to take a draft of the particular thing that they are providing for from many learned students in political science and political philosophy, and they do the necessary research so as to enable them to understand the interpret the Constitution; but when the Hon. Premier says that we in the West Indies have to evolve our own Constitution, I wonder what new provisions or what lack of provisions he would have inserted into the Constitution to be proposed for Barbados as soon as it becomes independent.

You see, Sir, when these remarks are made and they reach the ears of those who will examine them, they would want to try to find out what the speaker is driving at. When the Hon Premier says that we are trying to develop our own form of Constitution, does he mean that we are to ignore the whole stock of wording now, and try some new experiment that may be understood and appreciated by him but probably shock those who know the existing forms and the democratic form of a Constitution?

These remarks are important. Hon members may just push them aside and may think little or nothing of them, but I am a curious man; therefore I think the Hon. Premier owes it to us to give us some light as to what he has in mind, when he said that we have come to the stage in 1966 where we can forget all the stock of learned people in constitutional making and now develop our own form. 8.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that he should be addressing only the Chair.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, someone was addressing me in fairly loud asides, but he is in good spirits. I do not think you could be sorry for that. A remark made by the hon. member during the course of his speech has invoked my humour. there is much we had to know that could be a guide. Naturally, I do not think that those people who have the abiltity to examine Constitutions have ever come across a perfect Constitution; but if it is a question of our ignoring all the work which has been done by able men like Ivor Jennings, I think we should not cast them entirely aside. That is what gets me very sceptical as to what provisions or lack of provisions we have been accustomed to see enshrined in democratic principles. We are not prepared to see one iota of the existing rights to which we are accustomed fall from us. We have minority communities in certain parts of the world today, communities which are now fighting hard for civil liberties; they are risking their lives for these principles and we, in this island of Barbados, are very fortunate in that we have inherited a Constitution which I would not be able to say was made for people who look like me, but nevertheless people who look like me have been privileged to improve upon it in decade after decade.

We are in a position in which we can know what we have; we are very sceptical when pronouncements like these are made and when there is no further elucidation of them given to us. I think it is in duty bound for the Hon. Premier to tell us exactly what he means when he inserts such a statement as that which he has inserted in his address. I am not ascribing to him in his absence any im-,propert motives. I will never do that. I do hope that when he returns to this Hon. Chamber and any one of the members of the Government Party reports to him what was said *vis-a-vis* the remark which I have drawn to their attention, I will be fairly represented. It is rather alarming to hear an hon. member who is trained in the law and who must have more than a nodding acquaintance with constitutional matters, say that we must develop a new form of Constitution. That remark might have been well intentioned but there is already to hand a stock of knowledge which would-be Constitution makers have seldom ignored and which has already been put in.

The Hon. Premier was very adamant when he told the House that there will not be any modification of these proposals. He said that he could not accept any amendment to them, or words to that effect. He does not think it necessary for him to go to the country with any referendum. I do not think that that stand of his at the moment is one which I very well appreciate. I quite agree with the Premier as fas as the position of the Barbados Delegation at the Regional Council of Ministers attended by the Government Ministers is concerned. I have no quarrel with that. In that connection, the Premier said that he has the back-

ing of people like Sir Arthur Lewis; he says that when he finds himself in good water. On the other hand, when it comes to take a country which has reached this stage of political development into Independence, I maintain that there should have been some sort of consultation with members of the opposing Party. Since that has not been the case, I do not understand the Premier in his sticking out and saying that there is not going to be any modification, that there will not be any coming from his proposals. 8.10 p.m.

When we consider what has preceded this Resolution, all the activity relating to the laying on the Table of this House of the White Paper and these new constitutional proposals for Barbados, we can see that the Hon. Premier is going to remain firm in not accepting the amendment.

The Hon. Premier kept back for the last repeatedly made mention of a despatch from Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State. He toyed with this document in his hands, and we were anxious to hear its contents. He built up big expectations on it, referred to it, talked around it and then digressed on one matter and on to another, and then finally he read the despatch to us, and all I could make from that dispatch was that it was New Year's greetings. I was not impressed at all. As he toyed with it, and talked about it, and referred to it, and then made reference to it and came back to it, and finally read it, the substance was New Year's greetings. Well that is toying with a serious debate and a very historical debate. We got nothing from it. The Hon. Premier made much of the United Kingdom's financial aid, and I do not know if it was his opinion or whether he read from any particular despatch, but he said that the British Government was no longer interested in a Federation of these islands.

I think in the Preamble to the new proposals for the Eastern Caribbean Islands just released, it struck me as queer for the Hon. Premier to make reference to the British Government not being interested in a Federation of the Eight, when, if I remember correctly, in the Preamble to the new constitutional proposals for the Caribbean Islands, that Preamble begins with words to the effect that a Union of the Islands is still regarded as the best possible solution to their ills politically and otherwise.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, do you think it is in order that those in the House should hear the hon. member audibly? I do not know if the mumblings of the hon. member are meant for himself or for the Chamber, because those in the Chamber cannot yet comprehend anything he has said since he began to make his speech. *(Cheers)*

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a difference between hearing and comprehending. As for being audible, it is up to the hon. member who is speaking, provided the apparatus is working properly. As to comprehending, that is a matter for those who are listening whether they can understand.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Some hon. members would like to have all the say. When they sit, they regret others have to get up; but I am standing and I will continue to speak. Throughout the length and breadth of the Premier's speech, he described himself as an angry man. I do not see why the Premier of Barbados brings down for discussion new proposals for an independent Constitution for Barbados should be an angry man. There is nothing to be angry about. None of us in the Opposition manifested anger.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any feed-back in this House, I understand that there is in the precincts of this House, a tape recorder working constantly, and that maybe responsible for my not being heard. It has been secretly installed – which hints at a Police State in the future; and if it is removed, I think I would be heard without difficulty within this Chamber. Let somebody now answer. Already we have the foreboding of a Police State where a tape recorder lies within the precincts of this Chamber. It should be removed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, apart from the time wasting exercise that we are experiencing from the hon. member, he has made a very strange statement, and one of his new-found *media* is saying "hear, hear!" This is a charge for which you are responsible. He is charging you with having something secretly installed in here. You are not incapable of interpreting that as Speaker in Charge of this Chamber; and if it is secretly installed in here, he is making the insinuation that something is in the Chamber for which you are responsible which is not permitting him to be heard audibly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not accept any such insinuation, nor am I responsible for anything at this time except to ensure observance of Standing Orders in this Chamber whilst I am presiding. I have no knowledge of any tape recorder allegedly installed within the precincts of, or in, this Chamber. 8.20 p.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I do not, I shall not, and I will not ascribe to you any responsibility for the secret installation of any device that causes me to be heard improperly on this accasion. I learned of the installation of such a device not more than fifteen minutes ago, and it remains in its hidden position. Many people have not the wherewithal; therefore, they have to make some sort of show.

Mr. Speaker, I have on this occasion expressed my views to the distress of those who would not want to hear me at all; but I am mindful of my duty, not only to my constituency in the parish of St. Peter but to the electors of the Island of Barbados. Sir, when the time has rolled on I will stand among those who do not have to be offered any promises, among those who may not be deemed mercenaries, among those who may not be deemed traitors, among those who may not be called self-seeking; but I will be content with whatever is made law after that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it is said and it is a fact that empty vessels keep the most noise. Now, Sir, with such a momentous occasion, with such a Resolution of this nature I feel that it is my bounden duty to represent the people of Barbados.

I was asked by a few of my constituents the reason of Barbados going into Independence alone, and I had to give the reply that as soon as I had listened to the hon. introducer of the Resolution I would be able to tell everyone the meaning if they did not hear it before. But, Sir, it has not been done because the hon. introducer of the Resolution treated us to a whole day, or very nearly a whole day, with his way of talking in his own way, and I will have to read his speech; but up to now he has not let this Honourable House know the real meaning of Barbados going it alone or the meaning of Independence. He has not touched on the Resolution at all; therefore everyone would still have to guess because I am sure that the people of this country did not call on the Government and asked them into Independence.

The Government is trying and making every effort to take the country into Independence, and it is the Government's duty to prove the case to the people and to let them know what is the meaning of Independence and what to expect. What is the meaning to it? Is it going to relieve them from any kind of sufferings, financially or otherwise? Have they to pay more for it or less? Let them know something; they will be able to make up their minds; and if in case a shock is expected, they will be able to cushion themselves before it takes place.

What has the Hon. Introducer of the Resolution told us? He has told us some of everything which, he felt, could make out his case. But Your Honour is a lawyer, and a good one too; therefore, you are aware that the longer the case takes, the weaker it is. When you hear one take so long on a case, it is weak; but when a lawyer gets up and says ten or fifteen words and finishes, the case is won and the defendant is acquitted. That is because he had a case to make out for the defendant. But when he has to drift all around and around, it shows that he is looking for somewhere to make out a case. I believe that is what happened to the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution.

Now, Sir, you know that this House went into recess for the Christmas holidays, and we were not to return until next Tuesday, which is supposed to be the eleventh of this month. But I received a notice calling for this Special Meeting before that time for the purpose of discussing this Resolution.
8.30 p.m.

The hon. Introducer did not tell us the reasons for calling us out before the time. Surely he is not supposed to tell us; but out of courtesy he should have said what are his reasons for so doing, since this House was adjourned until the 11th of this month. I do not know his reasons for not stating the urgency of the case. I admit that if you have an urgent case you should, or can, call us out two weeks before the time; but in relation to a Resolution which has been before us for so long, and then you call us out before the time, something must have happened that they have done so.

Now, Sir, we are changing the Constitution of this colony. That is an important matter and the people of Barbados should know the proceedings and hear for themselves every word that their representatives have to say on this matter. What do we find? It is only the people who live in St. Michael that will be able to hear what their representatives have to say by the installation of a loudspeaker outside in the yard; but surely the people in the outlying districts, the people in St. Andrew and St. John would like to hear. The people in St. Lucy would like to hear what their representatives are saying just as the people in St. Michael, and I think that they should have been given the opportunity to hear the debate, whether the contributions are worth listening to or not. After all, I do not think that it is only some of the members of this House who have been treated with this discourtesy, but it is the electorate as a whole. That is the meaning of authority and power. We are seeking to put the power— or more power — into the hands of one man now than we have sand on the seashore. The introduction of Independence for Barbados is giving power to one person. I always say that I do not care who it is; whether it is my Government or your Government, we have to be careful in placing this amount of power into any one man's hand. What is happening today all over the world is a serious thing and that is what any of us will have to be thinking seriously about. It is not the matter of Independence that I am afraid of; it is the Constitution. It is what is going to be written in the Constitution that we have to be very careful about. Nothing was told us as to the Constitution. I know the meaning of giving power to any one man; whether it be a little man, a sane man or a madman, you have to be careful.

The hon. introducer of this Resolution, during the course of his speech, said that nobody can tell him when he is to hold an Election, that it is he, and he alone, who will say when the Election is to be held. The 250,000 people in this island have to listen to one man to hear when he is going to hold an Election.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: On a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has definitely misquoted what the hon. introducer of this Resolution has said. What the introducer of this Resolution said was that he and he alone has the authority to say when an Election is to be held, provided that it is held within the constitutional period allowed for holding such an Election.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, the hon. member has raised that question, and he used the word "provided". I know that the time for holding an election cannot be longer than the statutory period. Suppose the hon. introducer wants the period to be a longer one; it cannot be any longer so long as the Constitution has not been changed. I am saying that one man has told 250,000 people that he has the authority to say when the Election is to be held. That is democracy; that is the Constitution. I am also saying that I am afraid of the Constitution after Independence, because I do not know what will be written in the Constitution, and therefore I am bound to be afraid of it. You will pardon me, Sir, for saying that when I was coming in here just now I heard somebody say: "We want Independence, but do not want Barrow to get it." I am saying, Sir, that, whether it be Barrow or Sparrow, I am nothing to do with it. I am nothing to do with any of them. I do not know who will be the Prime Minister when this country goes into Independence, neither do I care.
8.40 p.m.

I am not against Independence because of one person, because I am nothing to do with a person when it comes to the people's business. I am thinking of those poor, honest, hard-working people in the country who have to work through the sun and rain for their honest living, and those are the ones who would like to know what to expect from a Resolution of this kind.

There are some people who have said that we do not want Independence and that we always want to be begging. That is not a nice remark for anyone to make. Nobody would try to stop the progress of the people of Barbados, but it is the duty of every hon. member in this House to express his views. If hon. members on this side try to state their views, it is the duty of the Government to convince us if they see we are against the Resolution. The Hon. Introducer of the Resolution seeking Independence alone should convince us over here who would like Independence within a Federation, and if his arguments are sound, we have as much common sense on this side as to see that we have the wrong end, but now that the right end has been presented, we would accept it. Nothing of the sort has happened. There has been for the whole day a lot of abuse of members on this side, and there has been talk about a blood bath and all sorts of threats.

Now, Sir, no Government is run properly on threats. It is run on co-operation, and we are quite willing to co-operate. The members on this side do not criticise everything the Government brings down to this Chamber, because when we feel they are right, they are right; but there are times when we feel they are wrong. They are not always wrong when we feel so, and it is their duty to convince us. For the whole day attacks were levelled in the right quarters, because I believe, Sir, that this talk originated at a meeting held somewhere in St. James some time last year, and the originators were members of the Government, not members of my Party. Those same members talked against Barbados going it alone. They said that only a madman or a fool would think about that. I have not heard one word said about those members up to this moment, although they have done just as much harm to the Resolution or to the Party as anybody else. There is an old saying that when your own dog bites you, you are well bitten. They want to accuse us of biting them, but we were never their dogs and never will be. They are too ashamed to tell the public that it is their own people who have put them in this position. They are not going to do that because they need the vote, but the time is fast coming when you will hear who is who in the Democratic Labour Party. There are members who have attached their signatures to an amendment, and you can see the signatures if they have not torn up the paper. Some of the members are playing smart, and when you get a little smart man, he is smart. He would not register his vote against the Resolution, but his absence means "No".
8.50 p.m.

Now, Sir, if the Resolution was the right one and was in the interest of Barbados, would it be so? Would the members play back — and if you ask what "play back" means, I would say "dodge". Would the members of the D.L.P. dodge if it were in the interest of the people?

This has a principle involved and I will die for a principle. Now, Sir, let us assume that I am a member of a Party. The Party proposes to do something. If I am not in favour of it, I will register my protest, and I will tender my resignation as a mark of protest. Now, here it is. You had a man who was against the Resolution even up to a little before Christmas time. Members from the other side up to a little before Christmas Day were against the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. The hon. member says members were against the Resolution up to before

Christmas Day. What does the hon. member mean? We were not in here on Christmas Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not in here that day. This Resolution was tabled some time in October of last year; so I would suggest to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph not to single out any hon. member, but to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: I am speaking on the Resolution and I was speaking about the principle also. If I said that hon. members over on the other side up to Christmas Day were against the Resolution, I would mean that the principle is affected, Sir. I am telling you that. If after Christmas Day or during Christmas time that nice liquor which is flowing at Lower Collymore Rock or Upper Collymore Rock caused men's mind to turn, I cannot be vexed nor can I bind anyone. I heard it was even better than a first-class liquor shop with every kind of liquor stocked; and, added to that it was such that you could even go and serve yourself. It might not be on account of the quality of the stuff, but it might be what was put into the stuff.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can quite appreciate the temper of the hon. member, especially at this time when we are still early in the New Year, and the hon. member is yet thinking of the spirit of Christmas. However, may I suggest that the hon. member come now from that spirit of Christmas to the spirit of the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I sat here in this Chamber on Tuesday, and the hon. introducer of the Resolution talked all over and over and has not touched on the Resolution yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Even if that be so, that is not any reason why any hon. member should do the same thing.

Mr. SMITH: And now, Sir, because it is I, I have to keep to the Resolution. I am doing my utmost to keep to the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member is not suggesting that I have discriminated. That can never happen with me in the Chair, nor can it occur with my colleague, the Hon. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SMITH: I was making the point where in the speech of the hon. introducer, he said that he is an angry man. Then today the Hon. Minister of Trade has tried to make us look at the poor St. Lucian workers as the worst in the world.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In my address today I never referred to St. Lucian workers. You would not see in my entire address any mention made by me of St. Lucian workers.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister began by saying: "the foreigners". I made my notes. He began by asking, if you want to know these St. Lucians, go up in Nelson Street. He also talked of one Castries. I would like to know where is Castries. St. Lucians live in Castries. He also went on to say that they work for less pay than Barbadian workers. He also said that these people are born from a woman. All of us are born from a woman. They are the same living human beings as Barbadians. They are honest people. I would show you the reason why they are honest. If a person wants something to do, and he feels within himself that there is a job yonder for ten dollars a week, and by saying that he would do it for eight dollars a week that he would get it, rather than to ask some person to give him five cents, he goes and do the job. Those workers should not be criticised. Would it pay the plantations to send all the way to the Leewards and the same St. Lucians to come and reap the crop? If Sturges, Bloomsbury, Locust Hall and other such plantations had the amount of labour on their plantations to reap the crop, they would not spend extra money to send to the Leewards to bring those people to work on their plantations. It is due to the shortage of labour, and those people work as hard as possible to reap the crop.

The Hon. Minister of Trade is telling us today that that is the reason why we should not federate. He gives his reason. He said: are we to take our money and spend on St. Lucia and Montserrat? If he has cause for not federating, that is no cause.
9.00 p.m.

That is not so because you will find it wherever you go. In all parts of the world you will find it. That is one of the reasons for which he is against these poor hard-working people. When we come to the point where the Minister says that the members of this House would like to see 18,000 unemployed, that we are so much up against our own people that we are against Independence, that we are insisting in fighting against Independence and we are encouraging 18,000 to be unemployed or words to that effect – that came from the Hon. Minister of Trade. Now, who would like to see or hear that 18,000 Barbadians are unemployed? I would be the most foolish person to want that to happen; but the hon. member failed to tell us if, with the attainment of Independence, 18,000 people would be employed. If the hon. member assures us that these 18,000 people will be employed by our going into Independence .....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The hon. member heard me say, during the course of my speech, that at present a recent survey showed that the unemployed people in this country number 18,000. That is according to the statistics revealed by the Labour Department. I went on to say that the number of Barbadian people unemployed would be increased by the influx of people from other territories into Barbados and would undercut the wages paid in Barbados.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, just as how the hon. member said it, I jotted it down. He said that members from the other side would like to see 18,000 people unemployed. If he says that he has not said that, well, I know that people have disowned their own voices on a tape recorder. Therefore, I am not blaming the Hon. Minister.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The hon. member is trying to say that I am denying that there are 18,000 Barbadians unemployed What I said was that the influx of foreigners would destroy the wages structure of Barbados and that is what hon. members on that side of the House are supporting.

Mr. SMITH: Well, the hon. member has admitted that he mentioned that there are 18,000 people unemployed in Barbados. He did not say whether Independence for Barbados would relieve that number. If the hon. member had said that as soon as we become an Independent nation those 18,000 unemployed people will be employed, that would have been okay; but just to be talking about the unemployed people and what he intends to do as far as these people are concerned, that is another matter. I understand that the hon. member mentioned something about white people; up to last night his big boss had a big party and the majority of the people there were white people.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is irrelevant to refer, in respect of the subject matter of this debate, to somebody having had a private party somewhere.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I heard that there were all white people there.

Mr. SPEAKER: That might be so, but it is entirely irrelevant to this debate. I was there and so was the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am going back to the point. The hon. senior member for St. Peter made a remark and said that if it had not been for the political change, the hon. junior member for the City and himself might not have been in here. That could be true, but who is responsible for such a change? The hon. gentleman whom the Hon. Premier spoke so hard against last Tuesday. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Who? Sir Grantley Adams?)
9.10 p.m.

The Hon. Introducer of the Resolution said that that man did nothing for the people of this country, but the hon. senior member for St. Peter admitted that a change was made, but he did not say .....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I must correct this nonsense that the hon. member is talking. The speech I made was not in the context of twenty-five years. I said that this was a plural society, and had there not been a change in political content, men of the ethnic group of the hon. junior member for Christ Church would have been dominating this Chamber. I would not be so stupid as to say that anyone person was responsible for this change, because other people started to come here long before us, and the hon. gentleman to whom we referred was not the first coloured man to come in here.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, I am going back to the Hon. Introducer. We on this side have stated our point of view. The members of the Barbados Labour Party feel that it would be much better for Barbados to go independent within a Federation. What the Hon. Introducer took eight hours to tell us in his opening remarks could have been done in half an hour if he had put it the right way, because only in the end did be begin to shed any light on what happened at Sherbourne by way of despatches and the Minutes of the meetings. That is the only thing that any intelligent person could say he managed to understand from that ten-hour marathon speech.

The hon. member began by saying that if any person touched either one of his Ministers, there would be a blood bath. Now, Sir, I was never at Sherbourne; but if that temperament exists here, then it existed at Sherbourne also. We know the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution; he is Bajan and we are Bajans, and we know him backwards. These other people do not know him as we do, and if that attitude existed there, it would be time for the meeting to be broken up and for people to run outside because they are strangers. We have not run out of here yet, because we are all Barbadians and we know that when he is getting on like that, he is making sport. When the hon. member started to talk about this blood bath, I began to gather my papers; but I remember I was a Barbadian and what I could do; so I stayed here. Now, Sir, would any sensible or intelligent thinking person with any sense of decency and respect think of touching either one of the Government Ministers? It would not be worth it; so that is only stirring up anger among people trying to get the listeners to gather downstairs and, when hon. members are going out, to behave in an improper manner. The Hon. Leader of the Government talked about a lot of cut-throats and ignoramuses. What example is he prepared to set in this House so that we can follow in his footsteps? We are not against his Government or against him, and he should always lead in the right way and always be on the convincing side and not antagonise us. A leader must be tolerant and must learn to give and take, just as he is tolerating some of his members and Ministers now. He should tolerate everybody as he is tolerating some of them. He is not going to do it all the time, because the lid is going to blow off soon. The hon. member talked about a Conservative user, but he is using them now. It is up to them not to use him as long as they can, because it would not be for too long.

Now, Sir, we on this side are willing at all times to assist the Government. One may think that I am against the Government, but I have to go by my conscience. If I feel that the Government is wrong, I am going to say so; but if it is right, I am not going to say it is wrong. The hon. member also mentioned that there are thousands of foreigners contributing to crime and prostitution, and he said that the Commissioner of Police has been continually complaining about these people. If the Hon. Premier knows that such things are going on, he should not allow them in this contry of ours.

9.20 p.m.

If he is going to put up a case for not going along with the other "boys" and saying that all that is no good is coming from outside, it does not sound right coming from the leader of the country. I do not know if it is true, but he has said that. I do not know his reasons; but, in my opinion, he feels that we cannot go along with these people because they are not as good as we are. I will have to put it that way; I may be wrong.

The Hon. Premier has gone so far and has spoken about the hon. junior member for St. George in his sickness and he has said: "Well, if the Almighty or anybody cared to strike him down, we are not responsible for that." All of us will be sick at some time or the other, and it is not always the case that after you have got an injection, you get over quickly.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has stood up and insinuated directly that the Hon. Premier yesterday made mention that God has struck the hon. junior member for St. George down. That is not so. The hon. member was speaking with reference to a printed statement in a newspaper on Tuesday. The hon. and learned member for St. John mentioned that this Party carried forward the date to hold this discussion on this Resolution until after the period of Christmas so that the hon. junior member for St. George would have the right to sit in when this subject was debated. Therefore, it is not right for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to stand up and insinuate to this Chamber that part of what was said by the hon. and learned senior member for St. John.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I do not understand that point of order, but this is what the Hon. Premier said. He said that they could not be responsible, if God struck down any person.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member should bring that into the debate. What the Hon. Minister for Agriculture has said is correct. The Hon. Premier went on to say that they did everything possible to make it suitable for the hon. junior member for St. George to attend the meeting on this Resolution; but if he could not now come through a matter of illness, they are not responsible for it.

Mr. SMITH: I would not get up here and say something which was not said. When I get the debate, I will quote what was said. Now, Sir, the Hon. Premier said that he can go on and give a lot of stories. I would say that his speech was eight hours of stories. That is his own word.

Mr. Speaker, I am going back to the Resolution now. The Resolution contains a lot of "Whereas". The hon. introducer of the Resolution read it and I am going to read it too. It states:-

"Whereas the pre-election Manifesto of this Government, issued in November, 1961, stated inter alia:

"The road to destiny is the road to independence...."

Now, Sir, they did not state what kind of Independence. It points out that the road to destiny is the road to Independence. It seems to me that the Government only took time off to carry out certain parts of their Manifesto, and I am not accusing the Hon. Premier for it; but if you are going to carry out your Manifesto and do the things in your Manifesto, I believe that you should carry on from the first thing in it and go down the line. Do not tumble all over the leaves and pick out what you care and put it to the people. Of course, it is your prerogative to do as you like; but in your first paragraph in the Manifesto, you said that the road to destiny is the road to independence. Sir, is it the road to the D.L.P. independence?

Now, Sir, in the introductory paragraph of the Manifesto it is stated: "The Democratic Labour Party present the following programme of action for immediate implementation to effect social and economic improvement in Barbados. The Party proposes that the next session of the Legislature be limited to three years instead of the five which the Law now permits. If it is elected to office it will at once prepare

a three-year developmental programme based on the accurate and additional information which will be made available by the opportunity to investigate the colony's financial position and economic prospects, at first hand."

Now, Sir, that is the introductory paragraph of the D.L.P. Manifesto. The Party has failed in my opinion to carry out this part, and it is the first thing which is written in their Manifesto. They promised the people of Barbados that they will prepare a three-year developmental programme.
9.30 p.m.

They promised the people that and, in my opinion, the people of this country voted for them on this paragraph that there would be a three-year Session. Three years have gone. No mention has been made in this introductory paragraph about carrying Barbados into Independence alone. That is a very important change which is supposed to come about. The people were not told about it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. The hon. member is certainly distorting the policy of the Government Party – at any rate the interpretation of it. It is true that we have promised the Electorate that there would be a three-year Session, and we also promised reform of a kind which cannot be implemented in three years. If electoral reform is more important than anything else, one had to give way to the other. Whoever thinks that my defence is not strong enough, I will refer him to the "Observer" of

Mr. SMITH: No, no, Sir. If he is going to read that.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that I would read it, I am referring to an article in the "Observer" of September.....

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet. I have not misquoted the Hon. Minister and what he says is not a point of order. I have not quoted anything from the "Observer".

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like hon. members of this House to understand that the Chair – and the Chair alone – is the sole judge of a point of order. The Hon. Leader of the House has risen on a point of order, and I have a duty to listen to hear what the hon. member says in order to determine whether it is a point of order or not. I am not unaccustomed to hear members rise allegedly on points which are not points of order, but I am not implying that what the hon. member is saying is not a point of order. Of course, I take it that the Hon. Leader of the House is not unaware of Standing Order 26(1) which says this:-

"1. A Member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, so much am I within the four corners of the Standing Orders that I was merely saying that if the hon. member needs any stronger defence of the Government, he may refer to the "Observer" of Saturday 26th September, 1964. That, in my opinion, gives the best defence of my Government's policy to the accusation which the hon. member is making.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I thought that that little book was the pay list and that the Hon. Minister was going to pay us. I thought we would be paid overtime.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may have an investigation made.

Mr. SMITH: The Clerk makes out vouchers for overtime. I am not anything to do with the "Observer"; I am something to do with the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party. This is the Government Party's Manifesto and it is the guidance of the Party to the Electorate. Since they have promised an Election at the end of three years, that is a promise, and I only thought that the Party should honour its promise. They are so sure about their re-election; they are so sure that they are going to win the next Election and that the work which has been done for the last three years was more than what the last Government had done, that, believe me, Sir, they should have honoured their promises. They have failed to do so, and since they have failed to do so, a doubt has been created in the minds of the people, and you cannot blame the people for that. Since a doubt has been created in the minds of the people, is this Party going to tell me that they are going to make a certain improvement before putting the question to the Electorate?

You cannot have a Government without an election and, taking it from the Manifesto, the Government should have been dissolved two years ago and an election held. That has not been done. Since that has not been done, are you going to push Independence upon the country? Are you going to put your platform for Independence as such an important matter before the Electorate? If the people want independence, they will vote D.L.P. If they do not want Independence, then they will vote otherwise. In that way, your hands will be clear. A doubt has already been created in the minds of the people. Whatever the people may think, nobody can be vexed with them for it. You are going on now reminding the people that the road to destiny is the road to Independence. That may be so, but when you make a promise, you should honour it. It is a question of 250,000 people with whom you are dealing. With everything you do, you refer to the Manifesto and if there is something in the Manifesto you should carry it out.
9.40 p.m.

Single member constituencies is in the Party's Manifesto, and if the Government carried that out, no one could blame them, because it was put to the people. Although my memory is short, I think that these Manifestoes were distributed only a matter of days before the general elections.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not know what the hon. member means by saying that the Manifesto was circulated days before the election. This Manifesto was presented to the electorate first on the night of November 19th, 1961 and the election was held on 4th December, that is to say, fifteen days before the general election.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, the Hon. Minister helped me. It was not a month; so I can say "days". I can say a couple of weeks, but I am still in order when I say "days". Now, Sir, in a month like November, which is near to Christmas, people were running to your home daily and minutely begging for a vote, and people were busy at that time and unable to study this Manifesto. Believe me, Sir, I only read mine after the election because I did not have the time; so it might have happened in many homes. We are saying now, Sir, that since the Democratic Labour Party failed to carry out their election promises in the introductory paragraph of the Manifesto, they should take this great change back to the people, because a doubt has been created and it is not my fault. Even in the Law Courts if a person is accused of murder and a doubt is created, he gets the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is a reasonable doubt!

Mr. SMITH: This is a reasonable doubt. The people should have time to defend themselves. You are putting more power in one man's hand than there is sand on the seashore. In Trinidad a Minister did something wrong and he had to resign; but the Prime Minister put him in a better position. The Trinidadians began to make a little talk, and the Prime Minister held a meeting and told the nation that if it did not like what he did, they could leave Trinidad. Now, Sir, that is one man -- and not even a whole man, because Eric is a little man. *(Laughter)* I am wondering, Sir, whether that would be written into our Constitution also. It is the Constitution that I am in fear of, and not Independence. When a man can tell a nation that, we are bound to be afraid. I am not referring now to any particular Prime Minister, but to the office. I may be Prime Minister and I am saying that it would be too much power for me.

Now there are some people who become quieter, the more power and authority they get. The first thing they

are going to say is that if they exercise their authority and power, they will be criticised and they would not do it; but there are some to the opposite. There are some who would want to kick you to the moon. I am thinking of those workers who have to work very hard and have to rely on their representatives at some time; and if this power is given to a Prime Minister, in some cases their representatives are nothing at all in the eyes of the Prime Minister. Even now there are some members on the other side who are as vexed as anything because we have not come in here and agreed to this. Some of them do not want us to talk. What is the good of having 24 members who are going to say the same thing? We are not saying that we are right, but you should convince us that we are wrong and not get up and call us cut-throats, ignoramuses and all sorts of things.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that since a doubt has been created in the minds of the people of this country, this Government should carry this issue to the people in an election.

This Resolution states that "towards this goal, the country must press on. As the island has never been a grant-aided territory, there is no reason why within or without a federation Barbados should not attain the full stature of independence now within the British Commonwealth."
9.50 p.m.

Now, Sir do not only tell us that we are travelling. Tell us how we are going to travel. Tell us what boat we are going by, or if it is by aeroplane or by lorry. Let us know; do not just tell us we are travelling. Tell us how we are going to travel, and if the transport is yours or if we have to pay for it. Some people have the idea that as soon as Barbados becomes independent, they would not have to work. Some people are thinking so, but I want these people to understand that that is not so. They will still have to work, and if anything else, they will have to work harder. If you are accustomed to two meals a day, do not think that you are going to get the third because the island becomes independent. Independence is not going to put extra money into your pockets. You cannot go to the shop and say that "We are independent now; give me my supplies!" You cannot do that. You cannot say that "We are independent now; I must have a job!" As far as the working class people are concerned, the only thing that it means to them is that they have to work harder. I do not see where they are going to get this lot of benefits, and I am waiting on the Government to tell us where we are going to get the benefits.

I do not know what is going to happen with the Civil Service, and so on, I feel, if the Government does not have these figures worked out and everything worked out, that they have time enough now to work them out. Let us know what we have to face or tell us if this year the taxes will be no more. Tell us that as far as taxation is concerned, Independence is not going to cost us anything more. All of these things should be told us in the introduction of this Resolution. All of these things we should understand, but they have not done anything so. All that they are saying is that we are going it alone. Really and truly, that is not sufficient.

I know by the last budget proposal that our debt was somewhere in the vicinity of $58 million, speaking under correction. We are going independent, and when we are independent we still will be dependent. Independence, as far as we are concerned is just only a name.

I do not know if conditions are going to be changed. If conditions are going to be changed to the detriment of the people, by all means tell us and let us hurry up; but if we have to hang around and still have to make the necessary loans, tell us. What is the good of your telling me now that tomorrow you are going up to Culloden Farm and fire one, and you can go to Government House at any time, but still when you come back you are still hungry? What is the use of your telling me that I can go anywhere with the big shots, but still I have to draw my belt? I prefer to stay at home. Who is calling and shouting for independence? I do not mean those inside here, but I mean the ones outside who do not know it. They just do not understand it and what it means. They feel that just because the Government has brought it down, it is something good; and therefore it should come. They may feel, if they go and ask for something and they take it, that they cannot be locked up for it.

Now, Sir, when it comes like that, I do not want to mislead my people, and it is time for us to tell the people and tell them everything. Do not hide anything from them. Tell us the truth; let us know what is to be and what is not to be, and do not let us think along wrong lines. Tell the people what they have to pay for it, and I feel that it would be alright because some day when the people come to find out that you are fooling them it is not going to end up well. Let them know what to expect. They just do not understand.

Sir, you have some working people who do not even have time to eat food. Those are the people whom you have to talk to because as soon as you have to tax the various items, the people feel it. All that the people are saying, as far as I know, is that they only want to know if you are going to increase the cost of living. There are some people who have asked me that. I cannot answer that.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that we were going to adjourn at ten o'clock. I will be quite willing to stop now if that is so.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question of adjourning now; it will be a question of suspending the sitting.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Carry on a little longer.

Mr. SMITH: It is not that I want to stop, because if the Hon. Leader of the House starts me up now, I will start afresh.

I was making the point, Sir, that as the island has never been a grant-aided territory, there is no reason for Barbados going within or without a Federation.

The next paragraph of the Resolution states:-

"And Whereas a Federation of ten British Caribbean territories then existed, and continued to exist until its dissolution on 31st May, 1962;"

"And Whereas this Government has, from January, 1962, to April, 1965, engaged in discussion with the Governments of the Windward and Leeward Islands on the establishment of a new Federation,"

Now, Sir, we have the example of the old Federation. Up to now I am not told what was the cause of the dissolution. I have heard of many things which happened. Now, Sir, the present Government started negotiations. The reasons have been given us now for their not worrying with the Federation. I just cannot understand.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I will not be doing wrong if I move the suspension of this sitting until tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member declare his intention to the Hon. Leader of the House and get his consent? Otherwise the hon. member may lose his right to continue to speak.
10.00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member give way to the Hon. Leader of the House?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I apprehend that the hon. member is asking for the suspension of the sitting. I will reply to him as I replied earlier this evening, that if he thinks he will finish his speech at, say, about ten thirty o'clock p.m., I think the House would accommodate him.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I can wind up by ten thirty o'clock p.m. *(Laughter)* Now, Sir, we have

an example of the last Federation, and every hon. member, I believe, inside of this House might have known the pros and cons. Since then another lot of negotiations started and every one of the members in this Chamber has given his view of that Federation, members who, I believe, are going to vote for Independence within a Federation. One of the best speeches I have ever heard since I was in this Chamber was that of my colleague. He made a first-class speech on Federation and I agreed with him. It was a sensible speech. He said that he wanted a strong Federation and he was in favour of that. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew gave another view and, as far as I can remember, every one of the members of this Chamber who spoke was highly in favour of Federation. I think that the hon. introducer of this Resolution went so far as to say that he would federate even if he federated with one colony. Therefore there was a unanimous agreement.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. I understand the hon. member to say that the hon. introducer of this motion said that he would federate if federated with one colony. I think that that is a misrepresentation of the Hon. Premier's point of view, because the whole purpose of the White Paper was to take into account the changed circumstances since the withdrawal of Antigua, and the reservations of other territories which reduced the number of territories which were taking part in the Federal exercise from 7 to 3.

Mr. SMITH: Anyhow, Sir, the Hon. Premier was highly in favour of Federation and all other hon. members were similarly in favour of Federation. Now, Sir, what is the reason which has been given for such a somersault having been taken? I am willing and ready to hear the reasons why they have departed so suddenly from coming together in a Federation, because everybody was in favour or it. It would help us in this way or in that way. One of the reasons which I have heard from some hon. members was that we cannot take the money of the people of Barbados to give it to the other colonies. I cannot agree with that. Now, Sir, these territories need to be developed. If we are coming together as one, we are not just going to say that we have come together and that is all. They have the potentialities there and the countries will have to be developed. We will have to see about the spending and these countries will have to be self-supporting. It is not that we will join with them and as soon as we do that, we will start throwing money at them.

Another thing is that you have to write things in the Constitution. For us to say that one is a carpenter, one is a mason, one is an organblower and one is a comb-blower, that is not good enough. If this Government knows so well what we have heard about these territories, why then has this Government gone so far as to try to bring about Federation? If you know that the people are poor and they are also cutting down the wages which are paid in this country, if you know that they are going to live immoral lives, why are you worrying to go further in this matter? I will say that you have all of these things already; this is not the first time that we have had these things; we had them all already.
10.10 p.m.

If you could bring about a federation now, it would show that the last one was wrong; but at the last moment, who is not an obeah man is a bush doctor and that kind of thing. All kinds of excuses have been given for not coming together with these people, when in truth and in fact you have been inviting them among you as guest to sit down around the table and see if you could work out proposals. If you invited them and they came, it would be your duty to be honest if they wanted to be wild and foolish, or if they wanted to work obeah, to tell them that they are with you and they could not come with you and get on in such a way. If you had one chair and you invited a guest to your home, you would give him the chair and stand. If he wanted to be rude, then you would have to draw to his attention that it was your place.

Now I have heard – and I have mentioned here already on the floor of this House – that there was a time when Sherbourne was nothing but a battle ground. (A VOICE: Were you there?) I was not there, but that is what I have heard. You know the meaning of Government. I was never in the Government; so you would know how bad-behaved you can be and unfair. I do not know how the Government works.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member completed addressing the Chair?

Mr. SMITH: I have been interrupted, Mr. Speaker, and I would be glad if you would read the Rule about interruption to the hon. member. It is mentioned here in the White Paper that owing to the remarks which one of the delegates from the other islands made, the Hon. Introducer of this Resolution had to absent himself, and if I am not mistaken, that could be the reason for the death of the negotiations. If that is so, that is the act of a coward. Do you mean to tell me that I would invite you to my place and owing to your behaviour I leave you in my place? I do not know how to believe that these remarks could have caused the Introducer to leave so abruptly and cause the death of the particular Session.

I also understand, Sir, that one of the Barbados Government delegates started to carry on, and that the Hon. Premier said that only he, and he alone, could say anything on behalf of Barbados. I am still saying, however that there is some ray of hope for a Federation, because the Government sets out in the Resolution:

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Barbados, reaffirming its dedication to the principles of Regional Association, will contine after Independence to work in close co-operation with the Governments and peoples of other Commonwealth Caribbean Countries to promote by joint endeavour the complete political social and economic emancipation of all classes in all territories;"

Here the Government seems willing to cooperate and do something; so I do not think that it can be stubborn in relation to what we are asking, because in one breath the Government is saying that Barbados would have to pay for these islands out of their money, and in another breath the Government was saying that it is willing to co-operate with them. If the Government is really serious about what they say here, it would be good to enter into correspondence with each of the islands and see if they are willing to resume the negotiations. It does not, however, appear that this will be the case because of the remarks which have been passed about these people.

If the Government could give us the assurance of what is going to happen by going it alone, we would drop the idea of Independence within a Federation just as the Government has done. We are highly taxed already – at least I am because the taxes are giving me "tisike" to pay, and I believe it is so with everybody.
10.20 p.m.

If you are going to do something to create heavier taxation on the local day-to-day routine maintenance to provide for that, let us know it. My opinion is that it is going to cost us more taxation, and we would have to raise the taxes in some way or the other. If it is not so, tell us it is not so and set our minds at rest. It is not so much a question of the big name. Let us have the big name just as anybody else. Let us go with the big shots and rub our shoulders with theirs; but at the same time, let me know how much I have to pay for it. Sir, do not think that I am asking on my behalf because I do not want to go anywhere; but the people who have to pay for it may not get the chance to rub their shoulders with those rich people. They may not even know of the celebration.

I do not know if the Hon. Premier is going to reply or if it will be given by the Hon. Leader of the House. If the hon. introducer of the Resolution thinks it is not too late – and it is not too late to do a good thing – if he can assure me that it is not going to cost one cent more, Okay you have me. (A VOICE: No, no, we do not want you.)

Now that we have got to the point which I was making, you have given us some assurance of what is likely to hap-

pen when you become independent; but thinking again of what happened as regards the first introductory paragraph that you have written in your Manifesto, I have doubt. When you have a doubt, you are always doubting.

This is January 1966. If in truth and in fact the Resolution is passed, and a delegation would have to go up to the British Government, I think that the best time for them to go up there would be some time in April but the British Government has their work cut out already. They have the right to receive us. When they are ready to receive us.... (A VOICE: Would you like to go?) No.

When they are ready to call us up, it may not be until September or October; therefore, I do not see the reason why you should be pressing us now, except it is that the British Government is only waiting for the Resolution to pass and call you up the next day.

As I know it, a Constitution would have to be drafted, except it is drafted already. There are one or two things which I would like to see in the Constitution but, anyhow, you would have to come back here with it. There are many things which will be written into the Constitution which many of us would like to see.

Sir, Independence does not worry me now; it is the Constitution. You can get certain things written into these things; and -- do not care how you feel about it -- you cannot get away from it. That is the only thing which I am a little afraid of.

The Resolution goes on to state:-

"And Whereas these discussions were carried on without hindrance to the constitutional and economic development of Barbados, which attained full internal self government in May, 1964;"

"And Whereas these discussions have proved fruitless for several reasons, among which are-

(a) the failure of the Government of the United Kingdom to indicate the quantum of development Finance which would be available to the new Federation;"

Sir, am I in order to move the Suspension of the Sitting now?

10.30 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 12 o'clock (noon) tomorrow.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to second that.

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

10.33 p.m.

On Resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER: When the sitting was suspended, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was addressing the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you may recall that yesterday I had to appeal to you for protection after leaving this Honourable House. I will say now that the Police have done their job and have done a good one too; but something is taking place outside the precincts of this building.

I had occasion to stop above the Public Buildings and I was molested by some people. I appealed for your protection yesterday, but I am saying here and now that I am going to protect myself; and if anything of that sort should occur tonight on my leaving this Chamber.....

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that he appealed to you for protection. I would like to make it clear that you, as Speaker of this House, are responsible for the conduct of the House; but you are not responsible for what takes place outside of the precincts; therefore, the hon. member is out of order. The hon. member is out of order because what he is saying has nothing to do with the Resolution before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister cannot decide whether the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is out of order. That is the exclusive prerogative of the Chair. May I say that certain complaints were made yesterday by three hon. members in respect of certain incidents which allegedly occurred on the day before yesterday. I have made certain representations to the appropriate authority. I have received information that the authorities in question are attending to the matter and that there was no recurrence last night of what happened on the previous night.

Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed with his address on the subject before the House.

Mr. SMITH: After all, Sir, I am a representative of the people and I am doing the people's business. I will not stand for molestation by anyone.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am assured that representations have been made and I have no doubt about that at all.

Mr. SMITH: I was only telling you what happened to me last night. I have reported the matter to you again and I want to say now that if it occurs again, I would not be reporting. I am sure if it happens again, an undertaker would get a job.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member now proceed with his address?

Mr. SMITH: I am no bride, although I am a representative of the people. I will carry on with my address.

Now, Sir, I was making the point when the suspension of the sitting took place last night .... *(Asides)* I would say here and now that we all here around this table are representatives of the people, and regardless of our political outlook, we have a job to do. You can clearly see that some hon. members on the other side are interrupting me, but hon. members over here have the same right as I have to state their point of view. I would say now that the days for licking molasses from puncheons are gone. We do not want wharf boys any more; but if we find people with wharf boys' attitudes it would be told them. I think it was the hon. senior member for St. Andrew who has said in this Chamber that if anyone were to dress up a monkey, he is still a monkey. Therefore, by just calling one by a name, you cannot change any one from what they are. They will be always like that. Let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would welcome that.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, it really and truly is heartburning to some of us when we have the Hon. Premier coming in here and introducing Resolutions or Bills, whatever the case may be, and in doing so passing certain remarks and saying whatever he likes and then disappearing; he will not wait to see or hear or reply to what hon. members have said. I have to be always saying that.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is not fair for the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to make an allegation like that relative to the Hon. Premier saying that he introduces matters and then run away. This is the Cabinet system of Government. Every individual Cabinet Minister is *au fait* with all matters and can deputise for the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have previously stated – and that statement appears in Hansard which has been circulated – that it is not part of the duty of the Prime Minister – or a Premier – to remain in the Chamber of the House of Com-

mons or Assembly. As a matter of fact, the appointment of a Leader of the House is to make that entirely unnecessary. It is the duty of the Leader of the House to remain in the House at all material times. That is why a Prime Minister or Premier appoints a Leader of the House. A Premier is not expected to spend any time in the Chamber other than when he has to introduce a motion which is peculiarly his own. I will ask the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to proceed with his address on this Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, is it also the right of the Premier to be calling people cutthroats, ignoramuses and things of that sort in his speech?

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At no time in this Chamber have I heard — nor has any other hon. member heard — the Hon. Premier speaking in this honourable Chamber and calling them cutthroats. This is another statement which the hon. member is making to mislead this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I do not have to mislead the Chamber.

12.10 p.m.

I do not have to mislead the Chamber. I always say I term him as a berry. I cannot call a man a berry, but I will come back to him. Just a little nay-nay job can turn us like what we are -- a few shillings. I can stand up to anyone who wants to stand up to me, and I will give it to him hammer and tongs and I just do not care. Would the hon. member ever have the ability to defend the Hon. Premier?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not concerned with that. I am concerned to see that the debate on this Resolution is resumed.

Mr. SMITH: We have it in this memorandum; but before I go to that I want to say that we have the remarks made in the speeches as against Federation or against Independence within a Federation. Nothing satisfies me or will satisfy most of us. This is a speech relative to Federation which was made by the Hon. Premier. This is page 489 of the Official Gazette.

Mr. SPEAKER: What date is that?

Mr. SMITH: This is Wednesday, 20th June, 1962. I am correct; I do not want to mislead you or the House. I have a case and therefore I do not have to beat around the bush. This Gazette was printed by the Government Printery and circulated to hon. members. This is what the Hon. Premier said:

"Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is now my privilege to move "the passing of the Resolution to approve the Report of the "East Caribbean Federation Conference 1962. It is not "necessary for me to go into the history of the develop- "ment which led up to the dissolution of the West Indian "Federation on the 31st May, 1962. The document which we "have before us does not attempt to set out a detailed his- "tory of the developments leading up to the establishment "and dissolution of the West Indian Federation. There are "certain significant dates which every school child in the "West Indies should learn and should know about, and I "think that these significant dates would be briefly re- "peated during the course of a debate of this nature. In "1947 at the invitation of the then Secretary of State for the "Colonies, Mr. Creech Jones, delegates from this House "and from other Legislatures throughout the British Carib- "bean area from British Honduras in the North to British "Guiana in the South met in conference; some of the dele- "gates from this Hon. House are still members of this "House, and others, although still alive, have gone to other "countries and retired from politics. This Conference took "place in 1947 and it was agreed to set up a Standing Closer "Association Committee under the Chairmanship of Sir "Hubert Rance who was Governor of Trinidad and its "dependent territory, Tobago. Perhaps, Mr. Deputy "Speaker, you will allow me to do something which hon. "members of the Legislature of this islands have appeared "to be reluctant to do. Perhaps you will permit me to ac- "knowledge a debt which they were unprepared to admit, "and that is the debt to those West Indians in the United "States of America who contributed a substantial amount "of money in order to make it possible for the Standing "Closer Association Conference to be held in Montego "Bay in 1947. The Colonial Office — or the British Govern- "ment — is often accused of forcing the West Indies to "federate. Personally, it is a view which I do not entirely "share, because on an examination of the history and the "development of the Federation, you will find that the Colo- "nial Office and the British Government were as uncertain "about the establishment of a Federation as they have ex- "hibited those uncertainties today in the granting of in- "dependence to the East Caribbean, and the shape of a "Federation for the East Caribbean. The Secretary of "State for the Colonies in 1947...."

I do not want to take up much time in reading this speech made by the Hon. Premier relative to Federation because it is very long and you may note that the Hon. Premier took eight hours off to point out to us in this Chamber the activities and functions of what went on relative to Federation. Now, Sir, I do not think that you were in the Chair all the time, but as I said yesterday, the time which the Hon. Premier took to say what he said could have been fifteen minutes. However, Sir, for some reason for other, possibly because the gallery was packed and I understood also that since a few big shots were in it, he took time off to make the Opposition look as if we are nothing at all. He attacked the Opposition right and left, but failed to tell the same hon. members of the Opposition what were his reasons for making such a complete somersault from Federation to Independence for Barbados alone. He has failed completely to do that. On page 17 at paragraph 14.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. I understand the hon. member to have said with reference to the Hon. Premier that he has made a complete sommersault from Federation to Independence and has not told the Opposition and other people why he has made it. That is entirely inaccurate. The hon. member is supposedly speaking on a motion which sets out in the Preamble to the Resolution quite clearly the reasons why this Government has abandoned the Federal exercise — the withdrawal of Antigua from the Federal negotiations, the decision of the Government of Montserrat to follow Antigua, the different approach by the Government of St. Lucia as well as the refusal even up to now of the British Government to say what financial aid the Federation is to have. Those are the reasons which led this Government to abandon this exercise. There is no question of a somersault.

Mr. SMITH: I am sorry that the hon. member did not go on further. There are several things which were not read and other things which we could let out. I do not want to interrupt the Hon. Leader of the House any more in his speech because I am quite sure he will have to get up regularly to day, and instead of making points of order it will be a question of gallons of order; so he can afford to make ready and get his gallon pot.

12.20 p.m.

No interruption today can take me off my stride, and I am proud to see that I have the same privilege as he does to stand on my feet on the floor of this Honourable House and represent my people; so he might just as well keep quiet and listen, because I do not have any rope to tie him. Now hon. members should out of sheer courtesy tell us in their speeches why they had made such nice speeches in favour of Federation and told us in some cases that we could not go it alone. The same members whom I expect to vote for this Resolution told us that we were too small and that we could do very little if we did not come together as a nation; so I am going to take time off to do my job today in the interest of my people, regardless of what they may have to say. They know that I can take and give too. I am going to represent my people, because this is a very momentous occasion. I am not today thinking about dollars and cents, of how much I can get or of being castigated or ostracised if I speak my

mind. We have to forget ourselves today and remember the people if we are their representatives.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member to remember the people and to remember the Standing Orders.

Mr. SMITH: Oh yes, Sir! I will not stray from the Standing Orders. We have to forget ourselves today if we want to be somewhere with the people, because it is the people that count, and not this Resolution, the Government or the Premier. In all we are doing today we have to face the people, and I am sure that all of them are not ignorant. They have their own good sense, and I believe that they are being deprived of their rights and privilege of listening to this debate and hearing what their individual representatives have to say in or out of their favour. I feel, Sir, that it is an injustice to the people of Barbados, after contributing to the upkeep of a Broadcasting Station, not to be able to listen to such an important debate; and I am very strong on this matter. These people pay money to keep the Station at Black Rock going, and now the ones who are paying the piper do not have a chance of calling the tune. It is a very unjustifiable act by the authorities who are responsible for it. There will never again be a debate of this nature in this House; yet people are being denied the facility of hearing it. There is an old saying that the billy goat did all he could to get his beard until he got it, and when he got it, it was a nuisance to him. I do not think that the people of this country would ever forgive this Government for depriving them of the right of listening to such an important debate. Mr. Speaker, I will quote from the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy made on 14th August, 1962. This is what the hon. member said:-

"Mr. Speaker, what really then is the situation which "these West Indian territories occupy? It is that they are "a part among that numerous mass which makes up the "under-developed countries; therefore, it seems to me if "they are to climb out from the unfortunate situation in "which they now find themselves, it can only be on one "premise, and that is in unity with one another if the "whole purpose of bringing these islands out of the econo-"mic doldrums in which they find themselves is that they "are able to make their place in the world, and having "made it, to keep it.

"Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there is the inescapable "political conclusion which must be drawn from their "situation. Since they are part among the under-developed "territories, there are only three ways in which they can "bring themselves out from there into a higher state. "They have to get hold somehow or the other of the tools "of modern production and make themselves up to date with "the production of wealth. They have to strive after higher "levels of education because it is the possession of skills "which brings them from among the under-developed to "the not-so-highly developed and finally to the well devel-"oped. And thirdly, they must have more experience in "modern methods of Government and administration.

"Now, Mr. Speaker, if you admit that these are the "three prerequisites for nationhood today, if these are "the three things without which no group of persons "living in under-developed territories can hope to claim "attention on the world's stage, then the federation of "these islands is the only answer: because it is only in "union with one another that they can get hold of the tools "of modern producton."

12.30 p.m.

Well Sir, this is the speech of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy on the Eastern Caribbean Conference, 1962-63 in this Chamber. This is the Official Report of the meeting of Tuesday 14th August, 1962.

Sir, you may recall that we had a federal debate in here in 1962 and this is what was printed and circulated to hon. members. You may think that this was a speech from one of us over here, but it was a speech by the hon. Leader of the House — and a first class one too, as he always makes first class speeches. This is what he said:-

"Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there is the inescapable "political conclusion which must be drawn from their "situation. Since they are part among the underveloped "territories, there are only three ways in which they can "bring themselves out from there into a higher state. "They have to get hold somehow or the other of the tools "of modern production and make themselves up-to-date in "the production of wealth. They have to strive after higher "levels of education because it is the possession of skills "which brings them from among the underveloped to the "not-so-highly developed and finally to the well-developed "And thirdly, they must have more experience in methods "of Government and administration.

"Now, Mr. Speaker, if you admit that these are the "three prerequisites for nationhood today, if these are "the undeveloped territories can hope to claim attention "on the world's stage, then the Federation of these Is-"lands is the only answer: because it is only in union "with one another that they can get hold of the tools of "modern production. It is only in union with one another "that they can obtain those higher levels of education "which impart to their citizenry the skills which are "so badly needed, and it i only in union with one an-"other that they are likely to gain that new experience "in modern Government and administrative techniques."

"It follows, therefore, that the reasons for the federa-"ting of these eight Islands are reasons which lie deeply "in their present situation. They are among the most "numerous portion of the world population, that part today "which is living economically from hand to mouth. In that "situation, they are no better off or worse off than Latin-"America and almost all of Asia and Africa. They are "among that numerous group which though numerous makes "the least contribution to the world national income, to the "over all wealth produced in the world. When you see all "of that, you see the reasons for coming together are "clear and distinct.

"Having said that, Mr. Speaker, it would be well for "us to examine the concept of Federation, both as it may "apply to Barbados and to the other nationals of these "territories, and as it would look to the outside world when "we do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, some people talk as if our "situation was so favourable that the people of Barbados "had a real choice as to whether they should federate or not. "What I have said before shows that that choice is narrowed "down almost to vanishing point, once you accept certain "things as given; but because it may appear as if there is "no future for us outside of Federation, it does not mean, "of course, that we have to go into Federation in order to "be worse off. When therefore some people talk as if when "we get into a Federation, it would be, of course, too late "for us to correct any mistakes which have been made, "they do not understand what a Federation is, and into what "it would involve this island; and the reason why I approve "of the White Paper and support it in its entirety is because "I think it is a valiant and quite intelligent attempt to "settle these issues.

"First of all, the Federation of these Islands involve "a decision of sovereignty. You must get that quite clear. "What it means in effect is that the eight territories and "the inhabitants thereof are coming to a decision that there "are some things which each of them cannot do and which "all of them cannot do separately and that it would be "better in offering these things of common concern to a "central authority, and that conversely the things which "by common agreement each can do by itself without detri-"ment to its own future or to the progress of the whole, each "will do. The division of sovereignty is the essence of "Federation, and there is nothing in this White Paper which "insists that the principle of the decision of sovereignty "will be in any way infringed.

"Far from that. Although the White Paper itself is "not a constitutional instrument, it pays great regard to this "principle that the sovereignty is divided between the several "units who can do things for themselves and the central "authority which can do things on behalf of all. What the "eight islands are entering, Mr. Speaker, is really a part-"nership among themselves and with one another to pro-"mote certain interests upon which they are jointly resolved.

"If you look at it that way, it spoils the whole essence "of a Federation if one unit, as seems to be the tendency "here in Barbados, insists that it can make prior claims as "to the conditions upon which it would enter that partner- "ship to the exclusion of others, as if it makes claim to "do things which would not be attempted by the others. "Since the Federation is a partnership, and since all are "equal, it is not wise to make the sort of reservation which "says that in a possible grouping we are bound to be out- "numbered; because if you examine federation structures, "all that you know of, in each of them there is bound to be a "single unit which is larger, more important and more "wealthy than the others and which so far as representation "is concerned is on paper outnumbered.

"Now, while it may appear that it would be in the in- "terest of a single unit to take whatever safeguards it "likes or can have against being outnumbered or allowing "the prepondering influence on the part of others to work "at a disadvantage, while that may appear feasible, at the "same time if pursued beyond a certain point it calls the "existence of the partnership into question.

"Let me explain what I mean. If the Barbados House "of Assembly were to go on record as saying that the only "condition on which it would enter a Federation of the Eight "would be that it must have one-half of the seats on the "future House of Representatives, then the other seven "territories would argue, quite rightly in my opinion, "that the very claim that Barbados makes to have that sort "of representation shows us clearly that they are not out "for partnership but for domination."

Sir, I am quoting from the debate in this House and this is the speech of the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. This debate took place on the 14th August, 1962. In other words, it was since the present Government was in power and was negotiating with the other Governments and planning and fighting hard to come together.
12.40 p.m.

He realised that the only way we can unite and live together is by Federation. I have some good, flowery speeches which I am going to quote. I must do it because it is going around that some of us are fighting to bring in people to work for less pay than Barbadians, to rob the Barbadians out of their jobs and to do all of these things. I will have to make my position quite clear that we are even thinking of a family more now than we were doing it before. This is a debate which took place in 1962, and if we are keeping 18,000 unemployed, this debate shows what they were doing. That is to say, we took a leaf out of their book. I feel so proud to know that I am in order that anybody can get up on a point of order. I am in order, and I will take time off and do what I am doing as calmly and as dispassionately as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is perfectly in order. Standing Order 26 (1) says this:-

"A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

I have only interposed to tell the hon. member that he is quite in order in reading extracts from books or papers in support of his argument, but I suggest to him that he should exercise his discretion in respect of such extracts. It may not be necessary in support of an argument to read an entire debate or *in extenso* *(ASIDES)* On the other hand, it may be necessary to do that. I wish certain other hon. members would allow me to speak without disturbance.

Mr. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir, that you will be kept there so long in the Chair but you will recall that we were treated to a marathon speech by the hon. Introducer of this Resolution. He took the entire time to do it, but I am not going to do that; I am sure I am not going to do that. I am only going to quote the speeches of certain hon. members. I am doing so because they are all geared to reply to my speech and I am also gearing up for that too. I know more about gears than any of them over there. I am a real gear man. Moreover, I will not put all the gears so that when you strike one you will go backward. You will remember that reference was made to the fact that any gear you strike in the Government's gear box the car will go backwards. If you put in the reverse gear it will go backwards too, but I can fix-it-right. When I am on my feet I am appealing to the hon. member and his members to set an example, and whatever example they set we will follow. We are in the background. If the thing was up to standard from the beginning as it should have been, I am quite sure that we would not be here at this time; the debate would have ended in a day. If the hon. member had spoken for half an hour, we would have taken 15 minutes; but if he wants to show what he can do, you humble servant will show that he will fix-it-right regardless of what happens. If you cannot stand up to any person at any time, then you should not go into politics; in that way you are not doing yourself or your constituents any good. When you have to say that they are right when they are wrong, that is not good at all. Before I would do that, I would borrow a pair of dark glasses and ask you to believe me and think ... ..

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: Before I would do that, before I unman myself as some one used to say, before I would say that wherever a thing is wrong it is right and *vice versa* just to get a berry, I would borrow a pair of dark glasses and ask a little boy to lead me and say: "The blind is passing."

Now, Sir, the speech goes on:-

"Now, while it may appear that it would be in the in- "terest of a single unit to take whatever safeguards it likes "or can have against being out numbered or allowing the pre- "pondering influence on the part of others to work at a disadvan- "tage, while that may appear feasible, at the same time if "pursued beyond a certain point in calls the existence of "the partnership into question."
12.50 p.m.

"Let me explain what I mean. If the Barbados House "of Assembly were to go on record as saying that the only "condition on which it would enter a Federation of the "Eight would be that it must have one-half of the seats in "the future House of Representatives, then the other seven "territories would argue, quite rightly in my opinion, that "the very claim that Barbados makes to have that sort of "representation shows us clearly that they are not out "for partnership but for domination. Can we then face "them on the vast counter-claims of one sort or another. "or each for the other? For instance, we are busily engaged "in the economic progress of this island, industrialising to "raise the standards and to produce more wealth so that "more can be shared among our growing population. But "that is not all that we have in the economic field. We are "not making these efforts in order to satisfy ourselves "alone; we hope that when our industries expand above "and beyond beyond what we want for our minimum needs, "there will be a lot left over for us to sell outside the "island, first of all to those who are in partnership with "us and then to countries outside the confines of the part- "nership. If we say that we must have the preponderance "of things in the Federation, you could not blame the people "in the other territories if they said: "Well, take all the "seats, take all the power, but who will buy your goods?"

Now that I have got to this point, Sir, I am wondering if the Hon. Minister of Trade is in his seat. The Hon. Minister of Trade yesterday said that it could not harm trade, and he said that the ones over here are going around doing all sorts of things and saying that Barbados would lose trade if it went independent alone. I hope he has heard what had been said here by his colleague. If we are an independent territory and we want to expand our industries, what will become of us if the people in the other islands agree not to buy our goods? I am just talking the words of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy as written in this document. If they say that they are not buying

anything from us, that we do not want them because they live immoral lives, steal, blow a comb, are ignorant, boil bush tea, and take a bush bath, what is going to happen to our industries? It is not everybody who does business with a particular firm or person that may like the person. There are some people who may not like an individual, but that individual's goods are so attractive that they have to forget hate and buy the goods.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph referred to a point in my speech in this debate where I spoke on the question of trade between the islands, and I am just elucidating what I said.

Mr. SMITH: That is not a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not rise on a point of order. He rose on a point of elucidation whereby he is permitted in respect of some matter raised by him in the course of his speech to elucidate any points.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in my speech, I said that the fact that Barbados goes independent does not mean that trade will be minimized between Barbados and the other territories, and I cited an instance where after Trinidad went independent in 1962 trade was increased between that island and the other territories by as high as $1 million in one year. I further pointed out that a trade agreement has been signed between Barbados, Antigua and British Guiana and the other Caribbean territories are invited to join this trade agreement. So the fact that Barbados goes independent — and no one on the other side can stop it — deos not mean that trade will stop, and this is what I have tried to put forward to hon. members who can understand. Although Barbados is now seeking independence, the fact exists that the area needs economic cooperation more so than political cooperation, and Barbados is trying now to come together economically where trade is concerned with these territories, and with a free trade area, there will be no tariff barriers.

Mr. SMITH: Is that a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not rise on a point of order. He rose on a point of elucidation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am elucidatng what I said which the hon. member did not understand. I said that the fact that Barbados is now negotiating and has actually signed an agreement with some of the territories means that trade will continue and will increase, because there will be no tariff barriers between the countries which have signed this Agreement. This is what I said yesterday which the hon. member did not hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of elucidation made.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you will clearly see that if you are being kept in here long, it is not my fault. It is the hon. member on the other side, because he gets up on a point of elucidation and talks for about fifteen minutes. What does it leave me to do but go back over?
1.00 p.m.

Now, Sir, the hon. member is saying that Trinidad has got more trade now that she is independent. Can little Barbados compete with Trinidad? Trinidad has so many industries over there and so many things. What do we have here? We have two little naked industries, and I take it from the speech of the hon. introducer of the Resolution, he is working hard to throw away some of them. After things has become so hard, little Banks at Clapham would have gone and it would be through him.

Before I go further, I just want to say that one of the introducers refused to sign with his buddy chips.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is he saying?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not clear as to the last words which were spoken. I do not know if they are of the English language. They do not appear to be unparliamentary.

Mr. SMITH: No, Sir, they are not unparliamentary. I said "buddy chips." If I call you my "buddy chip", I mean that you are my close friend.

Sir, one of the hon. introducer's colleagues, as far as I have heard, refused to sign.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. No one has refused to sign the free trade agreement. The members of the other territories were invited to join the free trade area and one territory sent two advisers. You can only sign an agreement if you were a partner to the agreement. There were only three territories that had discussions. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is ignorant of the facts, let him get them right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said he has heard so.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, the hon. Minister can talk his way; I will talk my way. Barbados signed this agreement. I am going to ask the Hon. Minister this question because I am wondering if such things can be done without the approval of the Legislature. I only want to know if that can be done.

Mr. WALCOTT: You should know; you should not wonder.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter not to interrupt me.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have not addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am on a point of order. The hon. member cannot continue his speech until you hear me. I said *sotto voce* that you should not wonder; you should know. Wonders are performed outside.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must note that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is getting inserted in Hansard what he has spoken *sotto voce*.

Me. SMITH: The hon. member is interrupting me all the time.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yesterday the hon. member stood up over here and did not say one word on the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Does he care more of me than I care of him?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation.

Mr. SMITH: I did not say anything of him.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of explanation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is in reference to a statement made by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is intervening by virtue of Standing Order 26 (16): A member who has spoken to a question may again be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood; but he shall not introduce new matter.

Is the hon. member seeking to speak under that or under a point of elucidation?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is in connection with the free trade area.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. Minister made his speech already on this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Minister made it a point of elucidation; but it must not be a speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph enquired whether the Government of Barbados has signed an agreement and whether this is signed with the

approval of the Legislature. I want to explain that the Governments of Barbados, British Guiana and Antigua have signed the agreement, subject to ratification by the Legislature.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate the way the hon. member put his point. It was brief and concise.

Mr. SMITH: I am not going to ask the Hon. Minister anything more because I do not want to break the rule. I will however ask him if the Government does not ratify anything before the agreement.

Sir, I do not want the Hon. Minister to answer me. I was talking about trade. It is understood that Barbados is a small island. How can you compare it with Trinidad? If you go independent like Trinidad and leave out these people or leave out all the other Eastern Caribbean Colonies who would care to come into a Federation with us and they do not buy from us, what would we have? We would stand to lose. Here it is; you are encouraging them and you want them to come into an agreement with you. You want them to trade with you.
1.10 p.m.

If these countries were to hear or read anything of what has been said against their own people, could you expect them to say anything different from saying that they should expand or industrialise? If they were to hear that Barbadians would have to take up their money and spend it on other people, what could you expect? What you should do is to have nothing to do with these people. If they are not suitable to be taken into your gallery, then they should not go into your backyard.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The question of a free trade area does not benefit one territory; it benefits all the territories concerned. When territories join in a free trade area with Barbados it does not mean that Barbados alone is benefitting. The manufactured products are sold from one territory to another, and that is a common thing between all the territories. The hon. member is trying to make out a case.....

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to the hon. member that the purpose of a point of elucidation is to elucidate a point raised by an hon. member in the course of his speech, not in connection with a point made by another hon. member in the course of that hon. member's speech? I would ask hon. members to give their accustomed full compliance with Standing Orders. It is not that I am in a hurry to leave the Chair although I may have to leave it sometimes. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph resume his speech on Independence.

Mr. SMITH: I would like to point out to the hon. member that he has already spoken. Of course, I have said that instead of there being points of order, there will be gallons. They cannot turn me off my stride because I am an old-time politician. They cannot do anything with me. *(ASIDES)* The hon. senior member for St. Peter is annoying me. It may be that he is reading something aloud....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member has said that nobody can turn him off, but I am not a Waterworks mechanic; otherwise I would do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is neither a point nor a pint.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am going along the line, I am talking. It is not true to tell the people of Barbados that hon. members on this side of the House are trying to mislead them. I have said on platforms all around that if the people do not care to trade with us, there is nobody who can make them buy our products. Who can make them take our products? Who can make them take our margarine? You cannot curse a customer and take his money too. If there is anybody who is trying to harm the country, it will be the Hon. Minister in the course of his remarks. We are doing everything to help people, and therefore he must be careful with his utterances.

Mr. Speaker, two hon. members on that side of the House have made me leave off my points. I cannot find where I was: so I will have to go back. Just as they kept quiet on the first day of the debate when the Hon. Premier was speaking and when the hon. senior member for St. Peter was speaking yesterday, let them keep quiet now that I am speaking. I was not taken in here by a stretcher; I came in here with a mandate from the people. When you receive votes from the people, you are the people's representative; but some hon. members in here seem to believe that they have bought those seats. Sir, some of them will have to leave those seats sooner or later, and they should not try to tie themselves too long. Lots of things happen when the Sheriff hesitates to call your name. Believe me, in answering if you just make the mistake and keep me at the polls, I will buy all sorts of horns and put them on my motor car and sound them around, I know that some of them have to go.

I was making the point as to who will buy your goods. This is what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said:-

"In other words, they can claim with a certain amount "of justification, that since the basis of a partnership which "a Federation has is a mutal advantage, the claim by one "unit of an advantage which the others cannot lay claim to, "calls into question the whole claim of the partnership "and breaks it. That is why I think we have to be very careful in this island that we do not stake claims and particular "conditions on entering a Federation which call forth a "similar reaction of a more violent nature....."
1.20 p.m.

"We have advantages which we can exploit to the full "without arousing any jealousy on the part of the others; "but we cannot start off on the assumption that because our "numbers in the Federal Parliament will be smaller, arithmetically speaking, we have got to guard ourselves against "any condition or any sort of advantage which will be taken "of us. If the idea of a partnership is to hold good, then we "must see to it that we give no offence while yet legitimately "championing the cause of Barbados."

Now, Mr. Speaker, could you wish to hear anything better? I wonder if the Minister of Trade heard this. I will read those few lines coming from his colleague.

"We have got to guard ourselves against any condition or "any sort of advantage which will be taken of us. If the idea of "a partnership is to hold good, then we must see to it that we "give no offence while yet legitimately championing the cause "of Barbados."

Those are the words of the Hon. Minister of Education to whom I must take off my hat. He said that if you want it to hold good, you must be careful and not give offence; yet the Hon. Minister of Education would not warn the Minister of Trade yesterday that he was going wrong. They were accused of immoral acts, living badly and reducing the standard of living, and it was said that we could not take our money to support them. While championing your cause, you should by no means fritter away your money, but you should champion your cause in the right way and not be too harsh or clumsy in your approach and we would get on. It is the approach that does the job. I will continue to quote:-

"Make no mistake about it, this White Paper is the con- "sequence of mutual agreement. It represents, if one may so "put it, the high water mark of the possible. There must be "some very tough intractible problems to be resolved among "The Eight. I myself have had the most interesting experi- "ence that we need to support the declaration of aims among "all of us from all the territories as to what it is we want and "upon the foundations of which we are going to build this new "nation. My experience is that we are not yet all talking the "same language. There has got to be — and nobody can do it

"better than Barbadians — there has got to be a bringing "together of conflicting points of view even before the "federation has started off.

"I made bold to say that we are watched with the "same suspicion with which we were watched before, because "some people in the other territories, some of them, seem to "think that it is the aim of Barbados to pull the wool over "their eyes. When it goes out that we have to set a prior "condition, that we must have a preponderating opinion in "the Federal House because there are more territories "than this one, and we must be logically outnumbered as "numbers go if we let them see that our contribution to "federation is to dominate, we must bring the curtain down. "What we see of federal importance is to state the position "clearly, and it must be stated with great clarity and tact "and with the greatest discretion, because too much is "at stake. We are not likely to get this nation formed as it "should be formed, unless we take out fellow citizens in the "other territories into our condidence and let them remain "there. They watch us to see what attitudes and postures we "are striking."

This is what happened at Sherbourne. They watched our attitudes up there and we watched theirs — the battle-ground effect and the jumping up and walking out. I will continue:-

"It is just to discuss this White Paper in the light of "these facts. The federation is a division of sovereignty "and it little matters whether you ask for a strong federation "or a weak one. It is the level of political awareness and "attainment which exists in the entire nation which will "dictate the strength or the weakness of the federation. That "is so, Mr. Speaker, because in a federation the centre "of gravity is always shifting. At one time the centre appears "to be strong and the units weak, and at another time, the "units appear to be strong and the centre is weak; but the "weakness or strength of the centre or the weakness or "strength of the component units does not make the country "as a whole weak or strong.

"Everybody knows that the Canadian Federation is "a strong one and that the American Federation is a weak "one. In the Canadian Federation more power resides in "the centre than in the provinces. In the American Federa- "tion, more power resides with the States than in Washing- "ton. Yet, they are both of them two enormous, influential "and powerful countries. What makes a federation -- and "I am speaking of the Central Authority — weak or strong "and what will make it in our case will be the degree of "agreement the people of our countries -- and when I say "'Our Countries" I mean the people who inhabit the eight "territories — can reach on what are matters of common con- "cern to all of them; and the more they discover that this or "that matter had better be handled at the centre on behalf "of all of them, the stronger the federation will be from time "to time. But the federation will not be strong because it "is centred in Barbados; it will be strong when the majority "of the citizens of the incipient nation decide how much "better certain things can be done at the centre than among "the compenent units. That is the essence of partnership.

"Let us take the cost of Higher Education, Mr. Speaker. "When I said a moment ago that what we need more than "any thing else is a positive declaration of aims, I knew "what I was talking about from my own experience, and "I can say this without offence. At the beginning of the "Common Services Conference in Trinidad last month, "the degree of unanimity which was reached among the "Eight on matters of Higher Education did not then exist. "At the end of the Conference, the eight territories saw eye "to eye on Higher Education, and we were able to play our "part in the preservation of the University of the West "Indies as a national institution. Why didn't they see eye "to eye at the beginning of the Conference, but saw eye to eye "at the end? The reason is simple.
1.30 p.m.

"During the course of the Conference, there was op- "portunity for the Barbadian point of view to be put to the "Governments of the other seven territories, so that in the "light of our experience in educational matters, they could "see and be convinced that the Barbadian attitude was "the one best calculated to serve the interest of the whole "region. We reached unanimity on that point because we "were able to meet together and declare our aims, and we "found that our aims were quite in accordance with one "another."

"Now I made that diversion to say this: the White Paper "could not be and was not meant to be a draft Constitution. It "represented the maximum agreement which could be reached "by the eight territories with the British Government, "having regard to the peculiar circumstances of each and the "difficulties with which all are confronted. Acceptance "therefore of the White Paper as it stands does not pre- "vent a detailed study of constitutional safeguards when "it is time to draft a constitution. Acceptance of the White "Paper and approval given to it do not mean that if there "is an authentic Barbadian point of view or an authentic St. "Kitts point of view, it could not be put and incorporated, "if acceptable to the others, in the draft constitution. But "I just want to say this to my fellow countrymen in Bar- "bados. We have been called upon to play a very difficult " role in this matter, and we have none of the advantages "at our disposal which the previous Government had be- "cause they had less excuse for failing in this matter than "there could be for anybody else, because they did not have "the double pressures of organising a nation at the same "time that they were re-organising the economy of one its "units.

"Mr. Speaker, a double job has been put on this coun- "try and on this Government, and it is a job which has to "be taken on simultaneously. You cannot neglect one for "the other. You cannot organise a nation on any proper "basis unless the Barbadian economy is viable and strong, "and you cannot make the Barbadian economy viable and "strong unless it is set within the context of a national "community; so it falls to this Government to do both "things at the same time, and I would have all Barbadians "remember this. It is not therefore that we are entering "into a Federation to neglect Barbados. It is that we have "to take Barbados into a Federation because if she stays "outside of it there is no future for her people; it is as "simple as that. We have no choice of going in or coming "out, or coming with the proviso that if you remain out, "you could still maintain your level of development and "even widening and expanding it. It will not be like that.

"We live in a world, Mr. Speaker, of rapid and catas- "trophic changes, and all the changes going around and "on in the world today force these Islands together, not "force them apart."

Sir, what are we doing now? Are we forcing them to- gether or forcing them apart? How is the hon. junior member for St. Lucy going to vote to-night, tomorrow, or the next day? I wonder how he is going to vote after making this speech. He says:-

"We live in a world, Mr. Speaker, of rapid and catas- "trophic changes, and all the changes going around and on in "the world today force these Islands together, not force "them apart. There are things to which we shall have to "give the deepest possible study. The economic arrange- "ment which seems now to be imminent in Western Europe — "the Common Market — deserves a study of its own, but "it would be fatal to say that we could not come together "until we know what is going to happen that side, because "our coming together may be the one means we have at "our disposal of influencing events which are the conse- "quence of these same economic arrangements in Western "Europe.

"Again, Sir, if these eight territories are to raise "the standard of living among their peoples, to industrialise "and to sell their surplus products abroad, not only must "they be able to speak with one voice; they must be able "to use that voice almost immediately. Speaking now as a "person and not as a Minister of the Crown, I only say this: "the one possible thing I would have against all these present

"Federal arrangemnts is that it seems to me that we are "missing the boat if we do not ask for independence with the "establishment of the Federation."

Sir, "we will be missing the boat if we do not ask for it with the establishment of the Federation." Are these the words of the Hon. Leader of the House?

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. The hon. member is reading from my speech and he is doing it to take up so much of our time. I do not mind that, but at the same time if he is reading my speech, he must be accurate. The point which I want to draw to the attention of the House is that I was saying that we should accept the White Paper and I was just reiterating that the only thing that worried us of going into a Federation was that it was not going to be independent at the outset.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is aying that I am putting in words.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may say this. I have noted that the hon. member is reading from extracts. He has interpolated with a comment. May I suggest that the hon. member in his reading begin by say "quote" and when he comes to the end of his quotation and wishes to make a comment say "unquote" and then make his comment? Thus would doubt be obviated as to what was quoted.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am not twisting what the hon. member has said. The hon. member said that "it seems to me that we are missing the boat if we do not ask for independence with the establishment of the Federation "and he went on to say that "there would be no time lapse or time limit whatever between the establishment of the Federation and the grant or assumption of independence."

He went on to say:-

"Things are proceeding too rapidly in this world even "for that time limit to do us any good, for our situation will "be no different if we federate next year and become inde-"pendent the year after, because by the time we become "independent, all the pressures of world affairs will still be "on us, and it will be better for us and the people in these "territories — and I say this solemnly because I believe it "to be true — to assume the mantle of responsibility im-"mediately and request independence as soon as the nation "is formed.

1.40 p.m.

"I say, Mr. Speaker, if countries which are poor and "under-developed want to make their way in the world and "and are not to be pushed around, they must have first of all, "and this is a prerequisite which you cannot gainsay, con-"trol and effective control of their own foreign policy; and "although we are not yet independent, although we are not "yet even federated, decisions are forced upon the Govern-"ments of each of these territories which bring them into "the international arena and it is forcing them to take "choices even before they are in a position to take a choice.

"If you look around at the turmoil and upset which is going "on in Latin America, the revolutionary situation which "has been created by the overthrow of the Batista regime, "the long torment which the Guianese people seem to be "undergoing, the long economic crisis, the weakening of "their financial position which seems to be besetting in all "these territories, the apparent instability in the American "and Canadian economies — all these are forcing choices "on the people of these territories daily, weekly and "monthly although they are not yet independent.

"The possible advantage of being independent is this. "While you cannot stop these crises from occurring, at "least you will be able to take decisions on your own "account which might affect to a greater or lesser extent "the way in which these things come upon you. That is how "I feel about it.

"Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to come to grips "with the idea of Federation realistically and by looking at "it as a question of partnership; and while partnership is not "the same thing as federalism, there cannot be federalism "unless there is partnership. That is the inescapable con-"clusion which I draw; and those who want Barbados to play "the leading role can have their desires satisfied, they can "have all the safeguards they seek, provided Barbados "was prepared to give the leadership which the other "people would admire and follow. We cannot afford to be "arrogant in our dealings with them nor in our manner "of speaking with them. We have got to let them see in us a "genuine desire for the common concern.

"I have under consideration in my Ministry proposals "to make to my opposite numbers in the other seven ter-"ritories on educational matters — matters which I know "would redound to the benefit of us all; but I have to be "careful how we put those proposals to them. I would like "to make Erdiston available to the entire nation as a "centre of Teacher Training; I would like, when we es-"tablish the Liberal Arts College here in a few months, "to see it freely used by our fellow citizens in the other "territories; but I cannot put it to them like that because if "I put it to them like that they will ask; "do you want us "to contribute money for the upkeep of Erdiston, to expand "it in one territory at the expense of others?" " And they "would be justified in asking it if I put it them like that. "What I propose to do is some time later this year with "the Cabinet's approval to summon a conference of the "Ministers of Education of the entire eight territories, of "British Guiana, and Trinidad and Jamaica, if those two "independent territories are willing to co-operate to that "extent, to consider the problems arising out of co-"operation in education. We shall ask them to supply us "with all the statistical information they can find about "their own educational plans and educational development. "We shall supply ours; and on the basis of a dispassionate, objective, factual survey of the situation, I am sure they "will reach a conclusion that it is in Barbados that their "own interests would be best served if the institutions of "Higher Education are situated there. I have to do it in that "roundabout way because, having been let down with the "break up of one Federation and having themselves much "to regret and to disapprove of in the handling of that Federa-"tion under a Barbadian Prime Minister, they may feel "well that anything which comes from any Barbadian Gov-"ernment must be viewed with suspicion; and that is why "I would ask all Barbadians who are debating and dis-"cussing this matter to exercise diplomacy, caution, re-"straint and tact in whatever they say which might affect "adversely the desire of our fellow countrymen to come "together with us."

There you are again, Mr. Minister of Trade, listen carefully.

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

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I heard the hon. member refer to the Hon. Minister of Trade as if he were purporting to address the Minister.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, we have a Minister of Trade. I will continue to quote. This is what the hon. member went on to say:-

"To work a Federal constitution, Mr. Speaker, requires a considerable degree of tolerance....."

That is what we wanted and it was lacking at Sherbourne. I will continue to quote:

"..... of good humour and of sound political common-"sense, particularly of the last-mentioned quantity. For "those reasons, since it is of the essence of the federal

"principle that it involves a division of sovereignty, it fol-
"lows that citizens of all federations have got to evaluate
"their politics at two distinct levels – or rather in two
"distinct spheres, because if I say two distinct levels I may
"give the impression that the federal level is necessarily
"higher than the unit level. That is not so. They are not
"different levels; they are different spheres – this divi-
"sion of sovereignty. The citizens of a Federation have got
"to be more politically aware than the citizens of a Unitary
"State because in a Unitary State there is one sphere of
"politics. It is true that in some Unitary States, there are
"local government authorities, but that does not matter
"for the point which I am trying to make. In Great Bri tain,
"for instance, a citizen of the United Kingdom knows that
"Parliament is supreme over all causes and there is
"nothing above the supremacy of Parliament.
1.50 p.m.

"In the U.S.A., no American citizen argues that the Con-
"gress of the United States is supreme. He does not even
"argue that the Parliament or the Legislature of his own
"State is supreme. What he says is that the Constitution
"is supreme. It is the Constitution against which no final
"appeal can be held. The Constitution itself is the final
"appeal.

"In the constitution which is laid down, the sphere of
"sovereignty which belongs to the federal body is different
"from the sovereignty which belongs to the different states
"of the U.S.A., therefore, in Australia, Switzerland, Canada
"and all federations, the citizens have got to get themselves
"accustomed to two spheres of politics and they have got to
"exercise judgment with respect to both spheres.

"It may well be that when the citizen is called upon to
"vote for representatives to the Federal House, he may be
"using not a higher, but a different yardstick, because he
"knows the spheres of activity which belong to the Federal
"Government. He knows great things which are of national
"concern: therefore, when he is choosing representatives
"for the Federal Parliament, he uses a sense of values
"which he would not have to call into account when he is
"choosing representatives for his local Parliament. It
"does not mean that the people in the Federal Parliament
"are more sensible or more politically aware than anybody
"else; it means that the ordinary citizen has to exercise a
"greater concern in Federal matters than in local matters,
"that is one of the things meant by the division of sovereignty
"What follows from this is this: to make this proposed
"Federation work, it is not enough even to approve the
"White Paper because that only sets out the maximum
"agreement to be reached in the circumstances. We have
"to get it across to the citizens of Montserrat, St. Vincent
"and the other territories that henceforth they have to fulfil
"two functions at the same time, as they happen to be citi-
"zens of unit territories and at the same time citizens of a
"nation. All their beliefs and judgments have got to run,
"so to speak, in double harness all the time. They have to
"reconcile them with one another because it is the only way
"in which they can make their national structure work.
"There is a division of sovereignty. That is why I cannot
"understand the force of the amendment which has been
"moved by the hon. senior member for the City, the argu-
"ment being, I believe, that the Barbadian situation may
"well be so precarious or that in some other territories
"the people who are now in power may so desire to remain
"in power in their own island if not in presence, but still,
"at the same time, to occupy positions of authority in the
"Federal sphere.

"Let me say here and now that whatever criticism
"may be made of dual membership, this criticism is the
"most unassailable; that once you accept the principle of
"dual membership in a Federation, you do not have a
"Federation; you have a unitary state or you are getting near
"to one. A Federation involves a division of sovereignty.
"Logically, if sovereignty is divided in respective spheres
"in local matters and in Federal Government affairs, it is
"not responsible in its own sphere for matters of a com-
"mon centre. The component Governments remain in-
"dividually responsible in their respective spheres for
"matters of local concern."

After reading this speech made by the Hon. Leader of the House, one can only think that he has made a complete contradiction of this particular matter. He told us in plain words that to become a strong federalist , you have to be tolerant. The hon. member only has one mouth, and these words resulted from it. I am wondering if another mouth will be presented to us in this House to vote against making another effort at Federat ion, because he said that perse-verance seldom fails. We are going to get Independence, but so long as the hon. member was so strong in respect of Federat ion, I am asking him to let us have one more try. We have everything to gain and nothing to lose from a Feder-ation, and I do not think the hon. member would be too hard now, because I do not think when they were deciding to bring down this Resolution to go it alone that he remembered this speech. It is likely that he may have forgotten it, and I am reminding him of it now.

Some people may think that I have read it to play for time or because I want it to be said that I made a marathon speech. The same way I expect the Hon. Introducer to con-vince me to vote for Independence alone, I am trying now to convince every member on the other side by their speeches to make another try at coming together, because the Hon. Leader of the House has already convinced us by his speech that 'going it alone' is not the answer. Who-ever is willing to cut off my head for it can do so, but I am trying to convince him that from his speech he wants Federation, unless he gets up now and gives us justifiable reasons for voting against it.

Now, Sir, I had all this information yesterday, and that is why I asked for the suspension to be moved last night, because I intended to go on until this morning. I re-member that the Hon. Introducer kept me in that Chair as Chairman of Committees from 12 o'clock one day until 7.30 next morning; so I am accustomed to that. As I said, this is a matter of great importance. We are going forward, but we woul d like to go forward in the right way. We would like, when we make a step forward, to make a true and correct step, and not when we make one step forward it is possible we are making two steps backward; so we want the assurance.
2.00 p.m.

Therefore, I want to be firm: I want the assurance.

Sir, may I move the suspension of the sitting at this stage? I do not want Your Honour to be sitting there all this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: If such a mot ion is made, I cannot guarantee what the results of such a motion would be.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, I feel alright.

Now, Sir, I am saying that we all want to go forward, and the hon. Leader of the House has given us the green light on this whole matter. As a matter of fact, we can stop here. I feel that I can convince every one over on the other side, because we cannot get away from that. These are facts which I have read out and it is not that I do not want "A" to be Prime Minister or "B" to be. Nothing of the sort. I am not individualistic in this matter; I am for the people; and as far as I can see in this document, we are not doing the right thing to be 'going it alone' without putting it to the people because I have already put some of the matters - not to all the people - and they have al-ready made up their minds and have said that the right form of independence for Barbados is within a Federation. I have my documents. The people already know and I am putting it to the Government for them. Take a little more time; let us make another try at Federation because the Hon. Minister in his remarks said that "perseverance seldom fails."

The Hon. Leader of the House made a good speech: he did not make a wishy-washing speech. I do not know what happened to the Hon. Premier last Tuesday. I would not even call that a water melon speech. It was nothing at all but abuse. If anything, I would call it a blood-bath speech.

It was nothing like this speech which the Hon. Minister of Education made on this matter. I will say that the Hon. Minister of Education was trying to convince somebody at that time, and I think he succeeded in convincing them. When I have finished I hope they will convince me to vote for this Resolution.

Now, Sir, we have other members who are against independence. Before I go further, let me just state that I said yesterday that I am afraid of the Constitution not being embodied when it comes to Independence. I am not the only member who said that I am afraid of Independence and I will quote this to bear me out. I am not going too far on this. I am quoting this to prove that I have a brother who is afraid and I am not alone. The hon. member said:-

"That is where I say I am afraid of Independence, "because it would get people ganging up and with all un- "righteousness saying "let us do this" as a Government "or a Party. I am not represent ing the hon. member "because he passed me like Levi - on the other side."

Do you want to know who said that? That is a speech from the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member mention the date of this reference?

Mr. SMITH: Tuesday, 24th March, 1964.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, nor do I want to challenge his honesty or the veracity of the statement. But onlay a man who is unacquainted with parliamentary speaking will get up and preface his remarks by saying that this is something against Federation. The hon. member has never read a speech of mine in which have said that I am against Federation. I am not going to challenge the hon. member because I leave it to his honesty, which I put at a low ebb, to quote the speech. Honesty is not a thing which you buy in a drug store or put in anything.

Mr. SMITH: I said that speech was dated the 24th March, 1964.

Mr. WALCOTT: That could not be a speech. Only a parliamentary idiot would read that little piece and call that a speech. What the hon. member has read could not be a speech. How in the name of heavens could that be a speech when it starts off: "Mr. Speaker" and he read that little piece and said this is a speech by me?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, --

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proposing to read an extract or book or paper in support of his argument? If it is so, let him read the whole thing.

Mr. WALCOTT: Read the whole thing then.

Mr. SMITH: I want to save time; I do not want to convince the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the hon. member is entitled to read the entire speech, or if he is reading an extract to point out that this is an extract or paragraph from the speech that is made. I understood the hon. member to say that this was made on the 24th March, 1964.

Mr. SMITH: This is how it began:-

"Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, "I do not think the Premier should be allowed to make "that innuendo, because it is not fair."
2.10 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Imagine a Parliamentarian getting up to read a speech that I have been alleged to make on a point of order!

Mr. SPEAKER: One shudders to think that any hon. member would preface his speech by mentioning a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Do you want me to read it? I will go ahead.

Mr. WALCOTT: The speech could not have started off from a point of order. I would have to be speaking before. The hon. member is trying to be clever, but his cleverness does not work.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to read from a book or paper, but do not let him refer to something which is prefaced by the words "on a point of order".

Mr. SMITH: This is an extract of a speech printed in the Official Gazette.

Mr. WALCOTT: This is another pitiable example where although you are trying to help the hon. member, he is thinking that an extract is subject to his political wisdom. I do not think you should advise something which cannot be advised. You are pointing out to the hon. member that he cannot st art a speech from a point of order, but in his anxiety to say something, he does not know where to begin.

Mr. SMITH: Empty buckets keep most noise.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are the biggest one.

Mr. SMITH: I am quoting. It says:-

"Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I "do not think the Premier should be allowed to make that "innuendo, because it is not fair. I said that we in here do "not talk behind a man's back, and the Speaker should not "have allowed you to say that you heard a fire engine just "pass, and the hon. member is not here. Those things do "not do the country any good. You cannot arrogate these "charges unto yourself. The hon. member should say those "things in the person's presence when he can reply. By "innuendo, what action is there in hearing a fire engine "passing? That is where I say I am afraid of Independence, "because it would get people ganging up with all unright- "eousness say "let us do this" as a Government Party. I "am not representing the hon. member because he passes "me, like Levi, on the other side."

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Only the hon. member's mentality would allow him to say that. He said that I am against Independence.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not like these elucidations. The hon. member has read that as an explantation that I did not advocate Independence. You will have to protect me because I cannot speak again. That is an unfair statement to make because it was not a statement made to a Speaker in which I said I am afraid of Independence. It is not that I am against Independence; we did not have any Independence debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out to the hon. member what Standing Order 26 (16) says? This is what it says:-

"A Member who has spoken to a question may again be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood but he shall not introduce new matter."

My interpretation of that Standing Order is that a member who has spoken to a quest ion may again rise to offer explanation in respect of the same debate. This is a speech which the hon. member has made already. I will give the matter further consideration in case it occurs again.

Mr. SMITH: I can stand it. I am quoting from something that was circularised to me. It is headed: "House of Assembly Debates (Official Report)." In the same way that

the hon. member made his speech yesterday, I am making mine today. He was exercising his right; am I to exercise mine now or not? That is all. If I was not exercising my right, Your Honour would rule me out of order. I am still here and I am trying to put up a case. It is not every case which a lawyer puts that he wins. I am trying to put my case.

Now this is an extract from the Offi cial Gazette, dated 9th July, 1963, and this speech which I am quoting from is one made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. This is what he said:-

"Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the Leaders of the "Governments of the Eastern Caribbean territories have "accepted to come together and form themselves into one "Government and I know that they are seeking ways and "means how to go about it.

"Now, Sir, I know of two Governments. This puts me "in mind of a man who is going to build a home. He sits "down and drafts his plan. He looks at the amount of money "which he has in hand and then he calls in his architect to "draft his plan to suit the money which he has, and to build "a building which would be satisfactory to him..... 2.20 p.m.

"I have sat down and listened to all the hon. members "who have spoken on this Resolution and they have brought "to my memory when old Jerusalem was broken down, "when the Israelites were under the jurisdiction of "Nehemiah and when Sanbalat and Tobiah got outside and "criticised – that was all they could do – in order to "tempt the spirit of the workmen and when they said that "if foxes ran across the wall, it would be broken down. "I am saying, Sir, that instead of hon. members getting "together and reasoning and working out the best solu- "tion, they are just talking and you cannot find out in "their hearts if they are lukewarm or if they are sound. "It is either that you are against a Federation of these "territories or you want it. If you want it , speak for it; "if you do not want it, speak against it.

"I am saying that the leaders of the Eastern Carib- "bean territories – what I would call the delegates – have "come toget her to reason because they want to build a "Federation of these territories and they have arrived at "a method. They have sat down and conferred in order "to unite. When a delegate is sent out from one territory to "another, he is sent out as a messenger. He has the whole "weight of the country on his shoulders. The people are "looking forward to him, therefore, the people who have sent "out a messenger should pray to the Most High God to "strengthen their messenger and to give him wisdom and "understanding to lay a proper foundation for them and "their seed. They are building a building and they must "build it on a rock for it to stand forever. If they are only "going on their own thoughts and they do not intercede to "the most High God who is to counsel and enlighten their "direction, understanding and knowledge on what is to come "I must say that they will only be working on their own and "when the streams, the tides, and the winds come, they will "wash them away.

"They will have nothing to steady them. I am sure that "if these members of the various islands want to get to- "gether and they know what they are about, the Almighty "God will help them. They have got to reason together. It "seems to me that, at this particular time of the age it is "impossible for these single units in the Eastern Carib- "bean to exist alone. I do not see any possible means of "their future existence unless they join themselves or weld "themselves together. We cannot help ourselves and there- "fore we will be strengthening ourselves by joining together. "One stick can easily be broken, but when you put six or "seven sticks together then it takes a great deal of pressure "to break them. If these representatives from the various "colonies have come together in order to form a Federation, "it is necessary to have a Federation among ourselves. "There are many countries and many businessmen from the "various countries who would be glad to invest their money "in the West Indies but they are afraid to do so because "we are all single. We cannot do anything by ourselves. "When we bind ourselves together, any businessman will "take a chance to establish an industry in the West Indies "because he will get sales for his industry. If we bind our- "selves together that will encourage industrialists to come "into the West Indies. We will be able to afford more em- "ployment for our people, and we will be able to expand "ourselves. We will be able to manufacture the com- "modities which we are now buying from abroad.

"In the las Federation Jamaica pulled out; Trinidad "also pulled out and left the other eight territories alone. "Now we find that Grenada has pulled out and has joined "a territorial state with Trinidad. I am praying that this "Federation will be successful because I can see that one "of the greatest punishments which Trinidad will ever "have to bear is when this Federation comes into being. The "Trinidad Government will then know on what ground she "is standing despite her $240 million. We expect to es- "tablish an oil industry here; we also expect to establish "a cement factory. At present we are buying these pro- "ducts from Trinidad and if we establish these industries "here then we will not be buying anything from Trinidad. "As a matter of fact, none of the big countries like Canada "will be buying its oil or its cement or fruit juice from "Trinidad because we will have our own. Trinidad will do "anything that lies in her power to get these territories "separated, because she knows that we will have to depend "upon her for our materials. Trinidad is going to suffer "more than any other country in the West Indies when we "come into Federation. She cannot stand alone; I am sure "about that. She can manufacture as much as she likes "but to whom is she going to sell her products? At the "present time she is depending upon the other territories "in the West Indies to buy her goods, and if we do not "buy them then she must suffer. If we were to cut away "from Trinidad her wealth would not be what it is.

"Mr. Speaker, the same thing applies to Jamaica. I "trust that we will stand loyal one to another and contri- "bute one towards the other in this Federation. We will "have to think of bearing one another's burden. We cannot "say that we will live sumptiously in Barbados while the "other territories are suffering. That cannot be so. As "soon as we bind ourselves together, we will become one "and therefore we will have to try and save those who are "going to die. We will be pulling together in Federation "and we should try and develop ourselves. I remember "that I was in St. Lucia working under the American juris- "diction and there were a lot of Barbadians there. Things "were hard down there and wages were low and we could "not get anything to send to our homes. 2.30 p.m.

" I suggested that we should have a "Sou-sou" which "is a "meeting turn", because I was the hero of the crowd. "We contributed five dollars a week and to the man who "had seven children I suggested that we should give the "first chance. I suggested that so that he could help his "wife and the children in their suffering. The next turn we "gave to the man who was not in such straitened circum- "stances and the strongest man we left for the last. The "strong man could not feel things in the same way as the "others. We helped one another like Barbadians and one of "the men said: "You are the best man we have ever met, "you have done good for us."

"Mr. Speaker, it is the same ting with these unit "territories. We have to try and develop these territories "which are ready to die. I am sure that when this Federa- "tion comes into being, big countries like the United States "of America, Great Britain, Australia and Canada, all "of these countries will have to look at us in a fuller "way. The world as a whole will say that Trinidad with "her $240 million has pulled out and left us on the steep "of the hill and these seven territories are still willing to "bind themselves together so that we can have some kind "of unity. I am saying that if we are divided we will fall, "but if we are united we must stand.

"Why did those countries pull out from us? They "thought they would have been robbed of their revenue.

"We know that we have one vine -- Almighty God. They "have pulled out from us, but we are still provided for. "The same God who helped Jamaica will help us. I hope "that if the territories join together, we will be able to "make a nation and help our poor brethren.

"The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that the "electorate will not mark blindly again. If they marked "blindly the first time, I hope they will not do it again. "The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has shown me "more light than I have seen before. I have never heard him "like that before; he seems to be a new man today. I will "consider his attitude, but what shocks me is that he did not "say much to us today. I hope that henceforth he will be able "to see the good works this Government is doing, and he "will realise that this Government has certain things under "consideraton with a view of helping the people.

"I am not saying that we should go into Federation "without telling the people about it. We have brought Redif- "fusion in this Chamber so that the people will be able to "hear our views on Federation. The people have chosen "members to represent them; they have put their trust "in us and have sent us to this Legislature to represent them. "We are here to look after the economic conditions of the "people. If they put their trust in us, I hope that we will do "our best for them. The people are the judges and if we give "them cause to mistrust us it will be our own fault. We have "to face the electorate and we are here to do good work for "them. If the Government gets spiteful or headstrong and "throws about its power it will be a matter for it.

"I am saying that several people are talking about "the Ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies, but I have "nothing to say about him. He has fought the good fight; "he has completed his work and he has received recom- "pense. If I were in his position, I would sit on the hill and "watch the horses run. I would tell the boys which horse "would win, but I would not go back into the ring like Joe "Louis. The Ex-Prime Minister has received compensation, "and there is no other man in the history of the world who "has received such a pension. He has reached a height where "he should sit down and praise God for the balance of his "days. He should sit down and take it easy. I do not know of "any other Prime Minist er who has received a pension. "I wish I had his wits because I would be all right today. The "Prime Minister has fought a good fight and I will not "speak anything against him. I hope that God will choose "the right leaders for this Federation, and I hope that they "will carry on in such a manner that they will satisfy the "people in the territories. I hope that these people will reason "one with the other and help the leaders to lead them suc- "cessfully.

"The Good Book says that when Moses was resisting "enemies, the people had to hold up his hands and as soon "as his hands were held up he resisted the enemy, but when "his hands fell he was in trouble. Politicians are in the hands "of the people and when they drop us, we will be in trouble. "When they drop us, we want to feel that we have done a good "job for the people and that our efforts have been accepted "in the eyes of God. Do not let pride overcome us. There is "nothing that can overthrow a Government like false promises "and pride."

Those were the words of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. He is right. He went on to say:-

"These things will overthrow a mountain in the east "which is Mount Iris in Asia. That sort of thing was respon- "sible for overthrowi ng the last Federation. God does not "like pride. Any man who has pride cannot lead his people "properly. He must humble himself; he has to listen to the "poor as well as the rich; he has to be in sympathy with the "rich as well as the poor; and when justice cannot be secured "something else will have to be done.

"I can assure hon. members that if this Federation "comes into operation, it will be a success. I have confidence "in that because I have seen how much help it will be to the "territories. People from Canada would be glad to come "here and establish industries but they cannot do that at "the moment because they would not get their materials "sold in view of our economic condition. If we join together "we would be able to buy what they produce. If we have the "nescessary material here, it would provide work for people. "Businessmen would establish new businesses here, and we "may be able to buy certain things cheaper.

"I hope that when the Federation comes into operation, "the Ministers will get together, reason together and never "forget Almighty God without whom we can do nothing. I am "asking the Ministers not to go to any conference without "thinking of God. I hope that this Federation will make a "wonderful success."

Mr. Speaker, this is the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. It is a first-class speech. The hon. member appealed for unity and for sympathy. He prayed for the leaders and he did everything. He had to agree with me at one time and I am in the same spirit today. The same spirit which I was in then, I am in now.
2.40 p.m.

When we have a speech from an hon. member like this. (ASIDES) Mr. Speaker, I am again interrupted, but I am not saying anything. The hon. member says that I should be in prison. I will take all of those remarks. I know that no one can hit me harder than I can hit him. I know that when I hit someone he will cringe. As to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, this is the same Resolution where we are asking for another try. Now this speech was a first-class speech. We have had some nice speeches in this debate. We have had them at a high level with a certain amount of honesty attached. I am wondering if these same hon. members are going to have the audacity to sit in their seats and vote against having another try at getting these other territories together. We are not against Independence; we are asking and appealing to the same members who went on record with their speeches not to vote against their conscience but only to say: "Let us have another try." We are not doing anything. I sit back and read these speeches and the public can read them; but when the people who have sent those hon. members here get to know that they have voted against Federation, what will happen?

The hon. member says that when the people let you down you cannot break through. They made promises to the people. I wonder if the hon. senior member for St. Andrew would put himself in trouble in St. Andrew. I want to know if the hon. member is going to eat his words or trample them under his feet. Does he not think that the people of St. Andrew are looking to him as a true, honest representative? He quoted the Bible in order to ring home his argument. He tried to convince us and to convert us, and now all that is left to be seen. I sincerely hope that the hon. member will live up to his convictions. I hope he will live up to his speech and quit himself as a true and honest representative of the people. I sincerely hope that he will forget all the promises, he will forget the individual, he will forget anything of that sort and live up to his convictions. He has a conscience and please do not let him kill it. Your conscience lives with you, and when you die, it dies with you; but you should not kill your conscience before its time.

The hon. member went so far as to say that he would bring Trinidad to her knees if she does not federate. I know she will lose trade if she does not federate. I blame the business community in this country for allowing this country to go so far. We have a Chamber of Commerce which should have got up and equipped itself when this matter was in the air. They should have got together like the other territories because the business community is responsible for the running of Government finances. No Government has any money to run a country. They have to sit back and find money by way of taxation.

You have a Minister of Finance, and what use would he be? Could he finance any project on his own? What Minister would he be who did not have money? It is the business community which weathers the storm. The Government will not

reimburse a businessman who loses money, but they are always ready to get money from his profits. That is why I say that the Chamber of Commerce should get up and pull its weight and no Government would be able to do anything which was not right in the interest of the masses. I say the time has come well, tell me what Government can do without finances? It is the taxpayers who have to provide the money, they are the masters and are you telling me that the masters are afraid of the servant? I say, No.
2.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, everybody must live and work together. Because the Government has the power, it should not go forward and do something that might not be in the interest of the people. Let us do all that is possible to make a success. If a businessman feels for a moment that if he invests money he is going to lose it, he is not going to invest it. He would do like the servant who hid his money. He would take it and put it down and not dare to touch it; but the other fellow did not have that doubt, and invested his and got more. The hon. senior member for St. Andrew cannot get out of this now. I am not criticising him, but I am appealing to his own good sense to think over what has been written here, and if he does anything else, I will have his speech printed in leaflet form and distributed in St. Andrew so that the people can see what he said. They do not know what is going on here today because they have been deprived of their rights and privilege of listening to the debates in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not proper or correct to suggest that anyone is deprived of the right to listen to a debate in this Chamber. This Chamber is open to accommodate as many people as it physically can contain. No Chamber can be large enough at any particular time to accommodate as many people as may want to be present; but let it not go out to the public that this Chamber is today closed to as many people as can find accommodation, because that is not correct.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if you misunderstand me. I did not mean that the people are deprived of listening to us in here; I mean on the radio.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, that is not a right of the people. It has been done before, but there is no reason why it should be done or should not be done again. That is not a right. Their right is to come here, so long as there is room, and attend meetings of this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we have had debates broadcast from this House already on matters not as great and important as this. We have had it done on more than one occasion with respect to the Budgetary Proposals, and on the last occasion two members' speeches were broadcast.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not being disputed that that has been done. I have conceded that there is precedent for it, but I am saying that it is not a right. Their right is to come here and sit in the Gallery so long as there is room. That is the only right which members of the public have, and the same applies to other Chambers. As a matter of fact, in the Mother of Parliaments, one can only enter if one has a ticket of admission, and if there is sitting room. Here no ticket is necessary; it is only a question of room.

Mr. SMITH: Did we always have that behaviour in the yard also? Is it anything to do with that also? No one can say that I am taking up the time or making a speech for the people to hear, but I am saying that it is my right to have published everything that I have said today. It is my right to have it printed and circulated in all parts of Barbados, and I will do it at the right time. Since it cannot be done on the radio, I will do it on paper, and I will see that it is done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will quote from the hon. senior member for St. George:

"Mr. Speaker, speaking in support of this Reso-
"lution, I do feel that hon. members of this Chamber
"have wasted a lot of time on it, because it is as simple
"as can be. When you have gone right through the context
"of the Resolution and listened to the statement made by
"the Hon. Premier and also considered the introductory
"remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Education, you can
"see the context there clear before your eyes.

"Let us take first the context of the Resolution:-

"WHEREAS the people of seven British Eastern Carib-
"bean territories, through their several Legislatures, have
"agreed to establish, and enter into, a Federation of their
"territories; and

"WHEREAS they possessed the untrammelled right to
"act freely and responsibly in determining the nature, pur-
"poses and functions of such a Federation; and

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

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

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House supports the pro-
"posals contained in that document, and particularly ap-
"proves, commends and endorses the proposal that the
"new Federation should be independent from the establish-
"ment of the first elected Federal Government."
3.00 p.m.

"Now, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the speeches
"of some hon. members who have come to this Chamber
"and spoken on this Resolution, I can only say that they are
"either wasting or delaying the implementation of this Reso-
"lution whereby the seven territories in the Eastern Carib-
"bean can get together and sort out their own type of Con-
"stitution, their own type of rights whereas West Indians
"they can live up and down without any person telling them
"how they must live in the West Indies.

"Let us take the last point that the new Federation
"should be independent from the establishmet of the
"first Federal Government. I think that is the point which we
"all should think of and argue about. I do not see anything
"wrong at all whereby from the moment that the Federation
"has been set up that you should be independent. If you are
"prepared to get rid of your children, the first thing which
"you should do is to make them independent because when
"I am independent, I do not have to hang on to my mother's
"coat tail and I can solicit help from other sources. You
"cannot tell me that either the U.S.A., Canada, West Ger-
"many or any place in this world is going to assist these
"colonies when those countries know that these colonies
"have ties and connections with the United Kingdom. That
"is the reason why these territories are suffering day after
"day. I think it is quite sufficient time that legislators and
"politicians should come to the full realization that it is
"the destiny of the people which they are playing with and
"not individuals.

"Let us look calmly and dispassionately at everything
"which is within the Statement. It is stated:-

"The Conference unanimously recommend that the
"Federation of the West Indies be independent from its
"inauguration with constitutional guarantees for the sub-
"jects set out in the Bill of Rights.

"What is the use, Mr. Speaker, that tonight you are pre-
"paring to give me ten acres of land and you are not prepared
"to give me the deeds -- the Bill of Rights – that I can
"say how to develop it and so that I can borrow money
"from people in order to develop it? Unless you are pre-
"pared to do that, I feel that the Federation is null and void."

"Sir, I remember when I spoke on the White Paper, I "stated emphatically there and then that the seven territories "must put their house in order and present their case to the "United Kingdom by informing them that this is what we want, "we are not begging them, this is something which belongs to "us. You have to consider that the chief product of these "colonies, some 300 years under British rule, some less "than that, is sugar, and right back through the ages we were "actually raped of our wealth, therefore, when we ask "the United Kingdom Government for aid, we would not "be asking too much if we tell them definitely now that "this is our position, we have served our useful purposes "to you, now we are asking that you compensate us to the "terms of this. They must not dictate to us what we must "expect; we should tell them now what we want to run our "Federation. We are not humbling and begging and be-"seeching any longer. If you are prepared to give these "territories their independence and allow them to obtain "nationhood, you must do the necessary things in order that "they would be able to be respected in international or-"ganizations and whereby they would be looked upon "as a nation and not as little children who are weeping and "asking for bread from the hands of someone.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great deal of comment about "the Federation being independent and that we are getting "something before we get a Federation. I doubt very much "if any person, after reading the Statement which was made "in this House by the Hon. Premier, could come to that "conclusion. You will see that the first thing is that you must "have a Federal Election and after that Federal Election "you must have independence; after that you will set up the "different things whereby you will function in a Federal "Government. I feel, Sir, that for the length of time during "which we have had this Statement and this Resolution before "us, we who have discussed the White Paper and who "realise that within this Statement there is something "from which these territories must benefit, we should "have had this Resolution passed so that the Colonial "Office will realise that the legislators in Barbados and "those of the other Eastern Caribbean Territories are "prepared to quit themselves like men and tell the British "Government what we want.

"Mr. Speaker, I can only say now that when we have the "Head of a Government who is prepared to make sacrifices "for the people and to see that they obtain nationhood, it is "very bad that legislators in their turn would fight so as "to thwart the efforts of the Government."

Mr. Speaker, that was a very short speech by the hon. senior member for St. George. It was short and sweet.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was quoting the speech of the hon. senior member for St. George relative to Federation. The hon. member tol d us that we must quit ourselves like men and become a nation. It is true that we must quit ourselves like men and become a nation.

Let me say, Sir, that this quoting of mine of speeches is controlled by Standing Orders. Why do they want to stop me? I have never seen big people so foolish since I was born. I do not know why they should be so foolish or I do not know if it is the other way around. The hon. senior member for St. George is a representative of the people of St. George, and he told the whole House that we must quit ourselves like men and form a Federation. There again, I am wondering if the hon. member remembers his speech on that occasion. I am wondering to know if this hon. member — as I know him, he is very fearless — is going to put the people in St. George to think that he is unfaithful. I am wondering to know if he is going to do that .
3.10 p.m.

He has already hinted to us in here that we must acquit ourselves like men. Well, I am saying to him "Quit yourself now like a man" with what you have said in this House relative to Federation. I know that there were some who would be glad if this matter would never go to the vote. They would be glad if we were to take until December with this matter because in their consciences they know of the meeting in St. James when all the big shots had to move in and begin to talk about this thing. The meeting started down there and it still here. *(ASIDES).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This behaviour cannot go on; otherwise we will have to stop.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, can I speak now?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have sent the Clerk for the Marshal because I cannot help observing the uneasiness which is taking place in the gallery. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that when a man and not a mouse says anything he must stick to principles. He must live up to what he says. He must say what he means and he must mean what he says. This particular Resolution will spell the fate of most of us. This is, in my opinion, the nails of the political coffin of some of us. This same Resolution will be the nails in that coffin. I will put three or four more horns on my motor car and I will blow them so that the whole Island will know that it is paying for this Resolution now. You should not try to make it harder for a Colony.

Now, Sir, I am quoting from the speech of my colleague, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. Before I go further I will say that it is one of the best speeches which have been made in this House by the hon. member. I know that what he said at the time he meant. That is a fact. I am not saying anything derogatory about the hon. member; I am just quoting his words. The hon. member knows as well as I do, that I am one of those people who will stick out for a principle. I will always abide by a principle. I have cursed everybody in my Party and therefore I am prepared to live 'for ever and ever, Amen' through a principle. I did what I did because of a principle. Make no bones about it; come what may, it was a principle involved. A principle was involved and I stood by it. I said very rash things about my Party because I was fighting for a principle. Just as I am fighting for a principle now, I fought for it then; and I will continue to fight for that principle. It was not a question of money or promises; it was only a principle for which I was fighting. I love to stick to a principle, and I will continue to do so regardless of anything. If tomorrow I have to fight for a principle on behalf of anybody I will do so, so long as it is a principle. I will continue to fight for a principle regardless of whom it may be. Nobody can buy me. You cannot approach me along those lines; nobody can do that. Do you know why? I can work hard. I know how to work and I am not ashamed of working. There are some people who cannot even come into Bridgetown. You can do anything with a "pimp", but not with me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the speech of my colleague the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. This is what he said:-

"Mr. Speaker, I consider it my duty to declare how I "stand in relation to this matter of Federation....."
3.20 p.m.

"When I refer to my stand on the matter of Federation, "I am not speaking in my private capacity but in my ca-"pacity as a representative of the people of St. Joseph. I "must confess, Mr. Speaker, that although one knows that "in unity there is strength, from the surrounding circum-"stances one has to be very firm in order to maintain his "stand on such an important issue as this. There is an old "saying that hard cases make bad law and it may be, from "the policy and attitude of the British Government in deal-"ing with Federation in recent years, that there may be "misgivings; to put it as mildly as I can, it may be that one "may be doubtful about the future.

"Mr. Speaker, there is no use in our fooling ourselves. "We cannot go forward single-handedly and if we must go "forward and fill our place in the Commonwealth, we must "do so in a united way. I believe that in the history of Fed-

"erations there has always been some set-back in the ele-
"mentary stages. As you know, Sir, perseverance seldom
"fails, and by persevering the time came when a number
"of these Federations have finally succeeded. As to the
"Statement made by the Hon. Premier and the accompany-
"ing note, one may wonder if Federation will become a
"reality. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that when we dis-
"cussed the White Paper in this Honourable Chamber, I
"made it abundantly clear that I am in favour of a Feder-
"ation but I must say that I am not in favour of a Federa-
"tion on paper; I mean a strong Federation. What I think
"will kill any Federation is if selfishness is allowed to
"dominate the position; our leaders must enter Federation
"with that determination of giving and taking. I note here
"in Appendix "A" of this Statement where the Ministers
"have apparently agreed that after the expiration of five
"years certain services should be handed over.....

"I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Ministers
"have apparently agreed that certain services should be
"handed over from the unit Governments to the Federal
"Government at the expiration of five years. They have
"further agreed that if any one of the unit Governments
"is not willing to hand over such services, that Government
"will still have the right to continue to administer such
"services. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that part of the Agreement
"is not good enough. I am one who hate to refer to the
"breaking up of the last Federation but it was so referred
"to by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the
"Colonies. I must say that just as there was a breaking up
"of the last Federation, there will be a breaking up of any
"Federation which is not built on a solid foundation. Mr.
"Deputy Speaker, it is not good enough for any unit Gov-
"ernment to retain the cream of its resources and then
"hand over the husks to the Federation. A Federation on
"that score will not worth us anything.

"We want to have a strong Federation. If we must have
"a Federation which I feel we should have, we must be
"realistic in our approach to that Federation. We must face
"up to the future and let the failure of those who have
"attempted Federation before us be forgotten. As far as
"independence is concerned, I am one of those persons who
"feel that it would be far too expensive for one unit to go
"it alone.

"I feel that if we unite together we can have an inde-
"pendent Federation. If you were to look around this Is-
"land, you will see that the business houses are uniting
"together. I suppose that the object of this is better effi-
"cency and better protection. Gone are those days when
"any isolated place will be able to prosper alone, but if we
"unite together much can be achieved. We are in need of
"a strong united nation. If we can unite together, we will
"succeed.

"Although our two bigger brothers have forsaken us
"and a small brother is now side stepping us, I feel that
"there is good prospects in the Federation of the seven
"territories. I am in favour of a strong Federation, and I
"hope that this new union will soon come about and that the
"leaders will do everything possible to make it a success
"even in the eyes of their enemies."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the speech made by my colleague. It was a first class honest-to-purpose speech really meant from his heart. I am appealing now to my colleague to convince me and this House and the people of St. Joseph with his reasons for not voting for Independence within a Federation. He is a businessman, and you can see his honest-to-goodness talk on Federation.
3.30 p.m.

The hon. member is a self-made business man; he is not a pimp; he does not have to hold on to promises or anything else. He does not have to pimp around in this House or out of this House. He can make a living. When we come up here, we should know how to fight our way. I would not think for one moment that we have to cringe or to sell ourselves or our souls for a promise. We can stand up to anything at all, so it has become his duty to convince us on the stand which he is about to take on this Resolution.

It is clear up to this moment from the speeches which I have read – not one of them, but all – that everyone is for Federation. But now, what has happened, what has gone wrong? What is the reason? It is not good enough for you to say that our big brothers have left us, but we still have a small brother and sisters; let us come together and lend them a hand.

Let us say that tomorrow I have my larder and kitchen full. If somebody comes at the back door hungry, must I close my eyes on my bowels of compassion for my brother? I should say, I know that he is poor, let us share with him, let him have something. That is how we must come together. The Hon. Minister is asking, if he wants us to spend Barbadian money on St. Lucians. When you get people talking like that and pulling down those other people, you get the same people telling you often that we can help our brothers. I have read out all those speeches which those hon. members made on Federation. I have not read them out as a matter of wasting time.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is interrupting me. I hope you would listen carefully and protect me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is interrupting me all the time, from the time he was on the other side, and now that he has come close to me. He has left his place to come here and interrupted me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure that I am giving you my undivided attention.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I need your protection. I was making my point and saying that my colleague and I represent one parish although we may not be in the same boat. However, we are the same representatives. We are nothing to do with party in this case. In this issue, it does not concern the people in St. Joseph alone; it concerns the people of the Island and we represent the people. If he says that he knows deep down in his heart of hearts that what he sees in this document is true, he will be doing the people of St. Joseph and the other people of the island a great injustice. It is all left to him; he has his own mind; he can do as he likes. He can vote as he likes; but, as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew said, the day will come, so it is up to him. Is he on the side of the people or on the side of the Government? I appeal to him as I would appeal to my twin brother. If what I have just read out has been said by him – and he cannot deny it – and he votes contrary to that, he will be a traitor to the people of St. Joseph. As I have said, we have to forget party in this case now. This is a case now of the people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to tell you that as far as St. Joseph is concerned, the people of that parish are very skeptical about matters. If they had fallen for the promises that were told them, neither he nor I would be in here; so I would say that the people of St. Joseph are the best of the whole lot of them.
3.40 p.m.

You get vagabonds from Bridgetown going to St. Joseph and the people up there will not even do anything wi th them. I would lend them my gun. I must say that they are nice people up there, a decent lot. Imagine you can get any hob-nob going up there lambasting their representatives and they would not come and borrow my gun!

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the hon. member aware of what he is saying?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. WALCOTT: I hope the hon. member is only being facetious. Is he aware of what he is saying? Somebody is holding a meeting and the hon. member is sorry that nobody would come and borrow his gun. What is he insinuating? Is it proper for him to say, because somebody says some-

thing about him, that he is willing to lend him his gun to shoot somebody? It is that what he means to say. If this actually turned out to be true it may be a good fee for you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think as a lawyer when I am sitting here. I think in terms of law when I see a fee first.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well, I will walk about with mine so that when I meet people like the hon. member, I will know what to do.

Mr. SMITH: What did the hon. member say, Sir? Believe me, Sir, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is interrupting me and that is not fair to me. (MEMBERS: Question!)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph would just give way for a moment I should like to say this. There is a limit to everything. I am here and I cannot help hearing certain voices at certain times. It will cease now. Is the hon. member willing to continue his speech?

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir. I am fresh now. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you were not listening just now, but I am going to quote the speech of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. I have to be very careful because we know that the hon. member has been writing books. I hope I would be able to read one. This is what the hon. member said:-

"Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is purporting to sup-
"port the...."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I expect that the hon. member is addressing the Chair.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, Sir,

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is on his feet.

Mr. WALCOTT: I think it is pertinent that we should know the date and the page of the Official Document from which the hon. member is quoting.

Mr. SMITH: Believe me, Sir, I am surprised at the hon. senior member for St. Peter. I would not have done that to him; I would not have doubted him. I would not deem him to be a crook.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. It is immaterial to me because he has passed through that life. I am not dealing with that. It may be that I should not have asked him. It is a matter for you.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on what is the hon. member speaking? He wants naming.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the date and the page of the Official Document from which the hon. member is quoting have to be mentioned because, if he does not state that, we would not know what he is reading from. The hon. member has to state the date and the page of the Official Gazette from which he is reading.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph continue his speech?

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have ruled and asked the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to continue his speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, no member will read from a debate of this House for the same Session.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have ruled on that point already and the matter is closed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you suggest that I cannot hear the date and the page of the Official Gazette from which the hon. member is quoting? Are you saying that the date and the page is not to be mentioned? I am entitled to have the date and the page of the Official Gazette from which the hon. member is reading and I wi ll not take my seat until that is given. We have Standing Orders and they have to be observed. That has to be stated to the hon. member. I am not surrendering any of my rights.

3.50 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will proceed because I am reading the Debates that took place in this House.

"Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, which
"is purporting to support the proposals contained in the..."

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is reading from the Official Gazette, he is not calling the words correctly. It therefore is not my speech.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to draw your attention that.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will give a final ruling on this matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I asked a question.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking both hon. members to take their seats. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph is reading, I take it, from the Official Gazette and I am asking him to enlighten the Chamber on the date of the Gazette.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the Debate of Tuesday, 13th August, 1963. I will continue to read:-

"Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which is purporting to
"support the proposals contained in the Statement made by
"the Hon. Premier in this Honourable House on the 11th
"June, 1963,....." – this speech was made by Mr. Batson.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, there is no "Mr. Batson" in here.

Mr. SMITH: This is an extract from his speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph continue.

Mr. SMITH: "Mr. Speaker, this Resolution which is
" purporting to support the proposals contained in the State-
" ment made by the Hon. Premier in this Honourable House
" on the 11th June, 1963, has had much discussion, and many
" hon. members have, no doubt, taken advantage of the op-
" portunity presented to them to speak at length and to ex-
" press their feelings in connect ion with this Resolution.
" Speaking at this point, it is a rather difficult situation in
" that most of the important points have already been ex-
" pressed by hon. members, and one at this time would
" find himself in much difficulty in trying to put over his
" case; but I would utilise a few moments in order to make
" a contribution to this debate in some sort of fashion. Fed-
" eration, as all of us know it, is very important for these
" islands which have signified their intention to federate.
" Most of these islands in the East ern Caribbean are unable
" to pool their resources independently, and therefore it is
" necessary for them to pursue some method of Federation
" in order to bring about a much more stable situation for
" themselves; so it is that Barbados will not be acting
" unwisely if we should adopt a similar course.

"We, in Barbados, are unable to go it alone. The rea-
" son for that is that we have only one economy on which to
" depend, and therefore we will have in a large measure to
" respect the other islands and to go along with them. Some
" people will say that to enter in a Federation with some of
" these islands which are not self-supporting would be a

"gamble; but when one seriously entertains the idea of "Federation, he should not seriously consider such a thing. "The two larger West Indian Islands, namely, Trinidad "and Jamaica, have already participated in Federation, and "they no doubt must have found it very difficult for them "to bear some of the burden which, no doubt, was imposed "on them, and so they decided to withdraw from the Fed-"eration. A similar situation now confronts this island in "that we are the foremost of the seven territories, and "many people are very pessimistic in connection with "whether this island of Barbados should enter a Federa-"tion with these colonies which are unable to support them-"selves; but I feel that this Government would be acting "wisely if they decided to approach Federation. It is true "that the British Government has not as yet seriously ex-"pressed their willingness to support financially the Fed-"eration, and that is in a large measure due to the fact that "they will no doubt like the islands to go all out on their own, "which is, in my opinion, impracticable. The average in-"dividual does not seem to be so concerned about paying "increased taxes. We hear many people denouncing the "Government when certain taxation is imposed, and there-"fore one has to be very careful when entering upon such "an important sphere. Now, we in Barbados have decided "that we will not be entering any Federation without inde-"pendence at the outset. If I may quote from the Manifesto "of the Democratic Labour Party, this is what is set out in "that document:

> The road to destiny is the road to independence.
> Towards this goal the country must press on.

"As the island has never been a grant-aided territory, "there is no reason why within or without a Federation "Barbados should not attain the full stature of independ-"ence now within the British Commonwealth.'

"One will therefore realise at the outset that the Bar-"bados Democratic Labour Party decided, before they took "over the reins of Government, that they were interested "in Federation but in a Federation with independence at "the outset. Some of the leaders of the other territories "are not much interested in independence at the outset. In "my opinion, they have not yet become sufficiently devel-"oped; their thinking seems to be short-sighted, and they "tend to pursue the same role as some of the politicians "whom we have in this island when they go on public plat-"forms and are always reminding the people of 1937.

4.00 p.m.

"On the other hand, we of the Democratic Labour "Party, are going to think on a higher level and we feel "that Federation without independence at the outset will "not bring about the situation at which we are aiming. "That is a very important point. I remember that one of "the speakers who spoke on this Resolution previously...."

Now, Sir, I heard a knocking and a laughing on the other side. I do not know what it is about, but this is part of the debate of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas. He is a little bit confusing. On the one hand he tells you that we in Barbados are unable to go it alone and then lower down in his speech he tells you something else. What is he about to vote for now? Going it alone?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am raising this question now. It is now five minutes past four and, as I understand, from the Leader of the House, we were to adjourn at two o'clock for lunch. I do not think it is fair that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should be on his feet all this time. If he makes a motion and he is defeated, he will have to stop talking and that is not fair. If you say that you are having a suspension of the sitting for lunch, have the suspension. You should not let these little petty things creep into this. You should adjourn now.

(A VOICE: You cannot eat in here.)

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think it is fair. The Hon. Leader of the House gave his word that he will move the suspension at two o'clock for lunch, and it is now after four o'clock and no effort is made to move the suspension of the sitting. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph moves a motion for the suspension of the sitting and then you vote against it, you shut him up and he cannot continue speaking.

I do not think this is the right attitude to adopt in a debate like this. Besides that, Sir, the staff of the House has to be considered. All honourable members have been walking out of the House and eating. It is not right. I say that it is most undemocratic. Do you think we are afraid?

The Speaker has gone out and he is eating. The Reporters cannot get anything to eat, nor the Clerk and Deputy Clerk. This is not an attitude to adopt; it is not fair and these things have a way of boomeranging.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must join in this protest That is why I defied the rules of this House to bring the hon. member a glass of milk. I have never seen anything so unscrupulous in all my time in this House. The Hon. Leader of the House said earlier in the debate that we will meet and adjourn at a stated time for lunch and dinner. Now, because the hon. member is talking, no adjournment is taken for lunch.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am listening to the hon. senior member for St. Philip, but I cannot resist hearing loud voices from hon. members across the fl oor. I will ask that they speak in undertones.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying here that we have had these undertakings. We were going on from twelve o'clock (noon). The Speaker has had his lunch and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have relieved him. Hon. Members of the Government have been leaving the House and going and taking their lunch. The only person who has not taken anything is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. All sorts of tactics have been adopted. This is hitting below the belt. I have never seen it here in my time and I am sure I will not see it again. If the hon. member is not allowed time to go for lunch, the only sensible thing to do is to bring some lunch to the hon. member.

Mr. WALCOTT: If these hon. members are going to play their politics, they have to learn to play them tough. If the hon. member intends to filibuster, let him filibuster; this is a toe to toe battle. The hon. member wants to read every speech and to filibuster. He must pay the price. This is the price he is going to pay. He is reading back all the speeches. He is not reading extracts, nor is he trying to debate the matter in a proper way. With the connivance of the last hon. member, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, who is always a party to such things as this, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can only be subjected to that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Apparently, all that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is trying to do is to refresh hon. members of this House of the stand which they took two years ago on this matter. He is perfectly entitled to do so.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, whenever the hon. senior member for St. Philip speaks, his memory is going to be refreshed. He will get a lot of refreshing memories today. He is the last member who should talk about people being reminded of what they said. Twenty years ago he was on a different side. He should be ashamed of himself.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am on the same side as I was twenty years ago on the question of West Indian nationhood.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member who is speaking must pay the price. When the hon. senior member for the City says that it is not fair, to whom is he appealing? If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph elects to go and read up all the debates and say that is the way you refresh your memories, we are not Sunday School boys. You are going to pay the price. Politics are hard. We must give you a

lesson in tough politics if you want to play it tough, 4.10 p.m.

We must give you a lesson in tough politics, if you call it so. There will not be any more soft politics around this place. It has been too soft for these political dish washers and these shabby looking, unkempt people.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am saying is this. I stood here and I heard when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that we were taking advantage of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. I am saying that that is not true. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that he is fresh to go through. I think that if the hon. member was hungry he would have moved the suspension of this sitting so that he might be able to get something to eat. No advantage is being taken of the hon. member.

Mr. BOXILL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Philip has just walked out of the House and walked back with milk in the House for another hon. member to drink. The next thing is he will want to come in here with his pyjamas. I want to know if that is the right procedure and I am asking Your Honour to rule.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is rather unusual that during the discussion of this Resolution today no suspension of the sitting has taken place. I do not know if it could be said that at 2 o'clock p.m. the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was filibustering. I do not think he could be filibustering. I do not think that at this hour, 4.15 p.m. of the clock he could be said to be filibustering. The hon. senior member for St. Peter talked about toughness, but I would appeal to the Hon. Leader of the House to move the suspension of this sitting now so that not only members of the House but members of the Staff of the House should have their refreshments. I think that refreshments should be given to those hon. members who require it and also to the Staff who have to remain here for long hours.

I hope that this appeal will not be lost on the ears of the Hon. Leader of the House. He is in the responsible position to see after the conduct of the affairs of this House in an orderly manner. The Hon. Leader of the House is a man who is amenable to hon. members on all sides of the House. He is usually approachable by members of this House and he told me that the sitting could go on for another half hour or so, as the case may be. I do not see what happened today that the hon. member may not allow the suspension of the sitting in order that the hon. junior member of St. Joseph might be refreshed. I repeat that it is rather unusual that, for the first time during this sitting, we have not had the suspension to which we are accustomed at 2 o'clock p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to agree to that appeal. The hon. junior member for St. Peter is now making an appeal in this case just as how the appeal was made where Pilate had to wash his hands. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph participated in this debate at length. This is not the first time that we have met at 12 o'clock noon when the Standing Orders had been suspended and we did not go to lunch at 2 o'clock p.m. That has taken place already; but when you gear up on one side of the battle, do not let us make any appeals. There is no question of putting up any flags or appeals. The hon. member made a speech in the course of which he told us who was not coming back and who is singing his "swan song". The hon. member started today at 12 o'clock noon and now the hon. junior member for St. Peter is the standard bearer for an hon. member who starts off to filibuster. I believe that this is the first time on record that any one hon. member read another hon. member's whole speech; but do you know what is happening? The hon. member is going back to the old speeches. There is one which he cannot find and he took one out of the context where I was speaking on a point of order. I said that we were not discussing anything in relation to Federation or Independence, so that the hon. member took that speech out of the context.

The hon. member read out the sppeeches of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for St. Joseph and if it is his game to go through the *Official Gazette* and read all the speeches, well then, he can read those speeches without having any meals.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been advised by the Deputy Speaker that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was speaking.
4.20 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am still speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I really see two hon. members on their feet?

(Both hon. members sat.) I am advised that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was addressing the Chair, and that various other hon. members rose allegedly on points of order. Accordingly the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is entitled, if he thinks fit, to resume his speech.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I gave way to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I correctly understand that the Hon. Minister, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, has risen on a point of order?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. During your absence from the Chair, the Rules of this House were infringed upon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot have any reflection made on my colleague, His Honour the learned Deputy Speaker. He is as capable as I, if not more capable than I to rule.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, you did not allow me to finish my statement. What I was trying to say --- (Mr. MOTTLEY: Don't try.....) Will you please shut up?

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I being asked to shut up?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I hasten to assure you that I had not such intention. That was not meant for your ears. What I was trying to say is that so many members got on their feet that the Deputy Speaker did not get a chance to rule before you resumed the Chair, and I am drawing to your attention that the hon. senior member for St. Philip, during the course of the debate, brought food into this House for another hon. member to use. I want you to rule as to whether this is correct, so that I can have my food brought in later on too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Thomas explain to me what he describes as food?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: What you can now see on the table in front of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. It is milk, which is a sustenance.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to draw to Your Honour's attention something which I am sure Your Honour would readily agree. We have Standing Orders and we have codes of conduct. If hon. members do not want to adhere to the general codes of conduct and want to break them, they will pay the penalty of your ruling- of expulsion or of going on to speak. The hon. senior member for St. Philip on bringing milk into this Chamber should have been promptly ejected from the Chamber from entering with anything such as that, because if I were in the Chamber, I would have acted in a violent manner. I would have kicked the glass through the window because no food of any form has any right in here. You were in the Chair and you were relieved to go and have some refreshment while the Deputy Speaker held on. The hon. member's intention was to filibuster in the debate for the whole day,

and it was other members' intention to allow him to filibuster the whole day at his own expense.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker ,on a point of order,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. senior member for St. Peter complete his point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: It was his intention .....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not speak of an hon. member's intention other than his own.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member read complete speeches made by other hon. members and did not care for any other hon. member's feelings. It was immaterial to him what happened to other hon. members, and we say that if this is part of the price we have to pay for parliamentary democracy, we are going to pay the price. If the hon. member's price is that we are going to allow him to talk all the time, neither the hon. senior member for St. Philip nor any other member should go through the back door and circumvent this, because if it is part of the parliamentary game that you can hold out and somebody can prevent you from holding out, no member should try to circumvent this by these circuitous routes. If the hon. member has numbers on that side, they can move the suspension; otherwise they should subscribe to the democratic methods, and pay the price in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a speech; that is no longer a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: The point I want to make is that food should not be brought into this Chamber, and food does not have to be in solid form; it can be in,liquid form. If that can be done, then I would be able to bring in pork chops, rice and stew, black pudding and souse or bread and fish.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the hon. member may decide to bring in is not a point of order.

I will now deal with the point of order as raised by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. I wish I could hear myself for the noises which are taking place entirely outside this Chamber!

Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is an action of mine which is under question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am dealing with the point of order as raised by the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. One point of order at a time, please. This alleged bringing into this Chamber of some article when I was not in the Chair and when His Honour the Deputy Speaker was in tthe Chair has nothing to do with me, and I so rule.
4.30 p.m.

I can deal with whatever happens when I am actually in the Chair. The matter should have been drawn to the notice of the learned Deputy Speaker when he was in the Chair as it allegedly took place during that time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, merely .....

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as this is concerned that point is finished. I have ruled on the point of order of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was not filibustering. (Loud Asides). Mr. Speaker, ask those hon. members to keep quiet. A member cannot interrupt another member who is on his feet and you must rule. Every minute he leaves his seat and comes out here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not understand to whom you refer as "he".

Mr. SMITH: I mean the hon. junior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like hon. members to be not unmindful of Standing Order No. 29 "Behaviour of members not Speaking." Paragraph 6 states: "While a Member is speaking,all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions."

Mr. SMITH: I was saying, Sir, that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas left his seat to come up here to interrupt me all the time, although yesterday I told the story about the man in St. Andrew.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed on the subject matter.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, last Tuesday the hon. junior member for St. Lucy moved the suspension of the Sitting and he said that he was moving it with the understanding that at half-past two o'clock on the days that this debate is carried on, the sitting would be suspended for luncheon: if any hon. member was speaking at that time, he will know to sit down at that time to allow the hon junior member for St. Lucy to move the suspension of the sitting. That is what the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said when he made that assurance of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as I am concerned, that is a matter for the Hon. Leader of the Houe, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. It does not concern the Chair as to whether agreements are made or disowned. What I am concerned with is proceeding with the Resolution befor us.

Mr. SMITH: Sir, you are the Speaker of the House and you heard when the Hon. Leader of the House gave us that assurance. You heard, and you are there to direct hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is purely a matter of arrangement that has been agreed upon between the Hon. Leader of the House and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SMITH: That was said in here. In moving the suspension of the sitting, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy said so. It was no agreement between anyone. He said so on the suspension of the sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair has no control over that matter. The Chair has no right to suspend a sitting because of that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker .....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. junior member for St. Jospeh when he was Chairman of Committees — not in this present session — was kept in the Chair from twelve o'clock one day until seven o'clock the following morning and this is nothing new.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. And if hon. members keep up with these points of order, they may be here until next Tuesday.

Mr. SMITH: I was saying, Sir, that hon. members were interrupting and talking loudly when I was speaking. I may tell you that from my boyhood days I am accustomed to eating something good; therefore, I can stand up now. I am not complaining to anybody. I feel all full.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is entirely irrelevant.

Mr. SMITH: I can stay up here and talk for hours now. When they talk of punishing me, they are not pun-

ishing me because I am the type of person that if I wanted to go out, I would walk outside. That shows the weakness of the present Government. It shows that they are afraid.

Now, Sir, you can clearly see by this, although we have not got Independence yet, if they are able to get this power which they are fighting for, what will happen to some of us. We will not be able to say one word at all.
4.40 p.m.

They do not want us to say anything at all. They are vexed. Believe me, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter should keep quiet.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member does not want me to say anything .....

Mr. SMITH: That is not a point of order, Sir, I will not let him say one word.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and I have not misquoted the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let hon. members understand that I am now refreshed; I can carry on undefinitely.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member has called my name and he says that we do not want him to speak. If we do not have Independence now, what will hapen? The hon. member has been speaking since 12 o'clock noon, but he now wants to eat.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question of giving the member the right to speak; this is an inherent right. I do not like to intervene in the debate but I am compelled to do so.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if they did not have something to hide, they would have allowed hon. members, without any interruption, to say what they have to say. What the hon. member is driving at – if I am out of order, it is a reflection on the Chair. I do not see why hon. members want to kill me for exercising my rihgt in this Chamber. I remember sometime ago – I cannot remember the particular Bill which was then before the ouse– but the hon. senior member for St. Peter read it out in order to curse us.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member cannot use the word "curse" in relation to me. He cannot say that I read out a speech in order to curse somebody.

Mr. SMITH: I was saying, Sir, that he read out all the speeches, but I cannot remember the particular matter that was before the House. I am only saying this to show how the hon. member had quoted every speech and now he is trying to make ..... *(ASIDES)* ..... *Pause.*

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member for St. Joseph concluded his speech?

Mr. SMITH: The noise is here on my left. I think that the hon. member should be brought to his senses and made to believe that he is nobody in here. He is getting up every time and interfering with me. The only person who would bring him to himself would be I myself if I were in the Chair. Yesterday the hon. member rambled all over the place; he spoke all sorts of things, and nobody interfered with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I were the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, I would address the Chair and turn a deaf ear to the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. junior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. Peter are making a noise, and I will stand up here and will not say a word.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member is being advised, and the person who is advising him has always behaved or has at times behaved like me. The hon. member has said that nobody in this House can stop him. The position is that the hon. member is getting tired and he is ashamed to come home gracefully. He is looking for an avenue for comfort. The hon. junior member for St. Peter will not be an area of comfort for him; he must come home peacefully.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. May I appeal to hon. members who would not like this sitting to be suspended for grave disorder, to allow the hon. member or whoever is speaking to speak and he heard in silence?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have been claiming your protection for the whole day and it seems to me to be fruitless.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I say this? Whether it is intended or not, it is a reflection on the Chair when the hon. member says that he is claiming the protection of the Chair and it seems to be fruitless.

Mr. MOTTLEY: And he is right too.
4.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it happens again that there is so loud an aside as I believe I heard, that hon. member will have to be dealt with. Let the hon. junior member for St. Joseph proceed now with the debate.

Mr. SMITH: Certain members feel they can get up in here and do what they like!

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member proceeding with the debate?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when one is vexed, he is not pleased. Too far East is West. I am not pleased with the treatment meted out to me here. After all, I am an elected representative as well as the members on the other side. If I live and do not die, I will see that they pay for their treatment of me, because they cannot get on a platform and talk better than me. They are as powerful as anything in here but wherever they go, I will be. I throw out the challenge now. I know whom to go for; I am going for the ones who will die if they lose their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is entirely irrelevant.

Mr. SMITH: I am not touching the ones who can live without being here.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is entirely irrelevant.

Mr. SMITH: The Hon. Premier said he is an angry man. Well, I am angry now too. I am going to make them look for work or have to sell their shirts.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph must not bother to deal with irrelevant matters. Let him proceed with the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in paragraph 14 on page 7 of the Constitutional Proposals, it is stated that an interesting feature of this Debate was that it was the first time that proceedings of the Legislature were broadcast. During the period of eight months the public heard the broadcast speeches.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew has risen on a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is the privilege of hon. members to know from what document and what page and paragraph the hon. member is quoting.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. That is a matter certainly of courtesy, because Standing Order No. 26 (1) says:

"A member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument."

I agree that it would be very helpful and courteous if any hon. member about to read would state the source of what he is reading, but there is no rule which states that he must. Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH: "An interesting feature of this debate was that it was the first time that proceedings of the Legislature were broadcast. During the period of eight months the public heard the broadcast speeches of eighteen of their twenty-four representatives in the House of Assembly. It is difficult to state that, at the end of this long drawn-out exercise in parliamentary democracy, the majority of members.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I consider that the hon. member is reading his speech, since I do not know from what booklet he is quoting or from what page or paragraph; and the Standing Orders provide that a member cannot read his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. Joseph assure the Chair whether he is reading his speech?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, no. If he does not have to read one, I would not have to read one.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not concern me. I wonder if as a matter of courtesy to the Chair, the hon. member would care to disclose from what he is reading. The hon. member does not have to make such disclosure.

Mr. SMITH: If I do not have to, why press me?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not pressing. Would the hon. member care to disclose from what he is reading, for my information? Previously the hon. member said he was quoting from the Official Gazette Gazette. That is all I am asking; but I am not pressing.

Mr. SMITH: Now, Sir, I am going to read.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member reading an extract?

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I said page 7, paragraph 14.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of what ?

Mr. SMITH: Of the Federal Negotiations.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member.

Mr. SMITH: It is a pity I cannot call the thing by his name.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Federal Negotiations!

Mr. SMITH: "An interesting feature of this Debate was that it was the first time that proceedings of the Legislature....."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that it is a pity he cannot call the thing by its name. If the hon. member wants to go in the gutter, I can go down there too.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that it is a pity he cannot call the thing by its name. If the hon. member wants to go in the gutter, I can go down there too.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am asking the hon. member to withdraw his reference to me, because it was I who was concerned with the point raised.

Mr. SPEAKER: I never assumed "the thing" to refer to a human being.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, he was talking in this direction at me. I would tell him where he left the thing.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I was making my point. "An interesting feature of this Debate was that it was the first time that proceedings of the Legislature were broadcast. During the period of eight months the public heard the broadcast speeches of eighteen of their twenty-four representatives in the House of Assembly. It is difficult to state that, at the end of this long drawn-out exercise in parliamentary democracy, the majority of members of the community was satisfied that a Federal system of Government offered "the best solution to the problems of the area".

This paragraph, Mr. Speaker, tells us that every member of this House and the public had the opportunity of hearing the views of Federation.

5.00 p.m.

Now, we still maintain that forasmuch as we did not get too far at the last Conference at Sherbourne due to the behaviour of some of the Chief Ministers up there – it tells us straight and plain that we did not come to an amicable settlement -- and because members had to leave before the time, one does not know what is likely to happen. Because of that, members did not settle the matters which they intended to do. They had assembled with the sole purpose of forming a Federation. But the meeting came to an abrupt end. It is no fault of the people that it came to an abrupt end; therefore, the people should have a chance of saying all that they are saying now that they would like to have a Federation. I cannot speak for all the other territories, but I can speak for the people here in Barbados.

I am sure we went practically all over the country and it was the consensus of opinion that we should enter into a Federation without 'going it alone.' If you pass this Resolution at this meeting, you are going to find the price of things going up. We just do not know what is likely to be the cost or anything of the sort, and if we had a rough idea of what is likely to be the cost so that we could tell the people who are responsible for the up-keep of it, we would be able to set their minds at rest. It is the people that matter most. It is not any one individual; it is not the twenty-four of us.

I raise the point that owing to the introductory paragraph in your Manifesto when you told the people elections would be held in three years, you have created a doubt in the minds of the people. Since this has happened and you did not come to the end of the Conference because it was broken up before the time, we cannot know what would have happened if the meeting had been completed. It may be or that the members would have decided that they should be no Federation or that they should go on and try for Federation.

Sir, I feel that rather than taking the people into Independence alone at this stage, you should consult the people. The Government Party is claiming that they have a mandate. Yes, I would agree that they have a mandate, but for how many years? I would say three. The people voted for them on that promise. Irrespective of what is the length of the session or the law, have you carried out the proposals in your Manifesto? The promise is in the first paragraph of your Manifesto, and this is what you told the people during the last elections.

Sir, we cannot make the Government do what they do not want to do, but it is a question of principle. You made the promise that you will go back to the people in three years. I have read out part of speeches of hon. members who spoke in favour of Federation and you can say that not one of the Government Ministers was against it.

Now, if they vote against federation, that shows that something has gone wrong and radically wrong, something which we have not been told, because the few things which

have been said are not sufficient to convince us that you should drop it right away. If you do not want to have elections before so as to give the people their democratic right to think for themselves, say so. But after all, we are the servants of the people; it does not mind how we may feel A man may have a servant, and he may tell the servant what to do; but the master is the master and the servant is the servant. You should tell the people before you take such a bold step.

As I have said, I am not afraid of the electorate. I am afraid of the Constitution and what is going to be written in the Constitution. We have been told that the Constitution will come before this House. Even if we should raise certain objections and make certain amendments to it, the Government is not in favour of it, the chances are that the Constitution would still remain as it is. Sir, you cannot blame us for having those doubts, and it would not be fair to us or the people to be springing it on us before we see it. If one is charged for murder and one does not have a barrister to defend one, the Government rather than hanging the person wrongfully or rather than imprisoning them, gives him a chance to defend himself properly by giving him a barrister so that whatever happens it can not be said that justice was not done. A person may be innocent or guilty. Suppose a person is guilty and you give him every chance to defend himself, can you not see that you should give the people a chance to defend themselves?

You cannot know the feeling of the people by holding meetings and getting a few people saying that they want Independence. Some of them say "yea" and some say "no". The people who have to contribute to the same Independence may be the ones who are not present at the meeting. They may be the ones who do not like to go out on nights. The fairest way that the Government should go about this is to go out to the people and let them have some say in the matter.

The hon. introducer of the Resolution told us his views for taking us into Independence so hurriedly that I thought he would be able to give to us some figures or some estimate of the cost and what to expect. He was only saying that the time is up for Independence. He said that we do not have to hold our hats in our hands and beg for anything. We maintain ourselves. However, that is not sufficient to take us into Independence alone. I would still like to know the approximate amount. I would not expect him to say up to the cent what it would cost to run Independence, but the approximate amount can be given. Say that it would cost around so much, and at the present moment we know what is budgeted for each year, and from that we would expect to put our hands in our pockets and pay more or less.

5.10 p.m.

The only way, the best and fairest way we should go about it now at the moment is to go out to the people and let them have something to say in this matter. I was thinking that the hon. introducer of this Resolution would have been able to convince me as to the reasons for taking us into Independence so early. I thought that he would have been able to come to us with some figures or some estimates and let us know what we have to expect. That is only saying that when the time is up for Independence we do not have to hold our hands together and beg for anything; we can stand on our own feet. That is not enough to take us into Independence alone. I would still like to know the approximate amount. I would not expect them to say, up to the last cent, what it would cost for us to have our own Independence, but they could say it will cost us about so much. We would know what we have to provide for; we would know what is the expected rate of taxation and we would be expected to put our hands into our pockets. If we were going to quote some of the words of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, if a man is going to build a house, he is not going to start just like that. The builder will have to give you the estimated cost of the erection of the building. Although the contractor is not going to tell you the exact cost of the building — he will not tell you that, because if he does so you would not start the building at all. I was erecting a building and every now and then the workmen would call for something more. I asked them why they did not tell me what the building would cost at the beginning. They told me this: "Shipper, if we told you what it would cost, you would not have started it and we wanted you to start."

I suppose that you should not do like the workmen; you should let us know what we have to budget for. Up to now, nothing has been said about the real issue of Independence. I would say now that we were independent ever since. We were paying our way, we could buy whatever we wanted and, like everybody else, we do not have to beg. Financially we can pay our way. If the Hon. Minister can tell us that no sooner than the declaration of Independence is made, the 18,000 people who are now unemployed would be able to find jobs, that is something you would like to hear. We would like to be told that these 18,000 would be employed and those who want to go abroad could do so and things of that sort. In that case we can afford to run hard on Independence. That has not been told to us and I do not know. I have never worked in an independent state yet. The hon. introducer knows about these things and he would be able to tell us directly what to expect. He has failed to prove his case to us; he has definitely failed to put his case. In my opinion since he has failed to put his case well, I will not be in a position to support this Resolution as it stands. I may support it with the amendment, if that is put in. We, on this side of the House, are thinking in terms of the people because up to the present time, if we had not done anything already, we could afford to put ourselves in debt to the tune of $58 million and say that we would support a Federation. Up to the present moment we are over $58 million in debt. We are carrying weight, and therefore we cannot run as fast as a horse which is not carrying any weight.

The question is whether you are going to put on more weight. Are you going to put on more weight in this race or are you going to take off any weight? That has not been told us by the Hon. Minister. What the Hon. Minister has done is to make threats, and threats cannot take you to Independence. Even in relation to your own supporters, they may have the wrong ideas about Independence and when they get the right ideas about Independence that might cause them to withdraw their support. In that case the hon. member has failed to put a case. Sir, it is my humble submission that this case should be thrown out with costs because he has failed to put it. In my opinion, he has not presented the case as he should have presented it. I am standing behind the Resolution with the amendment and it is that we should have an Election before we go into Independence alone. The Resolution has not said anything and I am not saying anything more about Federation at the moment. We are now dealing wit h the Resolution.

5.20 p.m.

The majority of people would prefer Independence within a Federation, although it is not the wish of the Government to make another try. I went so far yesterday as to say that the Hon. Introducer could have instructed his Permanent Secretary to circularise the islands again by means of a letter expressing the feelings of some of the representatives in the House of Assembly, or he could say that it is the feeling of the Government that we should make another try at Federation and ask if they would be willing to go in for some kind of negotiations again. I believe that they would be decent enough to reply, and you might find that three or four of them might be willing to come. If the Hon. Premier instructed me to write them at my own expense, I would do so. (Mr. WALCOTT: Who would write it?) I have a secretary who can write, just like some other people who have secretaries. I feel that if a letter was written to these people and they did not reply, you would be able to tell the people of Barbados that the Opposition wanted you to make another try that you have written these people, that they have not treated you with the courtesy of a reply and you are finished with it.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the Government should make another effort, and that is why I took time to read part of nearly every member's speech on Federation. I cannot vote for the Resolution. If you do not care to make another effort before taking us into Independence, at least you should put it to the people and let them have the say, and you would be freeing your hands. Suppose it works out in such a way that the people were very much

annoyed and unhappy, they would not able to blame anyone. The Government would then be able to say that they left it to the people and have worked according to their bidding. It it works satisfactorily, they would be satisfied; but if it does not work out favourably and you had to tax more and cause the cost of living to go up, people are not going to be satisfied because people did not have a chance to express their feelings, and you may be removed from office for that. I am appealing to you to make another effort or put it into the hands of the people.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr.Speaker,more has been said about Federation in the last four months to the people of Barbados than during the entire time leading up to that period. Even before the Federal elections when there was so much apathy among the electorate and they showed it in the returns by a very small vote, the people of Barbados knew nothing about what it all meant; but that cannot be said today. Since the White Paper has been laid on this Table, not only all the Parties in the House, but other groups have travelled the length and breadth of Barbados nightly explaining to the electorate the pros and cons of Federation; so it can truly be said that the electorate is more alert today and more educated to the fact of Federation than at any other time before. If there was ever a time to go to the people and ask them for their decision on this, it is now; but what do we see? A White Paper is issued and three months have elapsed; the ground is prepared outside and then we come here to debate the issue.

Mr. Speaker, instead of dispassionately laying their case, the Government has accused the Opposition of not wanting Independence for Barbados. Our Party is not opposed as such. We have always said that it is inevitable that we should be led into Independence at some time, but there is a choice of two forms of Independence offered us — one is within a Federation and the other is in isolation — and it is for us to choose. The Government has come down heavily in favour of Independence alone, after advocating a couple of months ago Independence for Barbados within a Federation, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has read at length the speeches of the very members who are now turning right around on that issue. They are now saying that that should be put behind them. Something must have happened suddenly to convince them that they were travelling in the wrong direction. They have not been able to convince us that they tried hard enough,because we were told that the Federal instruments were so complete that it only meant a matter of going to London. They had carried their deliberations almost up to the end,when there was a clash of personalities and we had the spectacle of a break-up of the last Regional Council of Ministers in Barbados.
5.30 p.m.

Then there was a hiatus of over four months before he put the matter before us, if my memory serves me right.

Those of us who are still firmly entrenched in the feeling that Independence within a Federation is better for the people of Barbados do so on economic grounds. We are a small island very heavily populated. Our economy is dependent on four pillars -- agriculture, mainly sugar,tourism which is now developing, industry and commerce and remittances from overseas. We import almost everything that we eat, wear and use.

We are not an industrial country, but the last Government has been embarking on a programme of industrialization because they realised that if the standard of living was to be raised, it was on that line that industrialization must take place. We have seen in Trinidad and Jamaica although those countries can boast of having natural resources — Jamaica its bauxite and Trinidad its oil — that they are not sat isfied with that, but they are encouraging capital and the know-how to come in to establish secondary industries to produce goods which they formerly bought from overseas, and we are following in that pattern.

The Hon. Minister of Trade and the former Minister of Trade have told this House over and over again that when the investors come to Barbados at the invitation of the Development Board, they always go into the various aspects of industries and they always ask what inducement the Government can offer. They have tax holidays for seven years. They are even given loans on easy terms. They are told that buildings would be erected for them at Government's expense, and there are other inducements which are offered them; but they always end up by asking "When is the Federation expected to come into being?" It would interest them because they would have a further market for their products. Their entire hopes were on a market within the Federation.

We have 240,000 consumers in Barbados, but the Eastern Caribbean can boast of 600,000. We need a larger market; it is better for such purposes; and that is why although we want to have Independence, we saw that the better form would be in a Federation with the Eastern Caribbean. Up to today, we still regret that Trinidad pulled out because although she has the general mass of industrialisation, we feel that certain investors would be only too glad to come into Barbados and set up their businesses.

Now we are told that these hopes have been dashed, and we would have, if we want Independence alone, to be content to develop our agricuture more, if possible. We would have to push our tourist industry harder than what we are doing, and we would have to hope that the remittances from overseas would be increased or even maintained because the gap between imports and exports is very large and is rising, and if there is to be any growth of industrialization in Barbados, then we will have to find other markets for our goods. I think that it is on that ground particularly -- and when the Hon. Minister of Trade asked why should we expect our trade to diminish with the other islands in the Eastern Caribbean if we went independent and he replied that Trinidad went independent and increased her trade by $1 million or more, I would say this. If we went into a Federation, it would be in the form of a customs union and we would have free entry into the other islands and Trinidad. At the present moment, there is some trade between Trinidad and Barbados. However, Barbados' products do not go into the other islands on a lower tariff. But if we unite economically, we would have rights far and above all the others, and the $9 million which Trinidad is now sending to the Eastern Caribbean, much of that would come our way because there would be no tariff barriers between them and Barbados. Our tariff will be maintained and Trinidad's will be increased because tariffs would be shared between us and the other islands. It would be in their interest to buy from Barbados. I know that today Dr. Williams must feel himself a very happy man to see that these islands have not been able to come together, because he can stand apart, and without any responsibility politically for them, he would be able to capture their markets. They have to buy from someone. Trinidad is the closest, the strongest and the healthiest.

We have turned our backs on them, and it is clear already that the business in trade has already been felt by our commercial business houses which are sending salesmen to those islands, since this White Paper was issued. It is not only the manufactured goods that leave Barbados and go into these islands. There is a lot of merchant trade which we have established in the other islands — and our salesmen are always up and down those islands — commission on which comes into Barbados. That goes to strengthen our economy and increase our finance. It also increases the income tax which the Government draws.
5.40 p.m.

The economic conditions for Barbados going into these islands will grow; and although today you may look at them -- as some people would like to say — as second-class citizens, many of these islands have a great tendency for the Federation. In another ten or fourteen years, if we do not associate before then, we will regret what we are doing today. We are a little island and we are out in the Eastern Caribbean by ourselves. What are we going to develop to feed the greater population we have or to maintain the present standards which we have — and everybody is expecting a higher standard year by year? Are we going to hold up

our hands?We are dealing with a people who are indigenous to the Caribbean – the people from Montserrat to Grenada who are predominantly of African descent.We are going to have a free trade area with British Guiana and it may be with another island. As the Hon. Minister of Trade said in his speech, that would be the prelude to freedom of movement. That means that we would prefer people from British Guiana coming to these shores and the people from the other islands as well. We will be opening the doors to people who are not all of African descent.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. What I said is that there is a lot of scope for development in British Guiana, and we have to think first of the people of our territory. Inasmuch as only one-third of British Guiana is developed, one of the great advantages to Barbados would be room for our people to assist in developing British Guiana which will be more economical to develop than Antigua or St. Lucia; I also said what the islands needed was economic association rather than political associations because we have seen that political association was improbable, if not impossible, and there was the possibility of having economic association. All the islands were invited to join in the free trade area.

Mr. GODDARD: I think we have already tried Surinam. That had the same fate as British Guiana and what was the result? All returned ... I cannot see Barbadians in any quantity going into British Guiana for development purposes. I can see the flight of British Guianese not of African descent travelling into Barbados. We have been fortunate, although we have a very heavy population, that we have the majority of African descent. We have not got a large Indian population here, and I do not think the people of Barbados would encourage that.

If our fishermen go out to sea and the engine of their boat breaks down, they find themselves next morning in the island of St. Vincent or St. Lucia. Barbadians would move into these places and would live there happily. We need a better association. It is unfortunate that these talks which have been going on for years have broken down. We were on the verge of completing an association that we had hoped would have come about. We have tried this association since 1946 even in a different form, and now we are faced with isolation for Barbados. We have nothing to fear. We knew that we would find the leaders in this Federation. They are still looking to us; and if they do not want to drag their feet we should have taken the stand that we could join with even one of them in this political and economic association. Two are stronger than one and friendly countries like Canada and the United States of America are willing to assist us financially. Those countries have repeatedly told us that they are not too happy about dealing with us individually. They have promised us financial assistance if we would federate, and that promise is still there. But you can quite understand that when these big metropolitan countries are dealing with large sums of money, they are not going to be bothered with eight or nine little units in the Caribbean. Sir, we are just mountain tops in the Caribbean; we can swim from one place to another in some of these islands.

5.50 p.m.

The hon. senior member fo St. Peter next attacked the Official Opposition yesterday and tried to make out that I was the only logical Conservative in here, whereas my colleagues could not be Conservatives. I do not know what he was hinting at. His conception of Conservatism and mine are totally different. Conservatism to him can only mean a white man, but to me it is not that. Conservatism like Socialism is a political philosphy. I would like to ask him if Mr. "T. T." Lewis was in the Houe today – he was a white man – whether he would be characterised as a Conservative. He was more Socialist than anybody else in here since he came in, and I wonder what would have been the answer for that. Conservatism is to be found in all walks of life. There are some shopkeepers who are more Conservative than I am according to my tenets of Conservatism. Why he should have introduced that to bolster his argument I do not know, and it is unfortunate that it has been mentioned by three or four of the Government Party.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national issue for Barbadians to decide, and I am one. I was elected not only by the white people of Barbados, because I had more coloured votes than white in Christ Church. The hon. member also mentioned that if the reverse was made, a white man would not have voted for a coloured candidate. That is not so and I can instance a case. When we first ran in the Local Government elections and obtained nine seats, among them was Mr. J. O. Tudor, a Roebuck Street merchant, but before he could take his seat, he died. You will remember that Mr. George Hunte ran as an Independent and lost. He tried a bye-election in the Carlisle Ward where the white people are supposed to reside. I went out and canvassed for my Party who was running Mr. Douglas Haynes as the candidate against Mr. George Hunte, and the result was that Mr. Douglas Haynes topped the poll by a large majority, which meant that the white people in the Carlisle Ward voted for him. His argument therefore does not hold water, and this is 1966.

I heard a speech by the Hon. Leader of the House in Queens Park in 1951 around the time when we had universal adult suffrage. It was an excellent speech. The election had been fought and won by the Barbados Labour Party and the Conservatives has been pushed aside, and he said that that as from that day, because there was universal adult suffrage, there should be no more talk in Barbados about black and white; but in 1966, fifteen years after, it is still being used for political purposes. If the industrialists, mindful of the economic position of Barbados and of the people they employ, feel that of the two forms of Independence one within a Federation is more stable, why should they not say that, and why should they be abused and their colour dragged into the arena on this occasion? They are not doing it because they are white or coloured; they aare doing it because they feel that in the interest of the people that form of independence is better for Barbados. That is how our Party feels.

We have had discussions on this matter and we have carried it to the people, and the reaction that we have got has been a good one, and in our amendment to the Resolution, we have given the Government an opportunity to review it. You have been in power for four years and you have one more year to go, because by December, there must be an election. Soon after that there will be the Estimates, and anyone interested in the economic position of the island will always avoid having elections during the reaping season; so that brings on June. Six months later, you will have an election; so what is the hurry? Why avoid the voice of the people? We would fight the election on the principle of Barbdos going alone or within a Federation, and whatever is the result, we will have our Independence. If the electorate returns the Party which says that we should have another try at Federal talks before we go into Independence, then we will have further discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of the West Indies, not only of Barbados, are more conscious of their responsibility to a Federation today than they have ever been. They were lukewarm in the past, but we can talk to them boldly now because they have something to gain by associating themselves with us, and we have something to gain by associating ourselves with them. If they wish to go alone, they have more to lose than we have, but we would accept those who want to come along, because as I said, we would be more recognised as a group in the councils of the United Nations than as Barbados with 240,000 people. We are proud to be Barbadians. We are not selling Barbados for a West Inidan nation. We are Barbadians first whether or not we are of African descent.

6.00 p.m.

We are proud of our heritage. I am, and I am proud of the fact that we have been able to have reform in Barbados without bloodshed.

I was elected to this House of Assembly in 1948. When I came in here, there were ten white faces; today I am the only one who happens to be here, and I have contributed my quota and do not let it be thought that I am just representing the white community of this island: I have a responsibility to the people of Christ Church, and after they have elected me, to the people of Barbados; therefore, I think of what will be the best for them.

If you can show me that I am wrong by asking that you go into Independence within a Federation, or you can show me that by going into Independence alone that these people will have a higher standard of living and we can remove the block of unemployment singly, well, I may change my mind. But you have not done that , and until you do it I think our Party's stand on Federation would be better than 'going it alone.'

We have 18,000 unemployment, and 25% of that number registered at the Labour Department are foreigners. When the Hon. Minist er of Trade said yesterday that 25% of the applications to the Labour Office for jobs are from foreigners, I would like to ask him what number that percentage represents. I bet you that it cannot be more than 600, if so much; therefore, do not let us think that the St. Lucians have not contributed to the economic development of Barbados. Just as we say that our immigration to the United Kingdom has contributed to the economic situation, we say that the St. Lucians are contributing to the economic situation in Barbados.

In 1961 we reached 192,000 tons of sugar. They might have been responsible for the contribution of 192,000 tons.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was at pains to point out that my address did not refer to St. Lucians. I referred to aliens coming into the island. There are 103,000 people on the unemployed list, and a quarter of that number are foreigners who are applying for jobs in Barbados.

I would like further to state that only about one-seventh of the people that are unemployed in this country are registered with the Labour Exchange, and if we strike a level and say that one-quarter of that one-seventh are aliens, it is seven times the unemployed aliens in this country that are unemployed as they are registered at the Labour Department.

The point which I was making in my address is, since there are so many in the country unemployed, it is taking effect on the taxpayers since so many of them are given public assistance and otherwise, especially in St. Michael.

Mr. GODDARD: That does not alter what I was saying.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want it to go out to the people that that 25% has any relation in the thousands. I said it was a much smaller number registered at the Labour Department, and of that number 25% are foreigners; but they are contributing to the economy of this island. Although I have heard that the Hon. Leader of the House has opposed that, if people can come in and compete favourably with the businessmen, they are welcomed. They have to pay taxes. It is a fact that the Barbadians have always been given preference in employment .

When it comes to agriculture. I know that there is a drift-away of the people from agriculture. It is because our standard of living has risen, our boys are looking for other types of work to do, but the replacement of that labour force must be made. The time must come when machinery for agricultural purposes must come in; if not, they will not be able to reap the canes. Fortunately, there is a source of Labour supply from St. Lucia and other islands. Those people come in and do a job which many of our Barbadians are not willing to do. They fulfil a need, just as we fulfil a need to the London Transport Service in England. The remittances come back from these sources overseas.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would just like to say that these aliens are doing a job which Barbadians are doing. The hon. member is referring to the St. Lucians who come to cut canes. The aliens whom I mentioned are not only men from St. Lucia.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, the world is growing smaller and the economies of countries are growing bigger at the same time because of the means of communications — the wireless, telephone and the aeroplane. Trade is expanding, and what do you find? You find in Europe the formation of an European Economic Community. The whole of Europe is one economic bloc, and in the future, they will be trading with the Government as a free trade area. Many people also think that in the years to come there will be a political association of these countries.

The leaders of Governments have become more and more concerned with the people and how to raise their plans. The European market is concerned with industry, and when they have satisfied those industries, they are in a better position to export and compete with other trade blocs in other parts of the world. Their powers are so great that they produce the goods faster than other developed countries of all sizes. 6.10 p.m.

The United States of America is a shining example. They can feed the world. They can produce goods so fast that they can help countries of all sizes. They can carry on similarly with South America: their potential growth is so much that they can turn out things faster than any other country in the world. They have been given a good start by having a large domestic market at home. When they have satisfied that market, then they can satisfy others. They find it necessary to associate as much as possible, they have encouraged the European countries to get together We must go into some association and where should we start? We should start at out own door step.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The hon. member has said that the United States of America encouraged the European countries to get together. The United States of America did not encourage the European countries to come together in a Federation; they got an economic community in this area.

Mr. GODDARD: I said that they encouraged the European countries to come together economically.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Not in a Federation.

Mr. GODDARD: They are thinking of that already; they are getting together. It is a question of one people, one race, one language and coming together cannot be denied them. We have just had in this Chamber the President of Nigeria who was on a visit here. He was able to unite a nation of 40 million or 50 million people speaking differently. In a vast territory of communications he was able to do that. If that is so, could we not find from among ourselves a leader to do the same thing? That is what we are asking for. Can we not find such a leader? Our economic development would be of a faster growth in that formula, and we would go on to Independence as quickly as possible.

We are dependent on a one-crop economy. We have been fortunate that in these last many years we have been able to balance our budget without outside assistance. We only get grants for capital works; but other people have been getting grants too, and it is our duty to take whatever grants are offered to us provided that they are for purposes which we can approve. As regards our current expenditure we have been able to keep abreast of the times. We want to retain our prestige. We were selling sugar at a price one-half the cost of production. Is that an empty statement? Tourism is but a recent development, and I can assure you that it can be a critical one too. It can be here today and gone tomorrow. Any disturbance in the Caribbean area or any sign of an epidemic of some sort in the Caribbean taking place, and tourism will go through the window with a snap of the finger. It is nothing for us to depend

upon to any great extent. I would be the first or one of the first persons in this Chamber to advocate Independence, but we cannot put too much dependence on our economic position in the future.

Those of us who invest in hotels and other things related to that industry are hoping that the expansion will continue, if not at the same rate, at double the rate; but that will pay for the slowness which we are facing in the falling off. If the hon. member is looking to British Guiana for an expansion of our industry in the free market, do not let him be fooled.
6.20 p.m.

Investors will come and look, and if they feel that Barbados has a healthy climate for industrial development for a particular industry, they may put their factory here; but remember that we only have 240,000 consumers, while British Guiana has 600,000. They would be inclined to follow that market as it would be cheaper to produce goods in British Guiana and satisfy the 600,000 consumers and sell the difference to 240,000 people in Barbados than it would be to put the market here to satisfy 240,000 people and ship the difference to the 600,000 people in British Guiana.

We know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that foreign capital is going to pour into British Guiana for political reasons.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is making the point that the 600,000 people in British Guiana would offset the establishment of industries in Barbados where there are 240,000 people. The hon. member does not know that the industrial incentives in Barbados are much better than in British Guiana.

Mr. GODDARD: It is so now, but when you join in a free trade area .....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is one of the agreements of the free trade area that any change in industrial incentives must be by agreement of the territories; so there will be no incentive given that would not have to be approved by Barbados and the other islands in the free trade area.

Mr. GODDARD: If the Hon. Minister of Trade thinks he knows all, he may be easily fooled; but if he is fooled, the people of Barbads with more experience than he will not be. It is natural that investors are interested in making money and not in people, and they will go where the market is greater. Things being equal, they will satisfy the 600,000 people in British Guiana with their products, and the balance would more easily be exported to Barbados. It is obvious that if you have not thought of it before, you have missed an awful lot.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I have not missed an awful lot. Barbados is a much smaller country than British Guiana or Trinidad, and there are certain industries established in Barbados today that were not thought of in British Guiana because of the industrial incentive; and what I am saying is that the industrial incentives given by Barbados are more attractive than those given by British Guiana, and the Free Trade Agreement is governed by various Articles of Association which have been agreed on by the areas concerned. The point I am making therefore is that the Industrial Incentives Act of British Guiana as well as that of Barbados can only be amended by agreement among the territories of the Free Trade Area; so Barbados is not going to agree to something that will endanger itself.

Mr. GODDARD: We are hearing something for the first time. I do not know what form of Government they have in British Guiana if the hon. member is going to tell me that the incentives we give to foreign investors are going to remain greater than the incentives which Mr. Burnham will be giving to people coming into British Guiana. If that is so, it seems strange. The American people for political reasons are going to pump money into British Guiana, and you are going to find that they will have the same incentives there, as Barbados is giving to investors. If you think you are going to have an easy time telling them that you are going to regulate the incentives they must give, when at the present moment less than .....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not say that Barbados would regulate the incentives given in British Guiana. What I said is that no changes in the Industrial Incentives Act will be made by any territory without the approval of the other territories in the Free Trade Agreement. That is one of the things that was dealt with.

Mr. GODDARD: Well, am I to understand that the present Incentives Act of British Guiana is equal to the one at present in Barbados? It is not. The markets in British Guiana will be expanding, and they are more likely to attract industries there. You may say that the industrial development in Barbados is greater at present than in British Guiana, because we started before them, but with a big market it is easier for an industrialist to produce goods there and send to a small market outside. When investors go to the Development Board in Barbados which we have been encouraging and to which we have been giving money both for advertisements outside and for entertaining investors and trying to get their capital here, the Board will have a good job trying to convince them that this is the spot in which to put their factory and not in British Guiana, because with communications being what they are, we have schooners that leave here regularly, and we might be able to encourage the expansion of the use of the federal boats, because I do not know if they go there now. That is for those who have that to realise. If this were done within a Federation, we would have had this market to bargain with other countries. The bigger the region, the more efficient it will be, and I envisage that some day — when we are strong enough, not by ourselves but in association with these islands when there will be a grouping of the entire Caribbean islands with Trinidad and Jamaica included -- communications would have improved to the extent that what is being done now in South America, Central America and Europe will be done not only in the Eastern Caribbean but in the entire Caribbean area. I would have thought that this debate from the Government side would have pointed out more of the fears I have stated, and that they would have answered these before I actually asked the questions.
6.30 p.m.

The position in which our economy now stands as regards agriculture cannot be expanded much more. That means about 50% or more to our revenue.

As regards tourism, we hope and trust that the industry will rise to even greater heights. We have been looking for everything possible for these islands which we have been talking about; but I see the slowing down of some industries, and some coming to a standstill. Many of the industries which we have now are duplicated in British Guiana. They have them already more established and they would be competing with us. It would help if we get Antigua joining. The other islands have not yet come into this type of thing, and if this debate goes into the other islands, I know, from what has been said by some of the Ministers, what would be the reactions. Barbados would be segregated by some in those islands. They would say that we have turned our backs on them. As far as I can see, the Hon. Premier should have left the door opened for them, but the door is closed quite firmly now.

In your Resolution, you have stated that after Independence alone, you will continue to seek Federation with the other territories. I wonder who has given you the undertaking that they will continue. I can only see it that, after you have brought us into nationhood, you would have to hand over to some other Party the task and ask them to try because if the same Ministers have to send invitations out, I see the same answers coming back. And this debate has done nothing to lighten it. Names have been called and people have been accused. Today, we have turned our backs on people whom we thought were our

friends — people of the same race as ours; and if we had gone on together, we would have grown in strength and we would have gained the respect of every metropolitan country which has offered us financial help and assistance. They are willing to give us aid now. They would give us individually, but they would give us less. They have strings of conditions attached to their gifts. They would give these little units some money; but if they give them individually, each unit would have to show good reason and cause how that money is to be spent. If we had joined in a Federation, we would have had the opportunity of doing more for ourselves and for everyone.

One last thing. I think it was the hon. senior member for St. Peter who said that the newspapers of this Island had not given fair comment to the Government's side. Well, if that is so, Government is somewhat to blame. I know of one daily newspaper which would open its columns and it had someone writing Government's point of view; but then, that was withdrawn, and in recent months and weeks that column was renewed again. But the Government did not see fit to take it up for their own reasons. If other parties have availed themselves of that opportunity and have put their point of view, the newspaper cannot be blamed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is no newspaper writing the Government's point of view. There is a newspaper writing a democratic point of view, but this is not necessarily the Government's point of view.

Mr. GODDARD: No newspaper writes a point of view. The columns are opened to the parties, and if the parties want to avail themselves of the opportunity on these vital issues, they can do so.

I only want to clear that up because it was stated by the hon. senior member for St. Peter that it was unfair to the Democratic Labour Party and the point of view which was stated was one-sided. These are national issues. I do know of one newspaper which held aloof entirely from the issue, but that is not a Barbadian newspaper; the newspaper is owned in London and the policy is dictated in London. These newspapers are becoming scared, not only in Barbados but in the other countries in which they are owned by this company and they cannot state freely what they want to state. Fortunately, there is a similar newspaper and others that can put your point of view, and this newspaper, as far as I know, is not one-sided. It has opened its columns to all Barbadians; and if the Barbados Government does not avail itself of the opportunity to put forward its point of view, do not blame that newspaper. It is unfair.
6.40 p.m.

I thought that I should mention it because it was mentioned here. If a paper is directed from outside, there are reasons for that; but enough has been said on this issue not only in the House of Assembly but on platforms throughout the island. The people today are more conscious of the issue which is before this House about Barbados going Independent in isolation or in a Federation than ever before. The amendment which was tabled from this side gives the Government their opportunity inasmuch as they have to decide when an Election is to be held — as the Hon. Premier has said, it can be held at any time between now and December. It is unlikely for the Government to have an Election before June and by that time we will be six months away from the debate. I will read the Amendment again. This is what it says:-

"To omit all the words after "convene" and to substitute the following words therefor:-

After the holding of elections in Barbados to decide whether Barbados shall proceed to independence, within a Federation comprised of such territories in the Eastern Caribbean as are willing to join in such an association, or alone, a conference representative of all political parties to arrange for the implementation of the decision taken for the constitutional, financial, defence and other measures for the establishment of an independent nation at the earliest possible time."

We are not against Independence for Barbados. We have been accused of that by the Government, but that is wrong. None of us on any platform has ever said that we are against Independence. It is a question of the form of Independence and the approach to Independence. You might have an Election on the issue, and when the people decide whether they want to be within a Federation or alone we would have had the decision of the Electorate. If it is a question of our being alone, then we will join you, the Government, at the earliest opportunity for constitutional talks. If, on the other hand, the people say that they want to be in a Federation, then we will invite you to join us in the constitutional talks in London. I throw that out as a challenge. We are not afraid of an Election; as a matter of fact, we would welcome one. It is for the Government to decide the time for holding the Election. This is too important an issue to be decided arbitrarily; it cannot be decided arbitrarily. I have confidence in the British Government even although it may be a Socialist Government, and I say that the people of Barbados should be given an opportunity to have a say in this constitutional change.

The people have never in such a change accepted only the advice of the majority Party. The Opposition has always been consulted and they have stated most recently that with respect to any constitutional change of this sort, it would require a two-thirds majority. That is so even if it was possible for you to get it here. The position in this country on this issue is such that the Government would be ill-advised to advise the Secretary of State for the Colonies contrary to what we are asking. It is not an issue which can be so easily resolved.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. Did the hon. member say that if a Resolution were passed by both Houses of Parliament, the Government would be ill-advised to advise the Secretary of State for the Colonies in accordance with it?

Mr. GODDARD: I said that and I will say it again. Knowing what has gone on in this House and throughout the length and breadth of this island.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but did we understand him to say that the Head of the State, the Representative of the Queen, has to ignore the Constitution of this Island and refuse to give effect to a Resolution or Resolutions passed by both Houses of Parliament?

Mr. GODDARD: I did not say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the moment it is not quite clear whether the Chair is being addressed or not. Let the hon. junior member for Christ Church continue his address.

Mr. GODDARD: If the Secretary of State for the Colonies were to make a decision for Independence alone on a simple majority, he would be ill-advised. I did not quote from the Premier's speech because every member of this House heard the speeches which were read out today, and in those speeches hon. members said what we are saying today. There has been a change and no substantial reason has been given for such a change. If those hon. members had reservations all along, they did not say so. From the speeches which were made by hon. members on the other side of the House and which were quoted, almost every hon. member was a federationist. They were all federationists in fact. Well, Sir, we are Federationists too. The reservations came from this side of the House. It was in reply to us that they went all out to state that there was no hope for Federation.
6.50 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the hon. members of the Government said six months ago, we accepted almost in full, but we are now being accused for regarding the road to Independence in the way which they first accepted to be

right. We are still firmly convinced that Independence within a Federation is in the interest of the people of Barbados and is the best form not only for relieving unemployment, but for our ills. We have been able to balance our budget and we are happy about it; but can you see that in five or ten years we will be able to do so? I am not so sure. But together, and with the promised assistance from outside, I am confident that we would be a strong nation in the Eastern Caribbean.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful to Almighty God for the opportunity to participate in a debate of such historic significance to this island. It is true, Sir, that it is not easy to see history in its true perspective until perhaps some time has elapsed, but I am confident that history will defend the actions of those of us who on this momentous occasion are supporting the effort for West Indian unity.

Mention has been made in this debate of my newspaper, and I should like the people who were referring to it to go to the Library and check for as far back as a quarter of a century ago. From its inception I have published this newspaper, and it is regarded by those in the West Indies and in Africa and elsewhere as one of the foremost champions of the Nationalist Movement. The late George Padmore who was the inspirer and leader of all the Anti-Colonialist Movements in Africa has contributed regularly to its pages, and all people like Dr. J. Azikiwe, Jomo Kenyatta and Colonials elsewhere accepted and appreciated its policies in this connection. This newspaper at the same time had also been the champion of West Indian unity, and has fought strenuously, Sir, for the building of a West Indian nation, and there is nothing in this island today — no power, no personality, no anything — that can make me reverse that stand, because I know beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt that it is the correct stand to adopt, and that history both in this island and outside of it will be on the side of those of us who champion the building of a West Indian nation now. Anywhere you go in the United States, in Europe and elsewhere in the West Indies, this is the hope and dream of every patriotic West Indian. Sitting in my house this morning at 1 o'clock was a gentleman from America waiting to tell me that he extended his warmest support to the stand we are taking, because back in the United States of America the West Indians are cherishing the fond hope of achieving a West Indian nationhood.

I should like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be able to spend all my time on this matter in consideration of the economic and constitutional aspects of the matter before us — that is to say, Federation with Independence — but during the course of this debate, some very extraneous matters have been brought in; so many vicious and malicious slanders have been uttered, so many facts have been distorted, there has been so much abuse and so much misrepresentation that I am sure you will expect me, before I begin to discuss this matter basically, so to speak, to spend some time in refuting some of those allegations and answering some of those malicious and unfounded charges.

To begin with, we were told by the Introducer of the Resolution that this is a lard-oil lobby lobbying against Independence — whatever that means; but the impression given to this country is that the proponents of Independence for the West Indies are engaged in an effort to protect some manufacturer of lard oil, soap or margarine. As a matter of fact, we have been told that this entire debate is to sell Barbados for half a pound of Velvo-Kris and half a pound of margarine by the manufacturer of these two products here in Barbados. In so far as I am concerned, if I were to base my political relations on personal grounds, I might have more reason to be hostile to the manufacturer of these two items than any other single member in this House. The gentleman who manufactures these items, Mr. Kenneth Hunte, was regarded years ago as an opponent of the Government Party. It was said that he was actively campaigning in St. John against the present Premier. I am not certain whether it is so or not, but subsequent to the election apparently he was restored to grace in the Government Party, and he has advised the Government on more than one matter during its term of office. He has also taken part in conferences in which this Government participated. Of course he made the mistake a few weeks ago of going down to the Arts College and appearing on the side of Federation in a debate; therefore again he is *persona non grata*. But I am not concerned with Mr. Hunte, with velvo-kris, with lard oil or anything else. I am concerned with the people in St. Philip who put me here, and the people of this country whom I have always represented.

Now what I want to begin by doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to draw to the attention of this Chamber the items which we export now to the Leewards and Windwards.

7.00 p.m.

We export sugar confectionery to an amount of over $232,000, and from the list for which we have figures, we export sugar to Dominica, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Montserrat and Antigua.

The hon. junior member for St. Andrew tried today to make some point of the fact that in the year 1955, St. Lucia did not buy any sugar requirement from Barbados and that it bought it from Trinidad although Trinidad had already left the Federation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. It is unfortunate that some people cannot quote people correctly, even by mistake. In the point which I was making, I did not refer to the year 1955.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Actually, Sir, I was not inside the Chamber when the remark was made. I said 1955, but it was 1963. The following year, 1964, they bought sugar from Barbados. All that happened in that year was this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that he was not in the House of Assembly, yet the hon. member got up on a point of order and said that Trinidad sold the sugar cheaply because he wanted to represent Trinidad.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was inside the Clerk's office; I left there, if you will remember, rushed to my seat and took down the statement and then refuted it; but I was not sitting in my place when the statement was made.

Now, Sir, I am saying that in the year 1964, St. Lucia bought sugar from Barbados. In the year to which the Hon. Minister referred, St. Lucia did not buy from us because of the fact that Trinidad offered it to them at a cheaper price, whereas the Barbados Sugar Producers Association was insisting on the world market price. Again, Trinidad was anxious to curry favour with the West Indian Islands and they also agreed to sell sugar to St. Vincent more cheaply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Sir, I rise on a point of order. What the Barbados Sugar Producers Association told St. Lucia was that if they agreed to buy sugar for five years, they would get it at the negotiated price.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What did I say? I said that Trinidad sold St. Lucia the amount of sugar they ordered at the negotiated price for that year. The Barbados Sugar Producers Association was not selling at the negotiated price; they wanted the world market price. Trinidad was curry-favouring to get back in the West Indian market and, as you will remember, when Trinidad left the Federation, immediately she became the target of antagonism from the Leewards and the Windwards and a lot of them who bought from Trinidad shifted and bought from Barbados.

Trinidad was trying ever since then to regain its lost place, and this offer to sell them sugar cheaper than Barbados was just another link in the chain to try and win back the trade which they had lost.

Apart from sugar, we export soap, lard and margarine. We also export animal foods, oilmeal, rum, cooking oil, knitted shirts, shirts not knitted, and underwear, worth nearly $200,000 for the year before. From 1965 onward, we began to export additional items. We began to export these items: toys, jewellery, toilet accessories, plastics, furniture, aluminum furniture, wooden furniture and iron furniture, handbags, beer and stout, gin, macaroni, clay bricks from the parish of St. Andrew, washing soda, boots and shoes, belts, paints, lumber, matresses, vodka, concrete pipes. Those are some of the other additional items. As a matter of fact, of the 32 industries in Grazettes operating, nearly everyone has shipped some of the goods which they manufacture to the Windwards and the Leewards. Their factories were established on the basis of finding themselves markets in the Windwards and the Leewards. Their very existence depends on the availability of markets in the Windwards and Leewards.

I will tell you more. I made it my business to make a tour of the factories at Grazettes. The Manager of aluminum furniture told me that half of the produce was for export to the Leewards and the Windwards. The Manager of the handbags factory told me that, were it not for the markets of the Leewards and Windwards in July, August, September and October, he would have closed his factory down and sent his staff home because you only got sales of handbags here at Easter and Christmas and that could not keep the factory in full production throughout the year. The Manager of the upholstery factory told me that they had eight crates of furniture awaiting shipment for Grenada. He went further and said that the only competition he feared was from Canada because they had everything -- the wood and the springs.
7.10 p.m.

They manufacture everything. They competed with them in this area. They fought for the customs duty and they could ship items to Grenada. If there had been a Federation with Customs Union they could supply these items. At the moment our exports to these islands amount to something like nearly $4 million a year, that is, before we started this new factory in Grazettes. In other words, it is more than likely that by the time that these factories are in full operation the markets will be doubled or more. During my term of office in the Ministry of Development, over 100 firms were granted industrial concessions. If you read the Manifesto of the Government Party you will see that they promised 30 industries during the three-year term of office. I did it; so I ought to know. More than 30 have been established and are operated and an additional 70 .....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The hon. member said that over 100 firms were granted pioneer status during his regime. I am going to deny that and state further .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has made his statement that it is during .....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am making a point of order. Far from that because the Minister had interest in a nail factory ... .

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am denying that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order has been made.

Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. member is referring to a nail factory for which application was made to the Development Board on behalf of my brother, Mr. Percy Stewart of the Esso Service Station and myself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I stopped the Hon. Minister of Trade, and therefore I cannot allow the hon. member to develop something which I stopped the Hon. Minister from developing.

Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD: The application for the factory was made and the approval of the Board was granted in 1960 before I came in here. If you look at the *Advocate* Newspaper for the month of August, or September, 1960 you will see an interview which was given to the Advocate and to the News by my brother and myself saying that we were arranging to put down a factory and we were offered a loan of $30,000 by the Development Board. That was long before I became a Minister. As a matter of fact, I have with me here . copy of the Minute which I myself wrote to the Permanent Secretary in my Ministry telling him that we could not grant another application because one had been accepted by the Board. If you will permit me, Sir, I will read the Minute.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot allow that at this stage. ....

Mr. CRAWFORD: Any Government Minister can check any statement I make here with the Advocate or with the interview in the Advocate, which was given it by my brother and I when we came back here from the United States of America. The application which the Hon. Minister is talking about came in about one year ago; but when prevaricators and people who should be the last to throw stones at other people -- if he could have brought in an application for a gasolene station at his school .....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Any foreign matter which is not connected with the debate will not be allowed. That particular issue is closed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He said that the deal was off; the hon. member told me that the deal was off.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Both hon. members are on the floor and I am suspending the sitting for 45 minutes. This sitting now stands suspended for 45 minutes.
7.20 p.m.

On Resumption:

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member. Let the Bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that immediately prior to the suspension, the hon. senior member for St. Philip was addressing the Chair. If he has not yet concluded, he may resume.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sorry to disappoint Your Honour. Before the suspension, I was trying to point out that the insistence of maintaining the closest possible political association with the adjacent islands in the Eastern Caribbean is projected, not on selling Barbados for half a pound of Velvo-Kris and half a pound of margarine as was nonsensically stated in here by the Premier on Monday and Tuesday, but is for the very good reason that these islands constitute the most readily available market for a number of items now manufactured in this country. I said also that apart from the items available in the last published Report which I enumerated which brought our total annual export to over $2 million, we have since then been sending at least another twenty-five or thirty additional items to these islands, and these additional industries employed a large number of Barbadians. As a matter of fact, the additional number of Barbadians employed in the last three or four years in new industries in this country now total over 700.

What I want to add is this. If you were to get a report of the Development Board for the last year available, Mr. Speaker, you will find that over 130 industries have now been granted pioneer status in Barbados. I do not want to tire the House by enumerating individually all of these industries to hon. members, but somewhere in their files at home they have a report and will see in Appendix "A" that these items include alcoholic beverages, building materials, electrical equipment, food products, furniture chemical products, pharmaceuticals and so on and they range over 130. I said, Sir, that during the years 1962-1965 over thirty industries actually opened their doors.

The point which I want to emphasise is this: there are now over 70 applications which have been considered and approved by the Development Board and the Government agreeing to what we call pioneer status or approved industrial status to the applicants. Mr. Speaker, this House will no doubt be surprised to learn that the greater part of these industries have refused to establish themselves although they have been given this concession. From the time it became apparent that the negotiations for a Federation with Barbados and the Leewards and the Windwards was likely to fail, the industrialists who made these applications have not proceeded with them further.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member is making a misstatement of fact. There are not seventy industries given pioneer status or approval under the Industrial Incentives Act which have not started since it was made known that the Government of Barbados intended "going it alone". The Government of Barbados took the decision to "go it alone"... .. ...

Mr. SPEAKER: That ceases to be a point of order. The point of order has been made.

Mr. CRAWFORD: My contention, Sir, is that from the time it became apparent that there was no likelihood of the Federation being established, these applicants lost heart in putting an industry in Barbados, and they have refused to continue with their applications.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, again in refuting the statement which the hon. member has just made, I am stating that during the last six months when the Government expressed its intention of "going it alone", more industries have been granted approved status than during the time when the hon. member was responsible for trade in the Government of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That could not possibly be true and I defy him to prove it. He cannot get up here or anywhere and substantiate that allegation. In other words, it is a rank misstatement, because even if you refer to the newspapers you will see that during the years 1962-1965 almost every issue of the newspaper carried advertisements from applicants for pioneer status. It is a downright lie, Mr. Speaker, if anybody said in here or anywhere else that more industries have been granted pioneer status from March last year until now than were granted during the three years I was responsible for development in this country.

8.15 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I rise on a point of order. The only reason that some of the other industries were not established was because the industrialist felt he had interest in some of the other industries.

Mr. SPEAKER: That could not be a point of order. However, I cannot disallow a point of order, unless and until I hear what is said.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, an ignorant statement like that cannot be refruted by me at all. The same industry was approved for pioneer status by the Development Board on the 17th March, 1960.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. That again is a misstatement. The application sent to the Development Board by the hon. member was turned down because a similar application was sent down by the hon. member's brother for the same industry. The same hon. member was then a Minister of Government, and he refused to submit it to the Government for the approval of pioneer status and he told me that he was interested in another application.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order at all. I think we might as well get this clear before we proceed any further; otherwise, something else will happen.

Members are not entitled to make use of a point of order in order to rise and express disagreement. Hon. members may rise when their turn comes to speak and discuss the point and express their views. "I rise on a point of order" is not a phrase to use when one want to refute or contradict something, or express divergent views.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I want to say that the allegation that the Development Board turned down an application of mine when I was a Minister is a downright fabrication. I have in here a copy of the Minutes of the file on this matter. This reads:

"The Permanent Secretary, ..."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member said that he has a copy of the Minutes of the file on this matter. He could not have a copy because the minutes would have to be on the file because this is a ministerial file.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He says he has a copy.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: What copy?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. We will never get anywhere with this debate if we have this going on continually.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The point is this. I want to know whether it is proper for someone who is not a Minister of the Crown to give reference to what he alleges is Government property. This is the point of order that I want to establish because, so far as I know, I cannot see how anyone in this House, who is not a Minister of the Crown, can gain access to the Government's files or is given permission to quote from a Government file.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as the House is concerned, that has nothing to do with the Chair. Any alleged infringement of Cabinet secrets is a matter to be dealt with in some other place.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is a copy which I made from one of the files of my portfolios before I left the Ministry.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I submit that it is grossly improper for a former Minister of the Crown who is not a Minister now, to be breaking the Promissory Oaths Act by quoting from files or parts of files in connection with which he has taken an oath of secrecy, and which oath he should keep although he is not a Minister.

Mr. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, the law has laid down reasons to the Crown .....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me say this. So far as any alleged bringing out of files and breaking of the Promissory Oaths Act, that is a matter which might well be dealt with some other place; but so long as I am in the Chair, that matter cannot arise here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I am saying that the allegation that the Development Board turned down an application for a nail factory is an infernal lie and it is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: So far as personal allegations and this House is concerned, we are not debating that now. Let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I just want to say that the date when the particular industry was approved by the Development Board was on the 17th March, 1960. I will not deal with the gasolene station.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question of gasolene station. Let us get on with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I challenge the Hon. Minister to go to the files of 1963 and deny that part. That is a downright fabricaton.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise. I am hearing no more on subjects of any application to the Development Board for a nail factory or gasolene station.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In 1961, long before I came in here ...

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member underst and me. I am not hearing anything more about that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: All that I am doing is to deny the Minister's reference to the Development Board turning down an application of mine. That is an absolute lie.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member appreciate that I am not entertaining anything more about the Development Board, and otherwise.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I will do is to publish in the newspapers of this country a full statement of the facts; but, again, I cannot have anybody coming into this Chamber and telling lies on me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. member is not hearing me.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think I will have to call the hon. member's name if he insists on disobeying you.

(Loud noises from outside the House)

Mr. SPEAKER: I am doing my best to hear what is being said, but I can hardly hear because of noises from without; the appropriate authorities, apparently, are doing nothing about it.

A VOICE: Adjourn.

8.25 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: My control is only in respect of the House and the precincts of the House. I have no control over Marhill Street or the Public Buildings Yard.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I regard it as a tragedy in this country that, with close on 20,000 unemployed, those who wanted to invest money in this country went to the trouble of making applications for industrial concessions, and the Development Board went to the trouble of granting those concessions and they have not got any further with the applications because they were predicating on the ability of the West Indian markets which no longer exists. I wi ll tell you more: more than half of the industrialists in the island at the present time are exceedingly worried about the position of their factories, for this reason. It is not merely a question of the market. This is the main question; those industries which we would have here are similar to industries elsewhere in the area. The industrialists who are either established here or who were about to establish industries here, were looking forward to Customs Union between ourselves and the Leeward and Windward Island, which would have placed them in a more competitive position in these markets. It is not merely because you are in a Federation that you automatically increase your market. It is your Customs Union and the non-existence of markets between the parties to the Federation which induce people to come here. With the old Federation people predicated as to Customs Union between Trinidad and the Leeward and Windward Islands. When the Federation fell through, they found themselves in the Trinidad market alone and they found themselves in competition with other markets outside.

In so far as this country is concerned and the industrial policy, the break-up of the old Federation was the best thing to happen to this island. If the old Federation were in operation, Barbados would not have had the opportunity to be able to get off its legs industrially. All the industries would have gone to Trinidad and Jamaica. They had the raw material, they had cheaper power, and therefore they were a bigger source for industrialists. When Trinidad and Jamaica went out of the Federation, it meant that Barbados was regarded as the natural capital of the Federation. Therefore investors came here because they thought that with Customs Union and Federation, they would have the market provided. The minute this market did not exist, they were no more interested in the small market of Barbados alone. That is incontestable. Industrialists want at least the minimum size market for any industry. A market for the 250,000 people we have here is not enough to attract any industry to compete with other industries which are set up either in the area or out of the area.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this statement which the hon. member is making is not accurate, because every week approval is granted industrialists to bring industries into this island. That has happened every week since this Government has given a declaration of its intention to enter into Independence.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The position is the opposite. I should like anybody to let me know how many industries have been established between March last year and January of this year. There could not be four or six. For nine months there have not been six new industries established in this country, whereas over 30 were established between January, 1963 and the early part of 1965. I am saying that it is a tragedy for this country, looking at the position from a purely selfish line, that in the potential for further development based on Customs Union and Federation of the other islands.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. It is not fair to ask how many industries have been established.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is inaccurate to say that that is a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member queried how many industries were established in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would not be a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member has distorted the Government's policy.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member has distorted the Government's policy.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no justification for the hon. member to get up on a point of order. What constitutes a point of order is set out on page 26 of the Standing Orders and Standing Order 27(2) which says this:-

"A Minister may conclude a debate on any motion which is critical of the Government, or reflects adversely on or is calculated to bring discredit upon the Government or a Government Officer."

8.35 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. I have always heard that you have to hear what one has to say to determine whether or not it is a point oforder. I expect that same treatment in this case, Mr. Speaker, when an industrialist is given pioneer status...

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member at least try to put his point?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I will try to be as concise as possible, if the hon. member would take his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: So long as it is not a matter of contradicting or denying what the hon. member has said.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am making a point of order but I have to develop it , if the hon. member would have a little courtesy and decency to take his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not observe that two hon. members were on their feet.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Do you think you could teach me decency?

Mr. SPEAKER rose and both hon. members took their seats.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, when the Government grants pioneer status.... Mr. Speaker, are you listening to my point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am listening to the hon. member. So far, it does not appear to be a point of order, but to be an expression of opinion, or a contradiction of something.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when pioneer status is given to an industrialist, he has to take at least six months before he can establish his industry. That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Let it be clearly understood that even if the hon. member who has just risen wants to put a different point of view or a statement to be contradicted, there are other hon. members whom he might brief to do so for him when their time comes to speak. There is no such thing as a point of contradiction.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The point, Mr. Speaker, is that during the years 1962-63 1964 and 1965, applications from industrialists for pioneer status were being considered. We had a backlog from 1964, and we might have had some from 1963 which had not yet been established in 1965, because it takes time to get equipment, get your building erected, get your equipment installed, get your raw material and start to work; but in spite of this backlog, I say that there are over 70 applications which have been granted pioneer status which are yet to be established. There has been a marked lull in the establishment of new industries in this country from March last year until now, and I am not saying what I am thinking; I am saying what I have been told, because from time to time I come across the people to whom these concessions have been granted. I have been told by them, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat it here and now, that they are holding off, they are no longer as interested as they were, because there is not apparently now the availability of the market which they envisaged.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of this free trade area. Mr. Burnham in British Guiana proposed the establishment of a free trade area between British Guiana and any other colony which would be interested in it. The Government of Barbados grabbed at it because it realised that with the absence of a Customs Union between Barbados and the Windwards and Leewards, some other market was essential if the colony was to be industrialised. Well, now, everybody in this country knows, Mr. Speaker, that in so far as fostering industrial development is concerned, nothing much can be expected from the free trade area between Barbados, British Guiana and Antigua. To begin with, this argument that we offer more concessions than British Guiana and Antigua at the moment and that the concessions on the part of any participant in the free trade area cannot be improved except with the agreement of all the signatories to the agreement does not mean a thing, because, for instance, if there are three people in the free trade area agreement now, and Barbados has higher concessions, Barbados with a single vote could not prevent Antigua and British Guiana from improving their incentives after. When the three of them meet and British Guiana and Antigua say that you are offering more incentives than we are and we want to bring ours to your level, Barbados with a single vote could not stop them at all.

I will tell you more, Mr. Speaker. All things being equal, the average industrialist will go to British Guiana in preference to coming here, because he has a bigger base market; he has a base market of 600,000 people. He also has hydro-electric power which is cheaper in British Guiana, and if he is ordering raw materials for a factory in a population of 600,000, he orders more and gets them cheaper than if he were ordering for a place with 200,000 people; so it is better to establish your industries in a bigger domestic market and ship to the smaller. There is no industry at all that we have here that British Guiana cannot have. I am certain that all the industries we have, British Guiana has already.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has said that there is no industry in Barbados which British Guiana cannot have. British Guiana cannot have an industry.....

Mr. SPEAKER: This cannot be a point of order. It is a point in reply. Let me, for the information of the hon. member, say that I have been supplied with a list of hon. members who may yet speak, and that list as supplied to me discloses that five Hon. Ministers have the right to speak, that only one of them has not the right to speak, and I am sure the hon. member would not seek to take advantage of alleged points of order to enable himself to speak again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there has been no accurate survey of the potential of natural resources in British Guiana; and while it is true that fools madly rush where angels fear to tread, I do not think that any person who knew anything about the potential of British Guiana would risk to say that there is no oil to be found there. As a matter of fact, I will say this: when the first proposal for a free trade area between British Guiana and Barbados was projected, the promise at the time was that since we had little to sell to British Guiana, British Guiana would take their oil from Barbados and from the Antigua refinery.

8.45 p.m.

This is what we would have got out of it. We were to sell them oil. Let us say that they say: "I am buying your rice. If you want to buy your oil from somebody else, look out!" However, the thought is gone because British Guiana is to have its own oil refinery; so their hope of supplying oil to British Guiana no longer exists.

Barbados has little or no resources. We used to have some manjak and some gas. What natural resources do we have?

A VOICE: This argument has nothing to do with St. Lucia, Montserrat or anything like that at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member continue his speech?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have not even been allowed to begin. The hon. senior member for St. John spoke for eight hours on Tuesday. I am not saying that it was long or short. Well, this may be twelve hours.

Sir, what I am trying to establish is this. I do not want the Barbados public to be fooled with the idea that we have anything to gain by any free trade agreement between British Guiana and this Island. The average industrialist would rather go to British Guiana than come here. If this Government goes as far as to put up a factory in Barbados to make plastics with the hope of selling the manufactured articles to British Guiana, there is nothing to prevent anybody putting up a plastic factory there and selling us their goods. As a matter of fact, they would say that it is better to put it in British Guiana because it would be able to turn out things at a cheaper price; therefore, the rumour is not true that we have anything to gain.

The Government has put this up as a sop for the loss which they know will follow the refusal to finalise the Federation and Customs Union. I do not want the people to believe that there is anything to be gained by the free trade area because they would be living in a fool's paradise if they thought so. A free trade area is not any alternative for a Cust oms Union with the Windwards and the Leewards, and Barbados will learn to its cost that it is not an alternative.

Mr. Burnham, Premier of British Guiana, will vote for it. It was his proposal. He proposed something which would be of benefit to British Guiana. That country has a potential of becoming even more highly industrialised than Jamaica because Jamaica has bauxite and British Guiana has bauxite and a good many other minerals. What minerals has Barbados got? We do not have any. We would just be an appendage to British Guiana.

It was a God send when Jamaica and Trinidad left the Federation and left Barbados to carry the others into a Federation; but now, we have flung it away. Jamaica is still anxious to get more trade from us. Trinidad would like to get back into this market again. I have had talks with the Trinidad Chamber of Commerce and I have been told by one of them that Trinidad would do anything to be able to get back the business which she had with these territories when she was in the Federation. He bluntly stated that Trinidad's position demands that Trinidad should be back in the Federation. It is abundantly stated in Trinidad that if Trinidad had to make that decision again, the Government would not be allowed to get away with that in the manner they did the last time.

The Hon. Premier in introducing this Resolution said that when Trinidad declared their Independence unilaterally, there was not even a debate in the Legislature and that on the Monday morning, Port of Spain woke up to find that the Government came out of the Federation and that was the end of it. That was a complete misrepresentation of the facts. It was completely inaccurate. I was in Trinidad at the time. What actually happened was that the P.N.M had a conference and decided to leave the Federation – not to declare a unilateral declaration of independence. The decision was announced the following morning in the P.N.M. party organ.

When it came to Independence, the most elaborate exercise ever conducted in any country was conducted by the Government of Trinidad. No less than 280 delegates from every conceivable organisation of the country – the Lions Association, the Agricultural Society, the Chamber of Commerce, and so on – were called in. I remember Mr. Wharton, who represented the Law Society and members of other organisations submitted to the Government Party a lot of proposals for the Constitution and after wading through this mass of documentation, the Government emerged with complete proposals. Then they went to England. As a matter of fact, far from it being correct to say that Trinidad woke up one morning to find that it was independent, over a year before that – Dr. Eric Williams got on a public platform in Woodford Square – that was in 1961 – and said that he was thinking of Independence for Trinidad and he began then by sending Sir Ellis Clarke to initiate discussions in London.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hate to interrupt the hon. member but the facts are as follows: At a party convention of the People's National Movement, a resolution was passed the text of which I have in my hands. The resolution was passed at which a declaration was made.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not hear what the member said.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am correcting the hon. member with the facts. The People's National Movement had a party convention at which a decision was taken to desist from further participation in the Federation and in which a call was made for independence. Immediately they started to make a move in that direction, and it was in respect of the Draft Constitution and in respect of the decision reached at the party's convention. It was the Draft Constitution which the Hon. Premier had spoken of.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I said was this. On Tuesday we were told that Trinidad woke up more or less one morning and found themselves independent,
8.55 p.m.

that the Government of Trinidad decided to go into Independence unanimously without reference to the Legislature, that a Conference was held on Sunday and on the next day the Colony was going independent. What was decided on Sunday was to leave the Federation, and Mr. Maudling, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, was presented with the decision to leave the Federation. What I am establishing is that it is nothing to conceal that the Resolution of the P.N.M. on Sunday may have had some effect on it, but it does not mean that Trinidad achieved Independence the next day. Independence was a long process after Trinidad quitted the Federation. Trinidad would like to come back into Federation now. Federation is not only a political association, but it also involves the question of Customs Union. It means that you can compete more successfully with goods manufacturers outside. This is the most important thing for Barbados. If we have 18,000 people unemployed and a number of young people are leaving the schools, do you want them unemployed just because you can get a few people to come and cheer at a public meeting? If I stood in this House alone, if the other 28 members were in favour of Independence and I alone was for Federation, I would vote for it. When the submarines were sinking the ships every day, I told Mr. Keith Walcott to put down a factory for the purpose of processing cassava flour. They laughed at me and said that it was not practicable to to do. They laughed at me, but subsequently Mr. Stewart said they had to get Mr. Watson from Searles Factory and Mr. Coppin, the former Government Analyst, to get scrap machinery to carry down there at Lancaster, for the purpose of processing cassava flour.

I am saying, Sir, that the history of this country unmistakably will demonstrate that the future of these islands will best lie in Federation or assocation. The Hon. Premier, in the most adverse statement I have heard, said that nobody in the island objected to Barbados 'going into Independence alone.' The entire struggle of the West Indies for nearly a century before Cipriani and others were concerned with constitutional reform was Federation. It is nonsense to get up in here and say that no islands in the West Indies have objected to Barbados going into Independence alone. They could not be so presumptuous or crazy. And as to the argument that none of the other islands has seen the light of any pro-federationists is also nonsense.

During the last weekend Mr. Joshua talked to the Premier and another barrister and said that he was in favour of Federation but he would do nothing to embarrass the Barbados Government. That is what Mr. Joshua said. Mr. Southwell in St. Kitts has told the people of St. Kitts that he would do anything tomorrow to see Federation come about. Mr. Compton in St. Lucia told me this: "As you know, we have just been presented with these new constitutional proposals." He hinted what they envisaged and said "Where can St. Lucia go from here? We are in a cul-de-sac." He said to me "I am thinking in terms of expanding my livestock production. I can supply the West Indian area with peas." We import over $1 million in peas. He said: "We must have a guaranteed market so that when we produce these peas and can them we will not only have the market of St. Lucia to sell them to. What am I going to do with my top-ranking Civil Servants if we have Independence? We have been sending our Policemen and Civil Servants all over the islands from time immemorial. Do you think we can absorb all the people in this little island? We want a Federal service where Dominicans, Montserratians and Kittitians can be promoted."

I will demonstrate to you that every single member of the Government knows that, and the failure to continue in the Federation is because of the failure of one man to realise his personal ambition. Not one single argument has been advanced, or could ever be advanced, in this island in this century to prove incontestably that Barbados is not better off in a Federation, which I contend that the people of the other islands would support under proper conditions and leadership. As a matter of fact, Mr. Compton was living as a Minister there with full powers to decide whatever is proper to be decided.

9.05 p.m.

No Government in the West Indies, I repeat, is going to embarrass another Government, and I wil ltell you why. Mr. Bradshaw told us here about two years ago that when he was in the Federal Government associated with Sir Grantley Adams in the Labour Party, he came to Barbados and took part in a campaign on behalf of the Barbados Labour Party. When the Barbados Labour Party lost the Government the Democratic Labour Party came in, his Party was still in office in St. Kitts and there was a certain amount of embarrassment in relationship, he felt, between himself and the Government Party here which had been in Opposition, because he had appeared on the platform here of the Barbados Labour Party. That was a lesson to him, and since then there was a shying away from any participation in the domestic problems in any of the individual territories on this basis. So long as this Government is in office, or Mr. Compton in St. Lucia or Mr. Le Blanc in Dominica, you will never find one of the other insular Governments taking any steps to embarrass them. This is perhaps ethical and the manner in which Governments should conduct themselves; so that the failure up to now of St. Kitts, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Dominica or any of these places to show some kind of interest in Independence within a Federation as proposed by the Opposition in Barbados is not because they are not interested, but this is what they feel: "We would be stupid to go on record or to place ourselves on record as approaching the Barbados Government saying we want to federate with them when they have told us point blank that we are a bunch of nitwits, we do not know how to run our countries, we are not fit to be associated with, and they are going independent alone."

The Hon. Premier got here on Tuesday and read recent correspondence between himself and Mr. Compton in St. Lucia. The innuendos of insult, the undertones of sarcasm, the hardly hidden attempt to snarl at one another the slightly veiled effort to nearly claw one another's throats appeared in the correspondence read here by the Premier. Does anybody in this island or in this House in his right mind expect that when up to November there was this sort of correspondence going on between Mr. Compton and the Premier that Compton will get in St. Lucia and say he wants to federate with him? Is he a lunatic? He would be completely lacking in self-respect . You could not expect any leader with self-respect so to demean himself in the face of the sort of correspondence going on between the Government of Barbados and himself.....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, again the hon. member is varying the facts. The correspondence between the Chief Minister of St. Lucia and the Premier of Barbados in November originated from a request by the Chief Minister of St. Lucia to the Premier of Barbados to change the text of the Resolution which is now before this House. The Resolution was already laid before the House and had to be adopted in this form, and the request of the Chief Minister to change the text of it to suit his own purpose could not be entertained.

Mr. CRAWFORD: How could that be a point of order? In response to what I said, what the hon. member said means absolutely nothing. I never said how the correspondence originated. I referred to the manner in which the correspondence was being conducted. And to what did Mr. Compton object? Mr. Compton objected to a statement in the Resolution placing blame on St. Lucia for the failure to continue the Federal negotiations. That is what it amounted to. In the Resolution here before the House, the Barbados Government attributed to the St. Lucia Government culpability for the attitude at the Regional Council of Minist ers to which the St. Lucia Government pleaded not guilty, and the St. Lucia Minister said .....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, again the hon. member has got the facts wrong. If the hon. member looks at the preamble of the Resolution, he will see that one of the reasons which is set down there for the change of attitude or the part of the Barbados Government is the rejection by the Legislative Council of the Draft Federal Scheme. This is a matter of fact. Mr. Compton objected to our saying that and wanted us to change it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Have I said anything different? I said that the St. Lucia Government objected to being charged with culpability for the attitude, which they pleaded not guilty to. That is all it amounts to. The Premier said that he based his allegation on newspaper reports, and that he wanted to see the St. Lucia Hansard to see if the newspaper reports might be correct since the St. Lucia Government had never denied the newspaper reports. He also said that up to now he has not got the St. Lucia Hansard. What does all this amount to? All this amounts to is that we are blaming the St. Lucia Government for what he saw in a newspaper; the St. Lucia Government say they are not guilty; the Premier says to send the Hansard, and whether it is right or not, it has not been sent yet. But what I am talking about is the tone of the correspondence.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the undertones of sarcasm reminds me of the criticisms hurled by Joe Louis and Schmelling at one another before they entered the ring in Madison Square Garden in 1938. They hurled so many insults at one another that hardly before I sat in my seat the fight was over, less than two minutes. Louis floored Schmelling in the first round. It is obvious, Sir, that from the tone of the correspondence between these two gentlemen that there is no love lost, and I say that to emphasise the fact that it is silly in these circumstances to expect the St. Lucia Government to make an approach to the same Government to say: "Let brotherly love continue and let us continue the association we had begun". And of course, this is not the only reason. It is much more in it than that. The nonsense which I have heard on the platform and which I have heard repeated in here is that no Government in the islands have objected to our going independent, or no West Indian territory has said that it wants Federation. You cannot expect that under the circumstances. What I can say is this: privately they have given assurances to Barbadian politicians and representatives of the people that they are willing to continue Federal negotiations at any time it appears that the elected Government of Barbados is willing so to do.

9.15 p.m.

They go further. They say this, "We were conducting negotiations with you. We believe that this is the only solution for the territories: that is, to come together. There is now this attempt to leave us and if you leave us, we will take reprisals."

I said earlier that we exported over $700,000 to the Leewards and the Windwards. If you go to St. Lucia now, you will find, Sir, that there is the trend of not importing things from Barbados which they can get from Trinidad. I was told that people in St. Lucia are turning away from Barbados' goods because of the attitude Barbados has taken towards St. Lucia. Do not let anybody fool you. That is quite true. As regards Trinidad, she has one million people and she can afford to be independent and still maintain a reasonable standard of industrialisation in that country. But I emphasize, and history will prove that I am right, that Barbados with 250,000 people can neither afford to enter into Independence alone nor can it afford to spurn the other West Indian territories. I am not afraid to state it, if I state it alone.

In 1946 a friend of mine who was on the Council of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People invited me to spend a week with him in Tennessee. I accepted the invitation and during the time he took me to see an agricultural station in Tennessee. What I saw was perhaps one of the few institutions outside Russia where they were practising artificial insemination: so when I came back into this House of Assembly, during a debate I got up and referred to the experiment in artificial insemination and reported to a Government Head that he could get the information from the agricultural industry about what they were doing. The whole House laughed and one member said: "Give the bulls a chance." Today, artificial insemination is the most common thing in Barbados.

Every single member in this Hon. Chamber, if he does not agree with me now, if he lives long enough, at least in the very near future, will agree that the stand which I have taken is in the best interests of this country. Mr. Speaker, do you think that this small island, bigger, it is true, than many islands or countries which are already independent, can have a better standard of living by Independence within a single territory by ourselves or as the leading island in a West Indian nation? If we entered a Federation with the other islands, we would have the Federal Capital here. That was agreed on. We would have the Federal Civil Servants here. I think there were to be seventeen Permanent Secretaries and you would have to find housing for them. You would have United Nations representatives here; international agencies would be centred here. All national conferences would be held here. Our taxi drivers and stores would get more business. All the housing of the Civil Servants, for international agencies, and so on, would have been centred here and Barbados would have some respect in the comity of nations and would not be an isolated territory with its own flag.

It has been over a quarter of a century that I have been talking on the floor of the House and writing in the columns of the newspapers on West Indian nationhood; but in the place of our unity with other West Indian islands, I could not in my right mind get on the floor of this Assembly or in any public place and fool the people of this country that 'going it alone' is the beginning of the existence of forming West Indian nations without any sacrifice to the people of this territory.

The Hon. Premier said that Independence would cost $1.66 million. He also said that our overseas representation if we are not independent would cost $217,000 or something like that. In other words, there was a differential of $1.4 million between the Federation cost and what it will cost the island now for overseas representation. Can anybody in their right senses believe this figure can be accurate? That could not be accurate. What is the ulterior motive for saying that? Unless you have representation in United Nations and in certain countries you are doing nothing. The initial cost of joining United Nations is $680,000 (Barbadian).

9.25 p.m.

If we are going into Federation or Independence alone and we are not going to join the United Nations, we are wasting time. We have to join the International Bank for development. Joining these agencies would cost us $900,000 annually and the recurrent costs would be the same, and we would have to have buildings for housing these embassies. The Report in which the Financial Secretary.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The Hon. Premier was speaking of Independence without Federation and of recurrent expenditure, and not capital expenditure as the hon. member was saying.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Have you heard anything more childish, Sir? I have not said anything about the Premier not including capital cost or excluding it. I said that the Premier said that the cost of overseas representation was $217,000. What I am saying is that, in addition to that, we must spend at least another $900,000 on such inescapable things as International Organisations.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. The $900,000 which the hon. member is assuming that we would have to spend, would not be recurrent expenditure.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The initial cost of joining the United Nations is $680,000 in West Indian currency, and the annual recurrent cost is almost the same thing. We have to contribute to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank, and these are the basic internationals which the smallest fledgeling solvent territory joins. I know it has been recommended that a country should own the building which its legation is situated, in the same way that we had a decent building in London for the Eastern Caribbean Legation, and one in New York and one in Toronto for our Development and Tourist Boards. The recommendation has always been that we should own these buildings, and if we own them, that will cost another half a million dollars. I have mentioned these figures in order to show that the cost of Independence alone for Barbados is not $217,000, and that the differential between what it would cost us to go Independent alone, and what it would cost us to be a West Indian Sovereign nation, is not what it was made out to be on Tuesday. The Federation would cost us $600,000 and it might cost us less because they have found that instead of 35% of the revenue projected, we only need 20% because there is a surplus of $800,000 over and above what the Federation had been projecting to be the cost.

I am submitting that Independence alone will cost us almost the same thing without the benefits which I have enumerated before - having the capital here, the Civil Servants here and that sort of thing. Small as we are, we are looked up to as the centre of a hub around which this little West Indian nation revolves. I submit, Sir, that pride in nationhood is a fundamental feeling. There is no Barbadian who would not want to think that he belongs to a sovereign nation; but if we can belong to a big entity without sacrifice of any importance, there is no reason why we should not take this opportunity. More than one speaker in here has got up and said that the pro-Federationists want us to take the money of Barbados and spend it on others. A lot of argument is being made about the fact that Mr. Compton came here and said that the surplus funds collected from the Treasury will not be returned on an derivative basis, implying that any surplus funds collected over and above the expenditure should not be given according to the contribution but according to the needs of the territory. Mr. Compton did not seriously expect that we were going to do this at all, but this argument *(ASIDES.)* .....

I am explaining the basis of the argument. You have a Federation with Customs Union. One or two major territories enjoy all the advantages of the Federation. Jamaica and Trinidad employed people in their industries and they collected income tax. Then they shipped the goods which they manufactured to other territories and you are really exchanging the imperialism of Great Britain for that of Jamaica and Trinidad. The argument was that you are having all the industries and we are buying your manufactured goods at higher prices; therefore, some of the extra money which you get you will give to us. I will tell you more. The

Premier has agreed with this, I am going to show you where it is not necessary to spend one single cent of Barbados money on any territory outside of Barbados.
9.35 p.m.

I will say Mr. Speaker, that the old Federation had it. Canada does it; they have a federal system of income tax, and a federal system of social security and everybody benefits; but in turn the Canadian Government gives special subsidies every year to poor territories like Saskatchewan and others. Australia does it. The Australian Federal Government every year gives special subsidies to territories like Western Tasmania - because they are under - developed and other parts of the country, and they render economically viable the industries in the other parts of the country. The manufacturing centres of Canada are now East Toronto, Ontario and Quebec in the West, and the prairie lands produce wheat and that kind of thing, and they get these special subsidies.

In the pro-Federation days the Premier agreed with me that there was some contention in my argument in this respect, because if you are going to have, as we can have in this country, at least 150 industries flourishing or employing Barbadians, you do not want to tell me that the people providing the markets for these industries should not to some extent participate in the profits. When I began talking to him about Compton on this thing, I said that Compton is not altogether wrong, but what we need is development of the small islands, and then he said that we give the Tourist Board over $600,000 a year to spend on promoting tourism, and there would be nothing in giving one per cent of our revenue to the country because we have the industries, and in those days one per cent would have been like something like $300,000 a year.

This is, however, not necessary, Mr. Speaker. The formula for the continuation of grant -in-aid by the British Government to these territories is that over three three-year periods grant-in-aid should progressively be decreased and discontinued, and this is predicated by the Development Programme on which it is hoped this tripartite Commission, comprised of people from Great Britain, Canada and the United States, which is coming down here to start work in January to investigate conditions and make investigation for the economic development, will so lay the foundation for developing the islands that grant-in-aid will no longer be necessary after nine years. This is the idea behind it all. It is true the British Government has not come out openly and said what amount of aid it will give to these territories if and when we are federated and independent; but the British Government's argument is this: Miss O'Loughlin recommended a fantastic sum which was beyond the conception and practicability of the British Government. They did not want to establish a precedent anyhow, because they have a lot of countries to become independent, and if they give to a group in the West Indies this money, all the rest would want a lot too; so they have been trying for a long time to get the Canadian Government and the American Government to demonstrate some practical interest in the territories in the area so as to assist them in developing the territories to a reasonably normal standard.

At long last they have now succeeded, and you will have read the Report, Mr. Speaker, that a team comprised of British, Canadian and American representatives will make a tour of Barbados and the Leewards and Windwards beginning this month to investigate the economic needs and make recommendations, so that we can expect in addition to the continuation of the grants-in-aid from the Imperial Treasury for nine years, these development funds for putting the economy of all the territories on a viable basis so as to render unnecessary the continuance of grants-in-aid after nine years. As a matter of fact, I go further; they say that if these development funds are being expended over three years, you can decrease the amount in each year until the ninth year you need no further grant-in-aid.

Now let us examine all the premises. We have demolished these non-sensical arguments about taking up Barbados' revenue and spending it on the islands. It does not suit intelligent people to get up anywhere in this island, and because they think they know a little more than the man in the street to tell him that if you go into federation you may not get a school in the Pine, finish the East Coast Road or finish the school in St. Leonard's Gap. This is not fair. If somebody in St. Lucia said that we must take up Barbados' revenue and spend on St. Lucia, he wants his head examined, and if somebody in Barbados says that we are to take up Barbados' money and spend it on St. Lucia and Montserrat, you have to examine his head. Nobody would say that instead of having a school in St. Joseph or a Maternity Centre in St. Lucy, you should put one in Castries or Soufriere. It is a confounded misrepresentation of the facts to fool the people in this island with that kind of talk. We get grants-in-aid too; we are not this big brother we want to make out. We got funds for the Hospital; we get Welfare Funds.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is a misrepresentation of the financial system and situation of this island to say that the Government of Barbados receives grants-in-aid. It is not true.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I repeated it, sir, in this context. I said they get funds from Colonial Development and Welfare. These are gifts. I mentioned that for the reason that people here are prone to believe that we are some wealthy aristocratic country that can get along without help from outside. We have been drawing Welfare grants in this island for the last twenty years, and a lot of our progress has been based on money from the British Government as a free gift, not to balance our budget. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Is that what grant-in-aid is?) The hon. member knows full well that I do not mean we want money to balance our budget.
9.45 p.m.

In the heat of argument sometimes, there can be what is known as a slip of the tongue. *(Laughter)* Why do some hon. members laugh like idiots? The hon. junior member for St. Lucy can tell them that not only in speaking but in writing, there can be a slip of the pen - *lapsus linguae*. If they do not know, ask the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.

Sir, everybody knows that we do not mean only subventions. We are recipients every year of funds from the British Treasury for assistance in our Development Programme and, as I said, we got $5 million from the Imperial Treasury towards the Hospital. The grants-in-aid which they get for the Leewards and Windwards will be continued for nine years. (A VOICE: That is not true.)

The hon. member says that is not true. I should know and the documentation is there. All he has to do is to go and ask somebody in the Ministry of Finance. By the end of nine years all these colonies should no longer be in need of grants-in-aid. Until they reach that stage, Sir, the British Government will continue to supply the grants-in-aid.

Well now, Sir, what I am trying to do is to put an end to this confusion because they are trying to make out a case when they do not have one. I am saying, Sir that it is only petty, confused, malicious actions they are getting on with when they talk about people. The hon. member said that for four months the people have been fouling the night air with obnoxious statements. They were to say nothing. The people in this country will reach a further stage of development . As I said earlier, there are some people outside there who expect, or have been promised, a reward because, after all, there are a lot of people in this country who clearly understand that Independence cannot give them a job. I do not mind that there are some people over there who are jeering. Some people over there have finished their day's work and they have come to be enlightened by the debate in here and you should welcome them. There are also some people who are unemployed and they are glad to get some dollars to keep a lot of noise. That does not matter to me at all. Then, there are some decent-minded people who are leaving their beds to come here and they are remaining there because it is the people's education to

find out what their representatives are doing. Some are giving applause; some are making a racket; neither; one matters me. I have been accustomed to both. I am reminded of a story told by the late Sir Winston Churchill who was to receive the freedom of a city after the last world war. There was a tremendous crowd on hand to welcome him and a friend said to him: "Sir Winston, you must be feeling very proud at this enormous crowd gathered here today to do you homage." Sir Winston replied: "In actual fact, if I were to be hanged, it would be three times as strong." Therefore, Sir, the fact that there are a couple of dozens of people who are allowing their economic position to be taken out of their hands does not matter me. When you get to the question of mercenaries, we can see who is the biggest employee of mercenaries. I have seen in my own constituency mercenaries at work.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is entirely irrelevant to the debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is irrelevant in the sense that you have not heard all. I have not stopped at saying that mercenaries are at work in my parish. I am going to give an instance of how they are employed. They have accused me of hiring mercenaries. As a matter of fact, some of the people on the other side were mercenaries to people on this side and they were mercenaries hired to foul the night air. The employment of mercenaries began with the Government. (A VOICE: That is not true.)

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas started that first.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not permit that in this debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Anyhow, Sir, so far, I am not concerned with who employ mercenaries, but I object to the term in which it was employed here on Tuesday. Imagine, Sir, they said that somebody wanted to assassinate them!

Mr. SPEAKER: That also is entirely irrelevant to the debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We were called assassins.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: The Hon. Premier is not present, and therefore I cannot sit and hear any implication raised against him without rising. Reference was made by the Hon. Premier of possible physical violence to a Minister of the Government two years ago. Mr. Speaker, the hon. senior member for St. Philip said when the windfall crisis took place that four masked men had broken into his house and he had reason to tell this House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Now, there again, that is a pure figment of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy.
9.55 p.m.

Making the four continuous meetings in here is doing something to him, and I think that we should give the Premier a rest. I have never in my life said that four masked men broke into my house; therefore if anybody says so, he is lying. The Police gave a report to the newspapers that some masked men had gone to my house during the windfall issue, but anybody who says that I said so is lying. I was not at home. The Police at Oistins received a report from my servants and they went to my mother's house. The two servants gave the Police the report and it was published in the newspapers.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. As you know, Sir, I am not given to intemperate speech. The first and only time that the members of this Cabinet heard of that was from the hon. member himself.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This is really a joke. The day on which this thing happened..... *(Noise in the gallery.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: The proper authorities should take steps to ensure that we are able to discharge our duties in here without undue interrruption.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am accustomed both to jeers and applause; none of that worries me. On a Thursday when the Cabinet was meeting, I was called away by the Police. I was given the report by the Police. I was not there. I came back to the meeting, and the most natural thing for me to do was to tell the members of the Cabinet what I was told by the Police; but for the hon. member to get up in here and say that I was the person.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I can corroborate what the Hon. Minister of Education has said. Added to that, an armed policeman was guarding the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, even although the Police represent law and order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the Police were guarding the hon. senior member for St. Peter day and night, and they were guarding the Premier day and night, it is idiotic foolishness to say what they are saying. I was told: "We have a policeman guarding the Premier, we have one guarding the senior member for St. Peter and we will give you one too."

Mr. SPEAKER: It obvious that the Police did an excellent job because all three of those hon. members are all very much alive.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I slept beautifully all night, too.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to sleep now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That merely serves to show the vanity of human hopes. The statement about masked men being in my house was made by my servants to the Police; the Police reported it to me and I repeated what the Police told me.

I wa.. trying to establish the fact that it a complete distortion to follow the idea of the obnoxious statement which has been going around by the Government Party to the effect that Federation means taking up revenue from Barbados and spending it on the other islands. I want to emphasize that with every ounce of vigour I command, because it is not fair to fool the people of this island to make that kind of contention.
10.05 p.m.

This is not expected from intelligent people, only from people determined to misguide and fool the community, commit the most outrageous actions in the community and lend themselves to this kind of behaviour. Who in the world could expect that from the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the hon. junior member for St. James or myself, or Senator Ward, a man with integrity who did everything important they had to do? They put him to work on the Draft Federal Scheme for the Federation; they put him to draft the Constitution for the Federation and he did it. Do you imagine a man of his intelligence and of our natural interest in the people of this country being so dumb and so idiotic as to get up in this country and propose a state of affairs in which the taxes of the working people of this country would go as of right to building schools or roads in Dominica or Montserrat when we need them here?

Obviously, Sir, any fool would tell you that no Barbadian in his right mind would expect to under-write the neglect of centuries of imperialism by Great Britain. What we have to do is to come together. We have to formulate our Development Plans for the area. As a matter of fact, most of the territories already have certain plans. I know St. Lucia has, and St. Kitts has some. All these islands could be developed; they have a great deal of potential, and the time will come, Sir, when these islands will have more to offer Barbados than we have to offer them in terms of economic assistance. Somebody got in here not long ago talking about the impenetrable hinterlands of British Guiana, because to get to the fertile regions of British

Guiana is a journey that few Barbadians will want to undertake travelling by canoe and by boat. Where the Evans Commission recommended to settle people in British Guiana up in the cattle area or wherever it was, because it was a land so fertile like Kenya, could not be compared in accessibility with the 30,000 acres of land lying fallow in Dominica which they hope to reach.

When Mr. Grant, Director of Highways and Transport was in Dominica in 1955, he gave me the job of travelling the new highway they were opening up. That highway made 30,000 acres of land available for agriculture which was not available before. It only had to be cleared, but the potential was there. Have you ever seen them cutting canes in British Guiana? Before they cut canes, they have to burn them; and they cut them in water up to their waists, and they transport them to the factory by barges.

We import now every year $1/2 million in citrus juice from Trinidad when Dominica can supply every drop. The point, Sir, is that with a proper Development Programme arranged with the West Indian leaders for these islands, the St. Lucians and Dominicans would not have to come to Barbados to look for work, because they would find it in their own lands. You hear all this talk about St. Lucians coming here and adding to the crime rate and all that kind of thing. We are not doing any more than Trinidad did in the early days of the Federation. Barbadians went to Trinidad in large numbers too; some are still there, and in reference to the fact .....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On apoint of elucidation, I mentioned that St. Lucians come here and find work and put Barbadians out of work, and they have often stopped Barbadians from being employed at the San Remo Hotel, because the person who runs the San Remo Hotel is a St. Lucian!

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member elucidating as raised by the hon. member for St. Andrew in the reported speech?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is an absolute waste of time replying to that. I will not worry to waste time with him. What I am going to do is to tell him what the Premier said about St. Lucians in here. When the Premier was pro-Federationist , he welcomed them. This is what he said:

"Right now, we are importing St. Lucians to help us to get crops out of the ground".

This is the Official Report of the House of Assembly on Tuesday, 12t h February, 1963, and is found on page 19. This is the Premier:

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

Apparently a lot of people over there who have been sitting in the Government never heard this.

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

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we had this influx of St. Lucians after.

10. 15 p.m.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while one of the hon. members over there is concerned with the St. Lucians and deploring their presence here, the Hon. Premier himself is issuing a clarion call for them to come in and he will build private houses for them. If you called them and they came, you have to accept them here. I am quoting from the "Official Gazette" from what he said. He said that the Police Chief has proposed that some of them should be deported. If they are criminals, deport them. They are not the only persons whom the police suggested that you should deport. We issued an Order against an international agent and he was deported. I myself have made complaints about an international agent and he was defended and he was not deported. If you are going to have international Communists walking free in the island, I suppose you can have St. Lucian and Domonican workers. If they are criminals, I say, deport them.

I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are not many places in the world in which you will find Barbadians working, and if we want reprisals, let us start sending out people from here. In St. Lucia we have a Barbadian judge. Mr. L. Williams is a magistrate in one of the islands. You have Barbadians who are members of the Police; you have Barbadians who are members of the Civil Service and all kinds of people down there. I am not saying that we can indiscriminately bring into this country people from anywhere. We have too much unemployment. I never called St. Lucians; the Premier called them.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Premier made some reference to the break-up of some of the newly created Federations. He talked about the break-up of the Central African Federation. He talked about the tenuous hold of the Malayan Federation and the subsequent departure from that Federation of Singapore. Definitely, the Hon. Premier is not keeping up-to-date with these matters. I want to tell you what has happened to Singapore since her departure from the Malaysian Federation. I am quoting from the "Time". This is what it had to say:-

"The tiny island of Singapore, strategically midway between India and China, has long been a commercial center of Southeast Asia. It processes and exports rubber, tin, pepper and copra from Malaya and Borneo, imports machinery from Australia, Britain and the U.S. Its trade has made it a leading banking, warehousing and insurance city in Asia. When Singapore joined with neighbouring Malaya, nearby Sarawak and North Borneo in 1963 to form the rich Federation of Malaysia, its 1.8 million people prepared expectantly for a boom in business.

The boom began all right - but it went bust after Singapore's expulsion from the federation last August as a result of racial and political conflicts. Instead of a boom, Singapore now faces such critical problems as widespread unemployment (13.5%), dwindling trade (down 20%), and tense relations with Malaya, on which Singapore depends for, among other things, its water supply and its raw materials. Singapore's leaders are trying to keep their nation's economy afloat by a massive switch from trade to manufacturing, are urging industrial countries to set up plants in Singapore and buy its products. If the switch fails, says Defense Minister Goh Keng Swee, "It's a certain deduction that the Communists will eventually win power by free elections" - a statement that is clearly made to elicit help and sympathy from the U.S."

This is the position of Singapore; I need not read any more. It is all well and good to present one side of the picture and leave the other side unstated. This is the course of argument of this debate. People come in here and make all kinds of wild statements - even more than what was made on Tuesday - and it is no wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people in this island are confused and do not know their minds.

All sorts of external issues have been engendered in this issue. I was surprised to hear the Hon. Premier when he got up in here last Tuesday and passed the remark that Mr. Keith Walcott was walking around and asking the people not to vote for Independence. In so far as Mr. Walcott is concerned, - and I am not defending myself - I doubt that I have spoken twice to him in the twelve years that he was in here, I do not think there is a man who had greater conflict with him than I had. I do not know for what reason the hon. member wants to drag him out of his bed. As far as I understand, Mr. Walcott cannot see now. That is a matter which we all deplore, but what is the point of dragging him into this debate? Why say that he said not to vote for Independence and then to add that they do not want Independence because they want to keep the black people as slaves?
10.25 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier knew when he said that that Mr. Keith Walcott had voted for the Democratic Labour Party in the last Election. He has been heard to say that Mr. Keith Walcott voted for the hon. junior member for St. Michael. All of these things are just calculated to deceive the people and make them decide that there is some machiavellian conspiracy among the people on this side of the Table to destroy people and that sort of thing. When Mr. Ward and I gave the Premier advice on the windfall issue, he did not take it. He went to Mr. Keith Walcott's house and discussed the matter, and what did he do? I have no brief for any white man in this country or anywhere else. I fought Mr. Keith Walcott in here. The Attorney General will tell you that many were the days when I asked Mr. Vaughan to get up and assist me to refute what Mr. Keith Walcott was saying or to vote against him because it was not in the best interest of the man in the street.

When the Premier left Mr. Keith Walcott, he said: "Never again will I stick out my neck for Frank Walcott." He knows that Mr. Keith Walcott voted for the Party. When I heard that, I laughed. Mr. Keith Walcott is part and parcel of the people whom the Democratic Labour Party has removed from power, but it suits them in this ungodly exercise to drag his name in a debate like this so as to make people believe that there is some Guy Fawkes plot to assassinate them. I would like them to live and see the evil of their days. I said that if the Premier ever gets poisoned it would not be by a man. When he talks this nonsense about anybody hurting a hair of the head of any one of his Ministers there would be a blood bath, who would hurt the hon. junior member for St. Michael? What we are prepared not to do is to allow the Premier to fool the people of this island all the time. I do not know nor I do not care whether Mr. Keith Walcott is for Independence or not; I do not know nor I do not care if he is for Federation or not. Apparently, he could not be against coloured people if he voted for the hon. junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was distinctly annoyed when I heard the hon. Premier get up in here on Tuesday and drag Mr. Keith Walcott's name in the debate completely unnecessarily and tried to insinuate that somebody would do something to bring him back into power. If he is his confidant and more than his confidant, he is not a man. I am not going to have it said anywhere in this island --- this sort of malicious propaganda which is designed entirely to bewitch the electorate will never work so long as the people are alive and speak with the courage of their convictions. There are many people who, for temporary advantage, are prepared to sell their birthright. Judas Iscariot betrayed our Saviuor for twenty pieces of silver. If you have a spy system working when you are in office, that is a matter for you. It does not trouble me, but don't cover up your wrong doings to malign other people.

The Premier said that we were fouling the atmosphere. Since 1963 Mr. Ward at a public meeting in Brittons Hill said that he was in favour of an Independent Federation for the West Indies. As a matter of fact, he and Sir Grantley Adams have had a public controversy over this question because Sir Grantley Adams and his Party favoured Federation but not with Independence at the beginning. There was a public difference between Senator Ward and Sir Grantley Adams over this matter of Independence immediately and federation a year after. Mr. Ward contended for an Independent Federation from the beginning. He came back at a public meeting in Fairchild Street and repeated his stand for Federation. I spoke at Passage Road corner and at Queen's Park on this matter: I also spoke in front of the premises of the Barbados Workers' Union, and the hon. senior member for St. Peter heard me say that in my considered opinion, if we want our entrepot trade and to expand our industry and get a guaranteed Customs Union in respect of the manufactured goods we need and what not, the best thing to do would be to have a Federation and immediately develop the islands, so that Barbados would not be called upon to support them at all.
10.35 p.m.

This has not been going on for three or four months, but for years. For what reason would you expect me to change this overnight? Because I am not to have the courage of my convictions; because a few people get around the street and pass a few remarks which they are paid to pass; or because a few paid hecklers get around at meetings and say "I want independence; if you do not want Independence, pack up and leave town"? I do not have any place to go; I was born here.

In January last year, I heard the Premier first with that. He was talking about Independence for Barbados and saying we should have this Independence, and I said casually that he would not get this unless there is complete unanimity between all the major political parties in the island. He asked where I got that from, and I said that it is common knowledge. I pointed out that when Mr. MacMillan the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, came here, the Democratic Labour Party met and discussed with Mr. McMillan the reform of the Legislative Council, and Mr. McMillan said that this depends on whether all the Parties agreed.

When we sent Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Jacobs to London to discuss the constitutional change to provide for the appointment of a Director of Public Prosecutions and to make the Attorney General a political appointment, the Leader of the Colonial Office with whom they consulted were at pains in the interview to point out that these changes would only be practicable on the basis of complete unanimity on the part of the political parties in this island. I said therefore that he would have to get all the parties to agree. Do you know what he said to me? He said "You go and join Grantley Adams and oppose me on Independence, and I will run you both out of the island". He told me so and I said "We will see who will run whom!" I am not tonight interested in what is popular or what might appear to be popular; I am interested in what I think is the best thing for this island. I am interested in creating for Barbados and the West Indies the best possible image.

The people who leave here and go abroad to represent Barbados on international organisations and what not are people who believe in the future. Which do you think would have more prestige? To go to represent Barbados alone, or to go as the accredited representative of this archipelago, of this West Indian Nation? How do you think the West Indians in New York would feel? Do you mean to tell me that you would eventually have St. Lucia with a United Nations representative; Dominica and Antigua independent with United Nations representation and Montserrat with United Nations representation? How stupid can we get? Does it make sense to anybody?

Right now in the International Organisations of Federal Organisations, one man represents several islands. As a matter of fact, in some of these International Organisations a Barbadian or a Trinidadian represents the whole area, even independent territories, and I am quite prepared, Sir, to say that Barbados should bury the hatchet, forget all these clashes of personality, and see if we can have an approach, and if they are willing to have an approach again, to assist one another in our own development by

mutual cooperation, and to go on together as one combined West Indian nation. This is the way we started off.

When in 1962 Trinidad withdrew from the Federation, I will admit that the Premier was not then so keen on Federation. I discussed it with him several times, and he told me we had only taken over the Government a few weeks ago, we had to get into the saddle, and we had to get more accustomed to the operation of conducting the Government and a better assessment of the Colony before we took on anything more. I tried to point out to him then the advantage of a Closer Union purely on economic grounds, but I am saying this behind his back because he likes to absent himself. At 2 o'clock in my room one morning in the presence of Sir Arthur Lewis and Mr. Pinard who was Cabinet Secretary, he was told "Look here, Errol; we cannot afford to let this thing break up because Trinidad and Jamaica have gone out; come in with us; we are willing to work with Barbados; let Barbados take the lead. We will see to it that you are the first Federal Prime Minister, because in our own opinion the future of these islands depends on unity." He accepted the offer and from the very next day when Mr. Maudling came and we met him, he worked tooth and nail ....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, do we understand the hon. member to have said that he and others offered to the Premier the post of being first Federal Prime Minister and the Hon. Premier accepted it? I think this is at variance with the facts.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am nothing to do with what he thinks, and I never said I offered him anything either. I said that in the presence of Mr. Arthur Lewis and Mr. Pinard in my room at 2 o'clock, he was offered the post of Federal Prime Minister if he would decide to carry on the Federation.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, again this is a variance with the facts, because it was very early in January that this Government along with other Governments of the Eastern Caribbean decided they would have nothing to do with resuscitation of the old Federation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He does not understand what I am saying. We are not talking the same thing at all. He is talking about the old Federation, and I am talking about the projected one. Jamaica had gone out, and Trinidad had served notice of its intention to come out, and what we were talking about then was the formation of a new Federation of Barbados and the Leewards and Windwards: and this is what he was offered to lead. He could not be offered to lead something that was dead. In other words, he was offered to lead the new Federation if it were formed, and he accepted the offer and worked with might and main; and if you read his speeches in here and study what he did to achieve the realisation of this projected Federation, you will see that he was most anxious and ambitious about it. None of the facts which they have submitted now as a basis for refusal to associate has in any way changed from what existed before when they were in favour of it.
10.45 p.m.

It was only, Mr. Deputy Speaker, after he attended the Chief Ministers' Conference and realised that they would no longer accept him as Leader, that he decided that he would break off the Federal exercises.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Again I must challenge the hon. member that what he is saying is not consonance with the facts. The hon. member said that the reason why the Hon. Premier has discontinued the Federal exercises is because he is not now accepted as the Leader. At the time of the London Conference, there were seven Chief Ministers. Since then, after these meetings, it has whittled itself down to five or four. Surely the hon. member must know that. I have a speech where the Premier said that he would go into a Federation with one. What is the hon. member saying?

Hon. C. F. TAIMA: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The hon. member himself is an experienced parliamentarian. He knows that Barbados could only get five seats, and he himself said at the time that Barbados would be subjected to the entire region and that we would be swamped and we would have one Premier and then never again. He said that he was not in favour of Federation on that basis.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We had several discussions on Federation, and the apprehension was that we had the minority of seats. My answer to the Premier was, "Do not worry with that." I told him that there would be a Federal Party; so the distribution of power would not rest on an insular basis; it would rest with the Federal Party. It was then that the hon. senior member for Christ Church said that he should now begin discussions about forming a Federal Party. In other words, it was not a question of our having the minority of seats and the others could vote against us; it was a question of the power of the Federal Party.

I did raise that question, and that was the answer given by me to the Hon. Premier himself. The hon. member should remember a lot of things beside that. He should remember how they were opposed to what was happening in the office of the High Commissioner in London and Mr. Taylor.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that he was opposed to the discussion. It was through the hon. member's recommendation that his Ministry sent up a Paper to the Cabinet which resulted in the break-down of the Commission in Great Britain.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that he was very apprehensive of Federation and the only thing he was apprehensive over was the offer of Prime Ministership. He was very apprehensive of Federation. He said that the Premier was opposed to the Federation because Barbados was having only five seats and we would have only one Prime Minister. I remember that conversation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I remember every word. That is exactly what he did say. I told him what I said just now. I told him that Barbados would get the first Prime Minister. In other words, the contention of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy was that the Hon. Premier had not been offered the Prime Ministership. That is clear. The Premier had been promised the Prime Ministership and he thought that he was getting that. I told him what was told to me and said that I was a bit concerned over this Federation crisis, but then as I said just now, it was the Premier .....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am in the middle of a sentence.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member gave the reason for his supporting the Federation. The great reason was that he thought he was getting the Premiership and that is why he was pressing this.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The facts are these, I repeat. When the hon. senior member for St. Peter recalled what I told him, that supports my statement. The second thing is that the Hon. Premier himself talked to me about this voting along Party lines and my answer was that there should be no apprehension about insular representation. In so far as my ministry being responsible for the removal of Mr. Taylor, I am inclined to remember what some people say: "A little learning is a very dangerous thing."

Now, let me remind the hon. member that if my argument had been followed, there would have been no separation between the Barbados Migrants Service and the West Indian Migrants Service. I was opposed to it on these grounds. During the time of the old Federation, even when Jamaica and Trinidad were in the Federation, the Barbados Government had resisted completely all the pressure of a marriage of the Barbados Migrants' Service with the West Inidan Migrants' Service. When I discussed it with the Minister of Labour, he had the same opinion as I had.
10.55 p.m.

He does not know what went on. He has just come through the door. In the old Federation, it was not merged at all; the hon. member wanted to merge it. I argued for hours against it; I never supported it. I would say more; they were swayed by vilification and abuse of the man-in-charge.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It is absolutely untrue to say that the Government was swayed by arguments of vilification and abuse. The point is that whatever decision was made, and after that decision was reversed recently, in each case the hon. member was very deeply involved, and the Government reached its conclusions on the facts before them objectively and without any attempt to vilify or abuse anybody on the facts presented by his Ministry.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is a deliberate misstatement to say that I was responsible for removing the migrant section from the West Indian Service Commission without saying that I was always basically opposed to the merging of them. I continued to oppose it and I did not rest until I had them dissociated. When he merely said that it was my paper and I carried much responsibility for the breaking up of the merger, that is not true. I was against it.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. The hon. member sailed very close to abuse of the Official Secrets Act. We are not vouchsafed to know what transpired in the Cabinet. They are getting near to the line of divulging something in the Cabinet which is likely to reflect on somebody who is still serving in the Cabinet. It would be very unfortunate for any Cabinet decision to be made, and it comes out that a serving officer connected with that decision opposed it. A serving officer is still serving, and I do not like to hear remarks about a serving officer at that level. We passed the Official Secrets Act and we have to be guardians of what we have passed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think it would be very difficult to get the services of Counsel.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point which has been raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter is a very interesting one, but there is nothing serious about it. Nothing is being divulged.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is extremely kind of the hon. member to be so concerned about the betrayal of Cabinet secrets by Ministers. I have never mentioned anything about a Cabinet Paper in this House. The hon. member says that he wants me to remember that it was my Cabinet Paper which was responsible for the separation of the migrant service in London. All I am saying is that he has forgotten or purposely did not want to remember that if my contentions and advice had been followed, the services would not have been merged and therefore I am being as consistent as ever.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, when you argue against a course of action and find yourself in the minority, what can you do? But when the minority's action has reached a point where anybody can see that there is a mistake, what can you do? At that stage when these services were merged, I was in the minority and it took three years to prove that I was right. Now I am in the minority and it will not take three years for that to happen again.

11.05 p.m.

This happened so many times, it is not funny; and this is what perturbed me. Now, Sir, with regard to this unfounded statement that I was canvassing for the Premiership, there is not a single man in this House of Assembly or out of it who can say that I canvassed or suggested I wanted to be Premier of Barbados, unless he is the most infernal liar ever created and has no respect for the truth. I have never told anybody in this House that I wanted to be Premier.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. senior member for St. Philip actually canvassed me against working under the Minister of Education as Premier in case there was a Federation, and to work under him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What is he saying? I canvassed him not to work under the Minister of Education. I have not heard what he has said, because so far as I am concerned he wants me to get hot in here tonight, because I would expose something that the hon. member would not want to hear. He knows that for quite a while when the Premier left this country and I was out of it too, he did not appoint the hon. junior member for St. Lucy as Deputy Premier alone. It has been a matter of complaint by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to officials; so I do not know how I can answer him now at all. He wants me to start talking in here tonight. It is absolutely untrue; it is a figment of his imagination; it is a product of a lying mind for anybody to say that I canvassed somebody not to work under the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and to work under me. I know nothing about it; I have never conceived it; the position never arose or existed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has replied to that point.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If I have to go on and explain why it never arose, I will. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy had better tell him not to let me start talking. If I heard him correctly, he said that I canvassed him not to work under the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and to work under me. I do not know about that at all, and if I ever hear him with that again, the hon. member would not like to hear what I will say, because this situation did not arise at any time. Automatically I was Premier when the Hon. Premier was absent. It is a fabrication that is completely incomprehensible to me. I have heard the Hon. Premier say that people want assissinating, but I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Andrew had in mind that the Premier was going to be assassinated. The hon. member is in a good school. He is in a school where he sees his colleagues get up on their feet and lie, but do not let him try it with me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Now I was saying, Sir, that one of the matters which led to the breaking up of the Federation was this question of Mr. Taylor who was Acting Commissioner in London. Apparently Mr. Taylor was rude to the Premier and the Governor, Sir John Stow, and at a meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers here, the Premier got mad and wanted Mr. Taylor "fired". Naturally the Chief Ministers could never agree, because it was not an offence for which a Public Service Commission would decide to "fire" a servant. But this led to a big altercation at this meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. The St. Lucia Government representatives naturally backed Mr. Taylor. Some of the other Chief Ministers also were not in favour of "firing" him. The Barbados Premier got annoyed because he could not rally the Chief Ministers with him, and I think this is one of the first indications the Premier had that he no longer commanded the support of the Chief Ministers of the Regional Council of Ministers.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, here again the hon. member's recital is at variance with the facts; therefore he is misrepresenting not only the Premier's personal position in this matter, but the attitude of the Barbados Government. The facts are as follows. Complaints had been reaching this Government both from Barbadians resident in the United Kingdom, and from Barbadians employed in the Eastern Caribbean Commission of the high-handed attitude of the Acting Commissioner. The Regional Council of Ministers asked its Chairman, who, of course, is the Governor of Barbados, to go up and investigate the matter. The Chairman did so, and he brought back a report to the next and subsequent meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers. It was the refusal of the other Chief Ministers to accept the recommendations made by the Chairman which

necessitated the attitude of the Government of Barbados to be what it was. It is simply not true to say that the Premier of Barbados wanted Mr. Taylor "fired", and because the other Chief Ministers did not "fire" him, the Premier of Barbados changed his mind about the Federal exercise. The facts are that the Chairman of the Regional Council of Ministers was asked to investigate the charges made against Mr. Taylor. He investigated those charges and submitted a Report to the Regional Council of Ministers. Their refusal to act upon his recommendations led to the difference of opinion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member to say what were the recommendations of the Chairman in the Report?

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member completed his speech? If the hon. member does not resume, his speech will be deemed to be completed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said, Mr. Speaker, that the Acting Commissioner, Mr. Taylor, had been charged with being rude to the Premier and Sir John Stow, which is quite true. Sir John was asked to make a Report, and he did; but the Report, so far as anybody knows, did not, as the hon. junior member for St. Lucy says, propose any recommendations in regard to disciplining Mr. Taylor. The hon. member has said that there were recommendations in the Report which were not accepted. That is not correct.
11.15 p.m.

The Chairman made his Report and it was a fair Report. All he did was to present the facts; he made no recommendation. I do not know where on earth the hon. junior member for St. Lucy got this fantastic statement from that the Chairman made a recommendation. What happened was that the Regional Council of Ministers sat with the Public Service Commission and said that they would have fined Mr. Taylor. The Hon. Premier insisted that Mr. Taylor should be "fired". This was the only recommendation that was made. He said that Mr. Taylor should be dismissed. The other Ministers did not go along with him. As a matter of fact, there are one or two Ministers on the other side, apart from four other members of the Party who were given an account of what took place on the same evening, and I gave my opinion at the same time. Someone was there trying to pour oil on troubled waters. Mr. Ward said we should reprimand Mr. Taylor and let him promise to be of good behaviour for the future. This was the only recommendation made by Senator Ward. The Premier said that he was not accepting that and the man should be dismissed. The others did not go along with him. This was what led to this rumpus with the St. Lucia Legislature and what not, but earlier -- the meeting before that -- one of the Chief Ministers said that if the Premier of Barbados was not there and Senator Ward was conducting the Federal negotiations, they would have had Federation ever since.

I am submitting, Sir, that it is because the Premier of Barbados realised he no longer enjoyed the complete confidence and support of the majority of the members of the Regional Council of Ministers that he decided not to have anything more to do with Federation. I am submitting further that that in itself is not enough reason for asking this country not to endeavour once more to proceed to Independence within the framework of a West Indian nation. At the moment, Sir, the atmosphere of the community has been so poisoned, there have been so many castigations of the Leewards and the Windwards and this has been done deliberately to create an atmosphere in which they would not want to proceed any further and so as to leave the only alternative that Barbados should go into Independence by itself.

However, I still feel that we owe a debt to the people of this country to tell them what the facts are before they are further confused in their views; and whether this is an unpopular view or not , we would have discharged our duty. That is what we are here for. Any hon. member in this country who has not the courage of his convictions and who is prepared to plough with the wind, to adopt any policy which may make him popular and find favour with a few people does not deserve to be in here. I have never in this Chamber worked along those lines.

Mr. Speaker, you and I were the only two members of this House out of the twenty-four, so far as I can recall, who went into Queen's Park in the early 1940's at a public meeting to pressurise the authorities of this country to get a quota of people to go to America. We got no support in here. If we had to depend on the twenty-four members in here, it would not have been done. We got people outside of this House to come with us, and because of that, we got a quota. I was not in the majority in here when, Mr. Speaker, we told the Government and the other members that they should make money available to get people to go to England; but with a minority it was done because the people realised that it was right, and it had to be done.

I am telling you, Sir, that I am sure as day follows night that in the not distant future the people in this island and the surrounding territories will be grateful for the part played by the people who hold my views on this occasion, and for our efforts -- in spite of the opposition being encountered -- to attempt to preserve even at this stage some semblance of West Indian Union unity. I am so sure about that, that the future does not worry me at all.

The Hon. Premier in his remarks on Tuesday decried all this talk about the possibility of the country slipping into dictatorship, and he said we have a Constitution and the elections are fixed by statute. They have to be held and there is no possibility of the principles enshrined in the Constitution not being carried out.

Now, I want to point you to one example which is a marked infringement of the Constitution. It is of tremendous public importance -- and I sincerely hope that somebody on the other side would take note of what I am saying because if you have one violation, you will have others. That is why we have to be so careful and be so much on our guard against additional violation.
1.25 p.m.

In an Act of 1963 we established the post of Director of Public Prosecutions in this island. This was one of the steps taken under the Royal Instructions to create the posts of political Attorney General and Director of Public Prosecutions. In Section 2 of the Act, this is what it says:-

"There shall be a Director of Public Prosecutions, whose office shall be an office in the public service of the Island."

Then Sir, in subsection (2) of the same Section this is what it says:-

"In the exercise of the powers conferred upon him by this section, the Director of Public Prosecutions shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other person or authority."

In other words, the Director of Public Prosecution is supposed to be a completely independent authority. He is the Head of a Department, and in the execution or in the exercise of the powers which were conferred upon him by this Section in the law, he shall not be subject to the control or direction of any other person or authority; yet still the Director of Public Prosecutions is not being allowed to exercise his office in that manner. The Police Authorities have been informed that any complaints which they have to make to the Director of Public Prosecutions must first go to the Attorney General. The post of Attorney General is a political appointment. That is not the practice in Great Britain or anywhere else. With your Director of Public Prosecutions, the police go to him and make their reports, and he decides whether a prosecution should take place or not.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I rise most emphatically to deny the statement made by the hon. senior member for St. Philip to the effect that it is

within his knowledge that action which should be taken by the Director of Public Prosecutions is channelled through the Attorney General who takes the decision as to whether a prosecution should be conducted or not.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member, if he does not know what he is talking about, had better keep quiet. I am saying tonight that the Premier said that we have a Constitution which is not being violated and that we have not got to be worried in the future. I am quoting an example where the Constitution is being violated. That is why when you talk about endangering established institutions and what not and the threat to freedom in this country, we are on sound ground. I have quoted the Act under which the Director of Public Prosecutions is established and he is the Head of the Department. In Great Britain, the Police have direct access to him, and he and the alone decides whether there is to be a prosecution or not. Here, that Act is being violated because the Police have complained that reports go to the Attorney General first.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order. That is definitely not true. The hon. member should be ashamed of himself to say that. He has not proved that the Attorney General interferes in any way with any discretion, authority or legal affairs which are under the control of the Director of Public Prosecutions. That is simply not true and I categorically deny it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am also on a point of order. I should like to say that in so far as the amendments to the Constitution are concerned, the post of Attorney General is now a political post and he is a Minister in his own right. The present post of Director of Public Prosecutions was formerly the post of Solicitor General, and that post in now the Head of Prosecutions in criminal matters. Prosecution in criminal matters was one section of the work which the Attorney General used to do so that he and he alone dealt with criminal prosecutions. To say, as the hon. member has said, that the Attorney General is the deciding factor in these matters, is not correct. He is in charge of the Legal Department; but the Director of Public Prosecutions, as the term indicates, is the Head of the Prosecution Section, a section of the work which was performed by the Attorney. General in former days.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a further point of order. It is true that the hon. member is now divided from us politically. That we understand; but he should be the last person to attack the Attorney General of this Island, a former Cabinet colleague of his, a man whose integrity and probity is beyond reproach. What we are discussing at this point is now more important than the Resolution itself. To assume that the police have been offered by us to channel matters to the Attorney General away from the Director of Public Prosecutions whose province it really is, is a question not only of distorting the facts of the situation, but to attack the character of the Attorney General. That is a breach of the Constitution and that is something which I cannot allow.
11.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Have you ever heard so much nonsense?

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Hon. Leader of the House rose on the second occasion, it was on a point of elucidation, the purpose of which was to elucidate some matter raised by the same hon. member in the course of the speech of the same hon. member. Well, investigation does not disclose that the Hon. Leader of the House has so far made any speech on this matter; hence it is not a point of elucidation which he has made.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It was merely a continuation of the point of order which was first raised.

Mr. CRAWFORD: All this is so much tommy-rot, balderdash and waste of time. I need no lecure from the hon. senior member for Christ Church. In so far as the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is concerned, I do not know why de does not listen. I think he had better go to an ear specialist. Nothing I have said is an attack on the Attorney General at all. Nothing I said could be interpreted by even the most simpleminded person — and the hon. member is not simpleminded -- as an attack on the Attorney General. This is ignorance, and there is no excuse for it at all. The hon. member, completely righteous unto himself, gets up, and without understanding what you say, puts his own — I almost said wicked -- interpretation to it. What I have said does not constitute an attack on the Attorney General. What I said -- and I repeat for the third time — is this: I never said the Attorney General did anything. What I said and what I repeat and what I can prove beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt — because when I get up here I speak with authority, not what I think — is that the police have been instructed .....(Hon. J. C. TUDOR: By whom? It is not so.) It is so.

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not carry the matter any further for one member to say "it is so" and the other to say "it is not so"!, both *ad nauseum*.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Police in this country have been instructed that they are not to send any matters of which they want to complain directly to the Director of Public Prosecutions, but they must go to the Attorney General. I have not attacked the Attorney General. (Hon. J. C. TUDOR: It could not be so.) I will give you an example of where it has happened. One of their bands of mercenaries .....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would request the hon. member to use a different word.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let us say that a political group in the country staged a march without having notified the Police.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I object to mention being made of a band of mercenaries referring to this side of the Table.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said "a political group."

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member used the word "mercenaries" and I drew his attention to the word. I understand that he refrained from repeating the word and substituted "group".

Mr. CRAWFORD: All day long on Tuesday the Hon. Premier talked about mercenaries. Everybody was a mercenary except him. A political group staged a march in the City recently without having given the Police the Appropriate time of notification. The law lays down the time and the amount of hours .....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I categoricaly deny that association. It is simply not true. The demonstration and march which was organised by the Democratic Labour Party was planned long before it took place, and therefore there was sufficient time for the Police to be notified and for permission to be given before it took place.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member to say "a political group".

Mr. CRAWFORD: Now I am definitely convinced that the hon. member should retire gracefully and go home and get in bed, or someone should lift him out bodily and let him get a rest. I have not said anything about a march organised by them. He is saying that the march oraganised by the Democratic Labour Party was properly organised and the Police given notice ot it. I am not talking about that at all. He does not listen or does not want to listen.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest that we pass on again to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am replying to the point made by the Premier with regard to violating the Constitution, and I said that a political group staged a march in this city a few weeks ago. They did not notify the Police with the time limit called for by the law. I am not saying that the Democratic Labour Party did not do that. That is a matter for them. I do not care what they do. It was reported to the Police that they did not give the appropriate time. Now the Police normally would report this to the Director of Public Prosecutions, and he would recommend what action is to be taken, whether the group was to be warned or prosecuted or nothing; but the report from the Police on this matter to the Director of Public Prosecutions had to go first to the Attorney General.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would challenge the hon. member to produce before this House without qualifications all the facts of that case, because if even half of what he says turns out to be facts, it is an attack on the integrity and probity of the Attorney General.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to argue with him. It is an absolute waste of time. The Attorney General is only a person sitting there. I never said that the Attorney General said that it must be sent to him. The hon. member thinks he is trying to be clever; but I am telling him now that these facts are incontrovertible, and what I will concede is this. I will concede that this might be completely beyond the knowledge of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. I am not attaching any blame to him for this, but I am saying here tonight that the incident I have reported, the fact not only of the march but the fact that the Police had been told to send their reports to the Attorney General is a violation of the Constitution. The Attorney General, Sir, is merely the recipient of these complaints.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have to rise again on this point because it is somewhat more important than the Resolution itself. Not only is the Constitution of this Island involved, but in some respects a member of the Cabinet and the rule of law. If the hon. member is saying that the Police have been instructed in certain matters not to go directly to the Director of Public Prosecutions, but to he Attorney General, the inference is that instructions go to the Police and are political instructions. That is the inference, and I want to exonerate this Cabinet entirely from any participation in that kind of exercise. There is no member of this Cabinet who would ever instruct the Commissioner of Police or his subordinates in matters affecting their duty. We would give them administrative direction when, from a departmental point of view, necessary; but no member can tell the Cabinet that he knows with scrupulous fairness that we are attached to these matters. 11.45 p.m.

The hon. member knows that we could not possibly be involved in this, and therefore if he cannot say categorically that political direction has been given to the Police, he should lay all the facts before the House. The hon. member made some serious remarks which, if true, show a grave dereliction of duty on the part of the Director of Public Prosecutions. You cannot sign this thing off: it is a most serious thing which the hon. member has said, and it must be threshed to the utmost.

I am so interested in this that I would like a full-dress debate on the matter to the exclusion of any other thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD: So far as I am concerned, nothing would suit me better. I only hope that we would have the opportunity to read the full documentation. I mention it here with the fullest sense of my responsibility. It shows that we have to look out for what is happening.

Sir, what I have said, you can rest assured that I would not have said in my place here tonight unless I knew what I was talking about. I heard the hon. junior member for St. Peter said that the Hon. Premier walked in here from outside the Chamber last Wednesday – he was not in here -- and got up on a point and said that he intends to move the suspension from the House of the hon. junior member for the City on the grounds that he had misinformed the House or said something against the interests of the people of the Island. Can a member of the House be suspended from the House just like that?

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, you say that it does not arise, but it did not come from a mere nonsensical backbencher; it did not come from an infinitely newly appointed member of the Party; it came from the mouth of the Hon. Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing of it in the records of Notices. No notice of such motion has been given in at the appropriate time. I will instruct that records would not be made in the Minutes about any such motion, no such motion will appear on the Order Paper.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, even a stupid thing like that could be made the subject of something, and then the Premier can act on them.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Premier went on to say that he set a trap and we walked into the trap. Sir, what kind of trap; what trap did we walk into? Hon. Premier went on to say that he was aware of the new constitutional proposals for the Leewards and the Windwards. He did not think of them; he knew of them.

The British Government recently announced new constitutional proposals for the Windwards and Leewards. They offer something approximating to attainment of self-government in their area and, simultaneously, they offer those islands Independence under certain specified conditions.

The hon. junior member for St. Lucy, who is not in his place, either innocently – as he has done so many times when talking -- or wilfully distorted these proposals.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not say that he wilfully distorted these proposals.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did not say "wilfully distorted".

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Philip said "wilfully distorted" and got as far as "these proposals."

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said that he deliberately or innocently distorted on the radio and in the newspapers these proposals of the Leewards and Windwards. He said that the actions of the Barbados Government were responsible for these proposals. That, of course, is a joke. Then he said that all we have to do was to get Independence. Let me tell you. The Secretary of State for the Colonies recently announced categorically that they have not had any indications from the Barbados Government on Independence, and in view of all these statements about the break up of the Federation, the United Kingdom issued these directives involving these proposals setting out the conditions under which they can get Independence.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The pronouncements of the British Government are constitutionally made for the Leewards and the Windwards. They have nothing to do with Barbados. The Secretary of State for the Colonies could not have had representation from Barbados for Independence before the Resolution had been adopted and passed in the Legislature. 11.55 p.m.

When this is passed tonight then it will be presented to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. We will have that representation from Barbados after this exercise.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, as far as I am concerned, I would not answer that at all. In the first instance, he is saying that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy is a liar and he did not understand what I was saying at all because he does not understand what I am saying now. The position is this: this plot which the Premier said he was hatching for us was a plot which the Colonial Office hatched for him. Actually, when he was saying that, everything was Independence; there was no approach to the British Government, and the proposals of the Leewards and Windward Islands only demonstrate how difficult it is for them to get Independence. In the proposals they must have a two-thirds majority in the Elected Chamber and a majority in the Upper Chamber, and they must have a referendum which must represent a two-thirds majority. A referendum is not a general election and, as you are aware, Sir, it is virtually impossible with the exception of one territory, for the Leeward and Windward islands, to get a two-thirds majority in the referendum. Therefore, Sir, how they are going to get their Independence nobody knows. It is impossible for anybody to get a two-thirds majority in a matter like this.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I emphatically pointed out that the pronouncement of the British Government with regard to a two-thirds majority does not include Barbados. The case of Barbados is a different one, it is a special case. These constitutional proposals did not concern Barbados; they concerned the Leeward and Windward Islands. It is therefore not fair to give the impression that the two-thirds majority refers to Barbados.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, everybody else in this House understood what I have said. I am saying that that is a virtual impossibility for all the colonies with the possible exception of one. The proposals have been communicated and they can be amended. The Colonial Office, in submitting these proposals for Independence on the part of the Leeward and Windward Islands, was giving notice even to Barbados at the time that the achievement of Independence can be attained not only by a majority in the Legislature, but by an express majority of two-thirds of the population; therefore, they were serving notice on Barbados that the question of attaining Independence was not a settled matter. (A MEMBER: You are wrong.) What I have said is quite clear to everybody; even school children in the Second Standard would understand that a two-thirds majority would apply to Barbados. All I have tried to do is to explain that the publication of these proposals, from the time they came out, was an indication to the whole West Indies that Independence could be achieved with the express opinion of the people in the colony.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another thing which I have to correct is a statement by the Premier with regard to the feeling of the Legislature in the Leeward and Windward Islands. Honestly, Sir, I have never heard so many fantastic statements by any responsible speaker in a Legislature in any part of the world. In criticising the idea of our association with these Colonies, he said that the Legislatures did not even meet. He said that if any of the Legislatures of those islands had any meeting in the year it would be creating an Olympic record; they are pooh-pooh islands, and if they have had three meetings in a year that would be an Olympic record for them. As a matter of fact the St. Vincent Legislature met 12 times apart from finance Committee meetings which comprise the whole Legislature. In Grenada there were 11 meetings of the Legislature; there were eleven meetings of the Finance Committee and eleven meetings of another Committee comprising the members of the whole House. There were 33 meetings comprising meetings of the members of the Legislature. In Montserrat there were 12 meetings, in St. Lucia there were 15. And yet the Premier got up in here with a full sense of responsibility and in his right mind and said that if they had three meetings, that would have been an Olympic record. Funnily enough, the only island which had the number of meetings approximating what he said was Antigua which only had four meetings. This is one of those puppet dictatorships where everything goes. You could almost call them three because one was a continuation of the other. They had one meeting on 23rd March and one on 24th March, which was a continuation of the meeting of the 23rd March. They had one on April 29th and 23rd October. In St. Vincent there were 12 meetings, one of the Finance Committee comprising the membership of the whole House and in Montserrat there were 12 meetings.

12.05 a.m.

Now I am taking time out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to correct this misinformation being disseminated to the public of this country. Why should he get up in here and say that when he knows it is not true, or if he does not know whether it is true, why does he not check his facts, and want to mislead the House and the public? He is so anxious to make it appear that these islands are nothing suddenly, that he gets up in here and says that they hold three meetings, when that is completely contrary to the facts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want also to refer to the other plot which the Premier said he had made. The other plot, he said, was about emigration. The other plot, said the Premier, was that we on this side did not know anything about the new emigration proposals by the American Government, and we walked into a trap. He does not know about them either. All the hon. member knows is that the American Government has proposed that as from 1968, 120, 000 people will be admitted every year into the United States from the territories in this Hemisphere, and that there is a maximum of 30,000 from any single territory. Even the American Government itself has not yet worked out whether or not five, five hundred or fifteen hundred would come from any single territory. Nobody knows; so this is no plot he has worked out for anybody to fall into. All that has happened is that when the time comes the American Government would tell us on what basis the new proposals will be worked out, and presumably on a population basis Barbados as an independent country will get a proportionate increase in the number of our quota as compared with any other territory, based of course on their population basis. This is no plot by him.

As a matter of fact, Sir, in this connection, talking about this same thing, he said publicly that "Barbados is very grateful to the United States for doing what we have been asking them to do for a long time -- this appeared in the Party manifesto of 1961 -- and I am glad to see that the law has been changed in such a way that our citizens will benefit." Nothing at all like this appeared in the Party's manifesto of 1961. How on earth could anybody get up and make these irresponsible statements, I do not know! This is what appeared in the Party's manifesto; I wrote it; so I ought to know what appeared in it: "The Party will continue its policy of endeavouring to obtain, wherever and whenever possible, outlets, even on a temporary basis, for our unemployed. It is also prepared to work towards the achievement of W.I Independence with all possible speed in order that an Independent W.I nation might benefit by the terms of the U.S. Immigration and Nationalisation Act, 1952, which places no limitation on emigrants from the independent countries of this hemisphere to the United States of America."

That is what I wrote in the Party's Manifesto and what appeared. It has nothing to do with what the American Government has now done. As a matter of fact, when I wrote that in the Manifesto, what I had in mind was this: there is no fixed quota for entry into the United States for member countries of the Organisation of American States. At the time I had the impression and so did Norman Manley of Jamaica that the moment a West Indian territory got independence, automatically it would be included for non-quota entry under the terms of the Immigration and Naturalisation Act. Jamaica and Trinidad learnt the hard way that this is not so. Both have been independent for some years now, and they have not yet been admitted to the Organisation of American States nor have they yet obtained non-quota entry of their nationals into the United States; so that the misapprehension by Norman Manley of Jamaica that independent countries would automatically be entitled to this prompted the inclusion of this paragraph in the

Manifesto, and had nothing to do with the current proposals before the United States Legislature, and these proposals in turn naturally have nothing to do with anything in the Party's Manifesto. It is just a figment of somebody's fertile imagination.

Now, Sir, a lot of people have been worried, and in this Chamber it was expressed by previous speakers, that we have wasted three years on the Federal talks, nothing has happened and why should we waste further time in this attempt to federate; let us go on to Independence. The Premier repeated this bit of jargon and said that from 1962 he has spent so much time and energy on the conducting of these Federal negotiations, and it is time for him to stop. It took years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for all the American colonies to be united in what is now known as the United States of America. From all the years after they were founded by the Founding Fathers, it was not until 1867 that all these separate colonies became united. The Federation of Canada took over 42 years to become what it is now. First there was the coming together of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and several years afterwards, Manitoba, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island joined. Then in 1905 Labrador and Saskatchewan joined, and later Newfoundland joined.
12.15 a.m.

Therefore, Sir, in all the Federation of Canada was over sixty years in reaching its final form. It, therefore, we are beginning with a number of territories and we take five, ten or fifteen years, we would not be taking anything more than what the big Federation of Canada took.

A friend of mine in Switzerland whom I invited home when he was here was much converted to the Island. After he returned he wrote me a letter because he and I spent many days in discussion on Federation. He himself lived in a federation, and what he told me was that the twenty-two states, or cantons as they are called, of Switzerland were small meaningless states until they became federated. He sent me a card at Christmas time and on this card was inscribed; "Federation has made our country great; I hope yours come off."

Any person in Germany will tell you that Germany is the most powerful country in Western Europe -- so powerful that they challenged the world. Germany was an insignificant country with a lot of small states until Bismarck welded them into one country, and this federation made Germany the powerful nation which it is.

I am convinced, Sir, that what federation has done for Central America, Canada, Switzerland, and Germany, it can do for Barbados, the Leewards and Windwards, subject of course to the existing circumstances and controlled by the potential of the area.

The Hon. Premier was minded to quote the Central African Federation which was broken up, and the Federation of Malaysia from which Singapore seceded; but there are other examples such as I have quoted, and those states have become mighty nations through their association with each other. I repeat my convictions -- not for the last time -- that the future destiny of these islands rests, as it must always rest, and has been realised for over a century, on their coming together and working together in a political union. This union is not impracticable nor impossible. It can be achieved if only a little tolerance and understanding are exhibited. Even now, it would redound to the advantage of this colony if we join with them and have Independence at the same time rather than to have Barbados in isolation.

The people of this country have been led to believe that this is not the correct thing, and I am quite prepared to have this issue tested by the electorate. Nobody has any legacy in here. Of course, there are occasions in which people not only in Barbados but elsewhere receive the support of the electorate just on the margin; but I have been heartened in my own elections by the amount of support which I receive in this country. As a matter of fact, it seems fairly certain, if certain people were sure of themselves, that they would not go to the trouble they did of trying to make their voice heard publicly. Nobody speaking on Federation ever endeavoured to stop any independent person or group speaking on Independence. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that every time those who seek West Indian unity got up in public to speak, there were a few yard fowls or cowards trying to prevent the public from hearing what they had to say. Up to the last meeting, from what I was told there was an attempt -- unsuccessfully of course -- to prevent people from hearing the point of view which was different and not entertained by members of the Government Party. If they are so sure of the support of the people on their stand, why try to prevent other people from putting forward their point of view? If they did, they would not stop them. They would not prevent people from hearing both sides of the story. In St. James, St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Thomas, St. Andrew, St. Philip, anywhere, the people of this country normally have always been prepared to listen to both sides and then arrive at a decision. And on this occasion that would take place again. You have heard all these expressions, all these falsifications, all this vilification and slander, all these waste issues, member after member on that side gave expression to. They ought to be ashamed as black people to be telling black people in this country that all this talk about Federation is because people want to keep them in slavery. What on earth has this question to do with black people and white people?
12.35 a.m.

There was a time when the white people in this country had political power; they lost it. It was taken from them and they relinquished it with sorrow and they cried. Now they have economic power. There is no power to take economic power from people which we do not have. We have internal self-Government, and any action which the Government wants to take to distribute the wealth more equally in this island, they can take it; so they are merely fooling the people that when they have got Independence they will be able to do this to white men or what not. There is complete internal self-Government. When this campaign first started, a Minister used to be in the Fairchild Street Bus Stand and he told people that when we got Independence they would get $25.00 a week. It is a matter for the Government to fix or abide by wages negotiated by the Trade Union. Apart from that .....

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I have to correct the hon. member. It is absolutely untrue that any Minister of the Government has ever got in the Fairchild Street Bus Stand and told anybody that when we get Independence people will get $25.00 a week.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: All I am saying then, is that the man who stopped my car in Fair child Street and said so was telling lies on the Minister of Education. When it comes to the question of land reform, the question of a more equitable distribution of land in the country, if the Government feels as I feel -- as a matter of fact, numbers of Resolutions in this House would show that I have contended for land reform for this country. Whatever the Government feels like doing, it can get done now under its existing power. Any power under Independence will merely enable us to conduct our external affiars. I am submitting, Sir, that people must not be misled by these protestations that you will be able to do this, that or the other when we get Independence. As I have said, Sir, the Government can do what it feels like doing under the existing power and that applies to any field. The facts are that there will be, as they probably are, some white people who talk about Federation, and what they said is due to the fact that they have money in industry which depends on the Federation for success. The Government is leaning over backwards to attract these industries. The Government is offering concessions to people to come in here and establish these industries. You bring in raw material and other things duty free because they want to increase the revenue and expenditure on an economic basis and to provide employment for the hungry 18,000 unemployed people whom we have.

Sir, it is malicious, wicked and slanderous. The Premier said that what we are doing will shy away investors form this colony. In Federation Square. (A MEMBER: Independence Square.) The name was changed. There was a visitor from Great Britain, who after listening to the speeches there, told his wife that he was leaving the country on the next day. They were investors who were selling their investments because of what they had been hearing on Government platforms and because of what they have heard in this House during the week. Do you expect that people will come in here to employ people and then you call them bastards? They tried to bring in people here and then they want to call them bastards. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not saying that they are not bastards. Of course, there are people in this country who can be characterised as bastards because their attitudes attract this type of person.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, none of us on this side of the House has ever referred to any white persons coming to this island as white bastards.
12.35 a.m.

The reference made to white bastards was in connection with the followers of Ian Smith's regime in Rhodesia.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well if that is the case, Sir, I expect to see a correction in the newspapers of this island, because either the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has not heard, was sleeping, was not in here or has not read the report in the newspaper. (Hon. N. W. BOXILL: The newspapers are always wrong.) The newspapers are always wrong because they report what they hear. I have seen a speech being edited; so it may not appear in Hansard either. I am not saying that you may not call anybody a white bastard, because as a matter of fact, we have been called black humbugs, as if the man who was calling us so was white. It does not matter to me. If a black man says that a black man is a black humbug, he is bigger black humbug in my opinion.

I heard so many misstatements in this place that it would take me a year to correct them all. There was this talk about liberators of the people dying poor, that George Washington died poor and that Hamilton died poor. We got all this stupidness as if he were talking to little children. As far as I am concerned, I can always die ppoor because I cannot carry the money with me. Why tell people all these lies when they are not true? George Washington's home is one of the biggest shrines in the United States. Hamilton's wife belonged to a rich family and he himself was a millionaire. Either the hon. member does not know what he is saying or there is something wrong with his head.

I have a note here, Sir, where the Premier said that he went down to St. Lucia after Mr. Compton got in, to congratulate him and to brief him on the Free Trade Area. There was, of course, a lot of talk about the report of the Tenth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers, and there was a denial of the fact that the Tenth Meeting broke down, because it was claimed that on the following morning the Conference resumed and settled a number of matters. There is one thing I want to say about that. In paragraph 37 of the White Paper it is said that the Ninth Meeting of the Regional Council of Ministers had ended on a note of optimism with positive steps being taken to pave the way for a final Conference at which it was hoped there would be unanimity on all aspects of the Federal Constitution. In other words, after the Ninth Meeting it was only a matter of dotting the "I's" and crossing the "T's" to reach finality on this West Indian Federation with Independence, and we know that the Premier blew up at the final meeting. He left the Conference Room stating that nobody could speak for Barbados but he himself, and it is quite true. He said that the Conference resumed next morning and dealt with a number of matters, but obviously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it did not deal the matters which even the Premier himself demands in paragraph 37 of the White Paper it should have dealt with. The things with which it dealt were matters of a routine nature and Barbados was represented not by a Minister, but by the Financial Secretary of the country. In other words, Sir, there was no Minister at the meeting at all. The Premier himself did not attend and none of the Ministers who had been at the meeting earlier were there, and all that was settled was thse routine matters in connection with the Commission in London for another year.

Obviously, therefore, the talks broke down; there was no question about that. If, as paragraph 37 says, the matters which it was intended to finalise were not finished, the final meeting did not deal with what even the Premier himself is supposed to have thought they dealt with, and therefore I do not see why there should be all this denial of the statement that the talks broke down without agreement having been reached on matters which everyone in the territories concerned looked forward to having dealt with finally.
12.45 a.m.

Mr. Compton himself has charged since then, of course, that even before the meeting started, the Premier had decided to take Barbados out of the Federation. This is common knowledge and, therefore, there was no surprise when the talks came to an end. But the time will come when those of us who have pinned our faith on this Federal exercise would possess our souls in peace and would rest content when all has been achieved.

There is one correction which I want to make, Sir. The Hon. Premier said that he went down to St. Lucia in August last year and had talks with Mr. Compton and they were successful. What he said was that he had meetings and talks with Mr. Compton over the establishment of Customs Union before Federation and canvassed the possibility of a Customs Union within or without a Federation. That is what he told us on Tuesday.

What he went down to St. Lucia to talk about with Mr. Compton, apart from the other talks and so on, was this question of renewing the licence of British West Indian Airways. The proposal was that the British West Indian Airways licence was not to be renewed and there was the possibility of bringing in Eagle Airways. They were some of the things which in due course the public would be told as to the reason why this Federal exercise is no longer going on. I bet you that if Mr. Compton had agreed not to renew the licence of British West Indian Airways and the other Chief Ministers had agreed to that, we would have been discussing a different motion here this evening.

In the course of the election campaign which must ensue, the facts and all the angles of them will have to be given to the public. This is not a campaign now. The passing of this Resolution now does not mean a thing. It is a question of doing what you think is right. The Hon. Premier of the country created a policy and lost the campaign on it. As a matter of fact, when the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and the present hon. senior member for St. John left the Barbados Labour Party you heard all kinds of serious misgivings coming from them. The hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for Christ Church after that, repeatedly asked me to come along and form an opposition bloc, and even outside of this Chamber, after losing three different elections, we won the last one; so do not let anybody talk nonsense of winning a seat as if the lot of seats in here can be won without losses. As far as I am concerned, I have won a seat in here at a time when you had elections every twelve months. I have fought to retain my seat in here yearly and then after a time every two years. So far as I am concerned, I think with maturity and experience a man who is anything at all becomes mellowed, and more definite and determined in his opinion. If he is young and immature, with less experience, and the public feels that it is better to go on with the fellow who is matured, it depends on what the public feels. If you reach a certain amount of maturity, you are thinking in terms — and I am speaking of myself — more of history and more of what is in the interest of the community, so to speak. A young man has to go along with the tide; but a man who has made a contribution and knows that he is right has no fear at all in

his convictions, I would rather any day, if it came to that, go to the public and tell them the plain facts rather than go with somebody who does not know what he is about and who says one thing in the past; that is to say, he says something in July and another thing in December.

Sir, I do not know of any time that I made any contribution out of favour of Federation. People were talking of West Indian nationhood for the last twenty-five years. 12.55 a.m.

Every Party published its Manifesto. I want to say this. It is unfortunate that, in view of the harangue to which we were subjected on Tuesday, it has been impossible in this debate not to devote perhaps a lot of time to answering some of these unfounded charges; but I do want to repeat my convictions as to my stand. In my opinion, I am sure that both God and history will justify the stand which I have taken on this occasion. Just as my pronouncements which were made on Federation in this Chamber within the last three years were agreed to by the Government spokesmen themselves and even the pronouncements made on this occasion -- because they have produced no arguments against Federation to compare with the arguments which were irrefutable and which were pronounced when we supported Federation – those arguments which have been produced then and now will warrant equally the stand which I have taken on this occasion. I make absolutely no apology for it. I have nothing to regret about it and I submit, Sir, that you will be here in the same position to hear me say again in this Chamber that the stand I took on this occasion was justified by all the subsequent events.

Mr. HOLDER: I am taking this occasion early in the morning as a member of the Barbados Labour Party to speak on this Resolution. It is well known that the Leader of this Party is not in the best of health. We all have these things coming to us, and we pray that the hon. member will come back to us safely. While I am speaking on this Resolution, hon. members will not have to get out their pencils and make notes. This matter of Independence within a Federation was always my stand, and therefore I do not have to say very much about it; but certainly the remarks which have been used during this debate about the hon. members on this side of the House have really brought me to my feet. You have your own view, and if you should just change overnight to give another view, you must be besmirched. I will take this Resolution and I will make a few points. It begins very well like this.

"Whereas the pre-election Manifesto of, this Government, issued in November, 1961, stated *inter alia*

"The road to destiny is the road to independence. Towards this goal the country must press on ...."

I have not got a copy of the Manifesto and I have not studied it; but I have read this Resolution. I have been told that those words are right on the last page of the Manifesto, but throughout the campaign I have never heard from the platforms of the Democratic Labour Party any of the members speak about Independence I remember the first Ministers' meeting that was held in this island in respect of the new Federation; therefore they supported Federation, and to print in their Manifesto:

"The road to destiny is the road to independence Towards this goal the country must press on ...."

I must say that they did not mean to have Federation. In my opinion, the question of Federation is tied in with Independence. When one comes to that and reads that you should not worry with Federation at all *(PAUSE)* Mr. Speaker, I am reading from my own Hansard. I have been travelling with it all the week, but I will take this one and I will just take a few extracts from it in order to support my argument. 1.05 a.m.

I will not be talking about what ahppened six months ago; I will just use extracts to support my argument for Federation. I suppose you will want to ask me where this extract was taken from, and I will at once say that it is taken from the House of Assembly debates of Wednesday, 20th June, 1962. I will read the extracts in such a way that they will not be taken out of context. This is what the hon. member said:

"I have always been a federationist. I do not think a unitary state would do anything more than create more problems in these areas. I will continue to be a federationist, in so far as the West Indies are concerned, because I think our background and geographical and other matters of that kind naturally make the West Indies suitable for a federal system of Government."

Now if that was said by the Premier and he has changed his mind, and is going independent, he must certainly give reason, because members in other Parties have not changed their minds from Independence within a Federation, and I do not see why we should try to vilify them. Only last week I was doing a spot of work in connection with Christmas activities, and I heard talk about money passing and that sort of thing. I am very skeptical. I personally do not think that anybody in making his speech should throw at members over here that we want to take away the rights of the people. The word "independence" has been ringing so much in my ears that I thought I would take time off to look it up in a dictionary. In looking up the word in an ordinary dictionary, I found that there were three meanings, and I have taken out the first of them. The meanings given were "a state of independence; a state of being not dependent." In clause 2 of the same section it said: "Complete exemption from control or the control of others;" and the last "as the independence of the Supreme Being" – and "Supreme Being" are written in capitals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of thought to that second phrase in the first clause, and I hope this is not the cause why the Federation seems to be practically broken up or is going to be, because one of the sections in the preamble reads as follows:-

"AND WHEREAS the Eastern Caribbean Federation contemplated by the Report of the London Conference 1962 is not immediately possible in changed circumstances;"

That is one of the reasons for the failure of the Federation, and if I did not reply to these notes, denials would come. I am trying, Mr. Speaker, to make the salient points and I will not be too long. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker the phrase "is not immediately possible in changed circumstances" suggests that there is still a feeling that Barbados and the Windwards and Leewards should come together. I am making these few points, Mr. Speaker, because I cannot sit here quietly when so many people have cast aspersions on members over here and have injected certain things which I do not feel are correct and worthy of them.

It is rather late, Sir, and my colleagues and others on this side of the Table have put all the points, and I do not think it would be right for me just to make a repetition of all we have been hearing for the last three days. I remember that in the discussion mention was made of the book which Professor Arthur Lewis wrote. I have not read it, but those who have read it seem to look upon it as if it were a Bible. They have taken out a certain page and argued on it and then went somewhere else and took out another part to boost their arguments.

We have been hearing about a free trade area and things of that sort. Only this morning, Mr. Speaker, it came over the 6 o'clock news that Jamaica was enacting a law to prevent planters from bringing in cane-cutting machines, and it came again in the 7 o'clock news that they did not know if the thin edge of the wedge with regard to that industry had ever been thought of in this Island. 1.15 a.m.

I have heard since this debate started last Tuesday heavy vilification of the foreigners and the St. Lucians. I

am not here to defend the St. Lucians, the Dominicans, and so on, but the word "Castries" was used and there is a village in close proximity to my home with so many St. Lucians living there that they call it "Castries". That village came into existence about six years ago.

I can assure all hon. members that like all other Barbadians, the St. Lucians have their faults; but when you say that twelve or eighteen of them live together in a house, that is not correct. When they arrive from St. Lucia, owing to the fact that you cannot get rooms nowadays so easily, they go and stay with a friend sometimes, but you do not find more than three or four living together. I would say that some of them are very useful in the reaping of our crops and they are very good workers. I do not know what happens in Bridgetown as regards them, but I can say that that obtains in the rustic part of this country in the different vocation of life, and especially in the sugar industry.

Therefore, Sir, I cannot hear such statements about the St. Lucians who live in my immediate district without denying them. They have been exceedingly useful to the economy of this island. There was a time when Barbadians left their island to emigrate to Panama and Brazil, and we all should know that, but now they go to England and the United States of America. What do they go for? They go for the betterment of themselves. St. Lucians live in my vicinity, and they are doing a good job; but they are vilified and talked about as no good.

There is another point, Mr. Speaker, which I want to draw to your attention. In St. Lucia we have very prominent Barbadians living there as well as ordinary workers. Barbadians in St. Lucia are holding very important posts, some of them from my immediate parish. If you were to go and deport these foreigners who come to the island, what do you think would take place with Barbadians in those islands?

Sir, with these few remarks I address you and would like you to know that by my convictions I stand with my Party on this question.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have listened attentively to the contributions made by other speakers, and the time has now come when I should contribute something to this Resolution. The first point which I want to make abundantly clear is that when the negotiations for Federation began, I gave Federation my whole-hearted support and I have not fallen from that spirit. Whatever the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has read out today, I am not ashamed of my words nor am I afraid of them. Whenever I see them here or hear them, I would respect them.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that he is going to the parish of St. Andrew and he will tell the people what I say, if I vote against this Resolution. It does not matter what he does; it does not matter to me. The people of St. Joseph sent him here to represent them and the people of St. Andrew has sent me here to represent them. I am the watchman for St. Andrew and he is the watchman for St. Joseph. If I do not report to the peopl e of St. Andrew, then the burden would be on my shoulders. It would be my fault. If I saw a danger and I warned them and they do not take heed, it is not on my shoulders.

Now, Sir, we have been sent here to the House from various parts of this country. We have selected the Hon. Premier and Ministers to the various grades, and as soon as they began to negotiate about Federation, the Hon. Premier picked out the greatest from here and started negotiations with the other Chief Ministers of the other territories to form a Federation.

Well, we waited, we listened to see what were the results. The Regional Council of Ministers went to England to a Conference, came back here and began to hold talks. Then suddenly we heard that the Conference had broken up and there were no more negotiations. When I heard that, it dampened the morale of my spirit.

I had to wait to hear what was the result from the Hon. Premier. After waiting, there was placed on the Table of this House the White Paper which said briefly that there would be no more negotiations on Federation and that we were going to seek Independence alone. I sat down and thought night and day over the matter and, as I am accustomed, I went on my knees to Almighty God and I asked him to enlighten me to come to the truth, and what answer he thought fit that I should give to this question of Independence alone. I went to the people in St. Andrew and we talked about it down there. Some of the people said they wanted Independence; some said that they wanted Federation.

I can assure you that when the first Federation began, not one of them uttered a word about it. We began negotiations again to start this new Federation. What is all this row that is going on? I do not know.

I have waited and did everything to see what would be the results. The Conservative Party has preached against Independence alone; the Barbados Labour Party has preached against Independence alone, and all like that; but what I want the people of this island to realise is that we are on a journey and we are advancing to some goal or the other. The Conservatives were in power for nearly three hundred years and they carried us a certain part of the journey.

1.25 a.m.

The Barbados Labour Party took over and they carried the nation a little further on the journey and they stopped. Then the Democratic Labour Party took up the position and they are travelling now. I can assure you, Sir, that I have looked over the sea and with this Independence I do not see any storm, and therefore the ship can continue to sail. I stand responsible for the people of St. Andrew, and with the good work that this Government has done, I shall go down in history with them. I do not have to insult either black or white, brown or yellow; whatever we are, we are all precious in God's sight. Wherever you come from, so long as you respect me, I will respect you. We have heard quite a lot about St. Lucia, but I doubt that anybody could tell you more about St. Lucia than I could tell you. I have spent 14 months there. I know that the conditions were bad, but by this time they must have enjoyed some kind of development.

I heard the hon. senior member for St. Michael say that Barbados needs St. Lucia, more than St. Lucia needs Barbados. I challenge the hon. member as to that. Apart from Trinidad and Jamaica, there is no country which has developed economically and politically more than this island of Barbados. St. Lucia has one and a half times as much land as Barbados, but it does not have one-half the size of the population we have here. They should be advancing in front of us and they should cultivate the land. What are some of us doing? Burying our talents? At one time our Master gave ten talents to one man, five to another and one to another. The man who had ten talents invested his and got ten more; the man who had five talents invested his and got five more; but the one who had one talent went and buried his. Are we burying our talents? If the people of St. Lucia have a cart to be done, they have to come here and get it done; they have to come here so as to learn everything. Therefore, I do not see that we have to depend upon them. The position is that they have to depend upon us. We give the people medical aid and everything else because we have been working and improving the economy of the island.

Sir Grantley Adams took over from the Conservatives and he had a great battle to get the people with him. He fought a battle, but some of the people still wanted to go back and say that the Labour Party is not going to lead them rightly. They remind me of the time when Moses took the children of Israel out of Egypt and when they got to the Red Sea some of them said: "Look at Pharaoh coming behind us; you might better had left us in Egypt." Moses told the people: "Stand still and you will see the salvation."

He told them to advance; they advanced and the sea was opened. We will advance until we get Independence. Do you not want Independence? The matter is as if a mother had a few daughters and she wants to see some of them get married and become independent. Canada will open her doors to emigrants; the United States of America will open their doors to emigrants. If we get Independence, will that stop Canada or the United States of America from taking emigrants? Will it prevent us from selling our goods? Even with their views as to the economy of our island they are trying to muddy our path. If you have materials and another country wants them it is a matter for that country to allow their people to buy those materials or not to buy them. I will not allow these people to deceive the people of this island.
1.35 p.m.

I respect all men and I love all men as I love myself. What has the hon. senior member for St. John done in this country? I am assuring you, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Premier has never taken a bribe from any man's hand. (Cheers.) He has not taken any man's ox or ass. He has not oppressed any man, and I can assure you that the God of Heaven is with him. Look at the advance we have made since he has taken over! Lift your eyes to the fields and from side to side and see the advances we are making in every direction.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to criticise the Conservatives or speak one word against them. They have the money and we have the Government and the law. At one time they had the law and the money, but now they have the money and we have the law. What has the Premier done to be hated? I say that they hate him without a cause; they hate him for his works. I remember in reading the Good Book that when Jesus was before Pilate that He asked "What have I done?", He was told that He had done good works, but it was for what He had spoken. They therefore took Him and crucified Him. Even parents have to use hard words to their children to get them under control, and I have to tell them not to continue with those words.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, has granted me whatever I have asked for for the people of St. Andrew. I remember that when Haggatts was to be closed, hundreds of people flocked around my home, and I told them to stand still and they would see the salvation of their God. I got in touch with the Premier and told him that this was a time of suffering, a time of distress and a time of persecution, that my people were willing to give birth but did not have the strength to deliver, and I asked him to think in every possible way of their future existence and see whether he could come to their aid with financial assistance. I told him not to let me down. He came down to Haggats and talked over the matter with the Cane Farmers Association, and today my people are kept under subjection. Thank God he has bought Haggatts, he has given us the East Coast Road, and he has given us free education. My God, why hast Thou forsaken the Premier for the good works he has done? I have told the Premier in this House that I am in the bow of the ship; I am not in the hatch or in the mechanic room, and if I sight an iceberg, I will tell him to keep off, because if I warn the Premier at any time and he does not take heed of what I say, I will tell the people that the Premier has refused to heed me; but up to this time he has never turned me adrift. The Hon. Premier has told me that I can approach him either at his home or at Ministerial Buildings, and I approach him in all directions; so what is the hon. junior member for St. Joseph going to talk about me? I will not have anything to talk about him in St. Joseph. All I have for him is goodwill. Whatever he likes to go and do, let him do; but I know, as I look there, that I see no sign of storm; I look on the waters and I see no submarine or iceberg. I say, therefore: "Sail the ship on with all the speed you have and get Independence."

Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do? Turn back the hands of the clock? We should strive for the shore. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the Ministers did not negotiate in the manner I expected in order to bring about a Federation of the territories apart from St. Lucia. Mr. Compton said that the surplus money from Federal revenue should be spent on the under-developed countries first, but the Premier felt that if he put 50 per cent into Federal revenue and there was a surplus, then he should have 50 per cent of that surplus to help his country. St. Lucia does not want that, and all these differences have caused us not to get together, because we are not willing to suffer on account of them.

Now we have joined a Free Trade Area with British Guiana and Antigua, and we are trying to advance; and I think it would be a good day if all the other countries would join us. If this could be done, one of these days we would have a Federal Government. The last Federation was weakened because the material was not properly cured, neither did it have the strength. The material was mixed with clay, and when you mix material with clay, as soon as it meets any resistance, the clay will give way and the iron will go the other side. That is one reason why the last Federation broke up. Jamaica said they could not support the West Indies, and Eric Williams of Trinidad said that one from ten leaves nought. Jamaica and Trinidad became independent, but this Government did not go about the West Indies telling them not to buy from Trinidad. Both Jamaica and Trinidad are prospering; so why could we not prosper too? The same God that is over Jamaica is over Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, why should people go around and try to dampen the spirit of the people? Let us go forward and I am sure that we will make a success. I am sorry, Sir, that I do not have as much time as I should like to go into this matter. I know that the Ministers want to reply and it is already late in the morning. I will therefore end by saying that I have every hope of Barbados making a success of Independence, and no man can stop the current. *(Cheers)*

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, this is a unique occasion in the history of this ancient Chamber.
1.45 p.m.

This is a time, Sir, in which we, the representatives of the people, are called on to decide the fate of this island. In rising to meet this challenge, we must have tenacity of spirit and honesty of purpose. Failing to do so we may create choas in this island.

As you know, Sir, hon. members come, hon. members go, but this ancient House remains. We, in dealing with this Resolution, must do our utmost on behalf of the people of this island. To approach this vital and important question, we must let them see that we represent their interest. God must guide us and the best interest of the people must always be uppermost in our minds.

Sir, during these discussions we discussed Federation and Independence within a Federation, and I am not ashamed to say, Sir, I state emphatically that I am giving this Resolution my unstinted support. I did my utmost but, Sir, the pro-Federal ship was laid on shifting sands, and it crumpled before a new Federation could be built out of the wreckage of the other one.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say if Mr. X or Mr. Y contributed most towards producing a still-born baby.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I have the assurance of the hon. member for St. Philip that he is not reading his speech?

Mr. WEEKES: No, Sir. We now are called on to get together and go it alone. If we are placed in a position to help our people at this present moment, why then should we waste time at this particular moment? We should not waste time in flogging a dead horse. Some precedence must be given at this particular moment to reconsider our decision, and we can only hope that we will achieve success and co-operation from all, regardless of colour or creed.

Sir, I stand firmly in supporting this Resolution here today. I do so because I have seen the handwriting on the

wall. After reading the new Constitution which the British Government has proposed to give to the other islands, I have come to the conclusion that there is no other solution to our problem but that we go into Independence alone.

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

I repeat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that having read the proposals of the British Government for these islands I must let you know that I was motivated to reconsider as regards Independence within a Federation.

Sir, some of these smaller islands cannot balance their budget; some are grant-aided colonies; and if Great Britain has decided to give these small islands a better system of Government, actually on par with the Government of Barbados, I feel, Sir, that the time has come for us to go forward, and in going forward I feel that we are not asking any favour when we are demanding Independence. With our integrity, experience and orderly constitutional progress, we can be a model for the other Governments.

We have done our utmost to see if we could have gone along with the other colonies, but we have failed. The time has come when we should represent the interests of the people of Barbados. We must do all in our power to represent them. I feel, Sir, that this is a very crucial moment in the history of this Island and we must face the fact that we cannot remain stagnant. If we must go forward, we must represent the interests of the people and let our code be: "If God be for us, the gates of hell cannot prevail against us."

1.55 a.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say, give us the tools and we will finish the job; given us freedom and we will build the nation. All the representatives of these small islands have decided to stay in their homes, in their countries and become insular instead of associating themselves with us and assisting us to build a nation; but we cannot do anything to convince them. We have tried our utmost, but we have failed; consequently, we can only think about going alone.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say to the people of Barbados and to the people of my constituency that when it comes to Independence alone, Barbados can go forward and the people are behind us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that the few remarks which I have made will manifest to the community my stand on this issue. I can only wish my Government success in going forward and I hope that the British Government will do all that lies in its power to expedite Independence for Barbados alone. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you. *(Cheers)*

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to speak on this Resolution which deals with the question of Independence for the people of Barbados. I speak as a member of the Government Party. In making this announcement that I am a member of the Government Party, I take pleasure in so doing, having regard to the fact that I have not waited until a crisis has arisen. I joined this Party over a year ago before this Resolution was tabled in this House. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I consider that whenever an individual or a group of individuals or a Party has set out to champion the cause of the poor down trodden people, that individual or that group of individuals or that Party becomes an agent of God. What they do will receive God's blessing. That is why I believe that we who are seeking Independence for the people of Barbados must overcome, not some day, but today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never known -- and I must say that there cannot be any intermediate stages. A man must be honest or dishonest; he must be either for you or against you. He cannot be for you and against you at the same time. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard from the opponents to Independence today that they are not against Independence, and yet one hon. member could get up on the floor of this House and filibuster for all of these hours in trying to prevent the people of Barbados from having freedom and Independence. You will remember, Sir, that in 1834 when slavery was abolished there were still some of those who did not want to leave their masters because they would look to them for houses. While some of them were willing to leave their masters, there were those who were still lingering with them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has read out a speech which I made on the question of Federation. I made that speech; but if I were the hon. junior member for St. Joseph I would not have read it, because I was looking for the speech which the hon. member made on the same question of Federation, but I cannot find it. When the hon. member was in this House for 17 years and I was in this House for two years, the hon. member has never made in this House the speech which I made. He could not make that speech and he will never make such a speech.

2.05 a.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the question of Federation was debated in this Honourable Chamber, I spoke in favour of it because I felt that disunity is weakness, but unity is strength, and if there was a ray of hope in the question of Federation, I would support it; but there is absolutely no likelihood of a Federation with these small islands.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us take a look at the British West Indian Islands before we talk about Federation, and you will see their unwillingness to federate. British Guiana is an underveloped country which is under-populated and in which one river, the Essequibo, is larger than the whole of Barbados. They say they do not want a Federation, and when the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Alexander Bustamante discovered that these small islands would be robbing his people, he drew a sow with nine piglets sucking and showed the people of Jamaica, and then Norman Manley had no alternative but to pull Jamaica out of the Federation, and Trinidad followed leaving eight islands. Barbados was the only island which was not a grant-aided territory, and if you had read the speech of the Prime Minister of the defunct Federation, you would have seen where he said that the eight remaining islands were not economically viable.

I am wondering, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Prime Minister of the defunct Federation is still the Chairman of the Barbados Labour Party, because the members of the Barbados Labour Party are saying that they want Federation with Independence, when the Chairman said that the eight remaining islands are not viable economically. As a matter of fact, we do not have eight island going in for Independence now, because Grenada was not interested in Federation. They were interested in a unitary state with Trinidad and Tobago. Barbados tried to form a Federation with the other seven islands, but when George Charles lost the Government in St. Lucia and Mr. Crompton took over, he said he was more interested in the banana business than in Federation. With whom therefore must we federate?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not for or against the Premier of Barbados but I am for the people of Barbados, and more so the people of St. Joseph whom I have the honour to represent. Some of the people in these small islands feel that if they federate with us we stand to benefit more than they. It is known, Sir, that in every respect we are leaps and bounds ahead of these small islands, which means that if we federate with them, we will have to stop our progress and work with them for about ten years during which time the people of Barbados will be the sufferers.

I feel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that some of these islands would welcome some form of closer association, and under the circumstances I do not see how the members of the Opposition can try to put the Hon. Premier or any individual to ridicule as the one who is preventing Federation. I have reached the point where I would be in favour of Federation, but seeing that there is no possibility of a Federation, I compliment this Government in seeking Independence for the people of Barbados. I have absolutely no desire to lower the standard of this debate, but to say the least, it appears rather indiscreet to find people whom I thought would have some intelligence going down to the islands and asking the people down there how to run their business when they cannot even conduct theirs.

As far as Independence is concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to some of the meetings of the opponents of Independence, and I thought that as one boxer to another they would have taken Independence and knocked it to pieces, but everything I have heard was focused against one man. I have heard as much from the opponents of Independence that if I had to vote today for the Premier of this country, I would say "no"; but I am going to vote for Independence, and not for the Premier of this country. It is known, Sir, that Barbadians are people with a great spirit and outlook, and I consider that the Government of this country would be doing the people a disservice if it did not lead them into nationhood. If the speakers who are opposing Independence had said that the people of Barbados did not really know what is Independence and had asked the Government to explain it, I would have seen with them, because in everything a man must learn, and there must be an explanation given; but I know the people have been told and it has been explained to them, and it is no use Barbados trying to take on these islands which the stronger islands have refused. We are unable to carry that weight.

It is a gross insult in the Twentieth Century, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to find people whom you thought had better understanding trying to mislead the masses and tell them that we are not ripe for Independence. If we are not ripe for Independence today, we never will be. I know, Sir, that without a strong Opposition one may say you do not have a strong Government, but opposition for the sake of opposition is without worth. For years now some of the members of the Opposition have been going around the country and preaching to the people that they should be independent of the capitalists of this country, but now the same people are saying that they should not be independent. What more wickedness do you want than that?

I do not think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have to make a long speech, because we have a case, and I consider this question to be one of the most important that has come before this House of Assembly for the past fifty years. Consequently posterity will progress or retrogress by the action of this General Assembly today, and if I have the honour to add my quota at this time, I am going to add it in a way which I feel will be of benefit.
2.15 a.m.

I am not a goldfish going down the stream; neither am I looking in or out of the Government for a job; but I consider this matter to be very important. It is a very important matter and it should have been settled long ago. Under the circumstances, I am supporting the Resolution to the limit and I am appealing to hon. members who are against Independence to consider this matter from a broad view in the interest of the community as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I will quote what Evelyn Gauge Brown wrote:

> "No matter how deep the darkness on the path that must be trod,
> There is always faith and courage, there is always love and God;
> The stars will shine above us and the hand that guides the way,
> Is the hand of our loving Father who is leading us day by day."

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say that when we are dealing with such an important and momentous debate, I as an old parliamentarian will not sit here without saying a word, despite the lateness of the hour, to let hon. members know how I stand in the matter. This debate has gone on different lines from time to time. At some stages, it descended into the gutter; at other stages you saw examples of filibustering, a lot of mistakes made, untrue statements made from time to time, and there were a lot of mysterious remarks made, most of them coming from a few members of the Opposition. I do not care to elaborate on that but, on the other hand, we listened to one or two speeches from the Opposition, and of course, the mammoth speech made by the hon. Premier which will go down in history.

I do not care to follow the pattern set by some hon. members because if I were to make the speech which I intended, I probably would speak for more than two hours. However, I will say this in passing with respect to the hon. junior member for St. George. This debate may have taken place before; but owing to his suspension, it did not take place. I want to emphasise that it is not the case that we were taking advantage of his absence to carry on with this debate. Of course, as Mr. Speaker pointed out, the five sittings for which he was suspended had expired and the hon. member knows that it was only a coincidence that he happened to be ill now that we are carrying on with this debate. I want to say that we all sympathise with him and wish him a speedy recovery.

Sir, I heard many unnecessary remarks and utterances as regards race and all of that. I have the honour and privilege to represent a mixed society in Christ Church. It is an intelligent and up-to-date parish – a parish that is comprised of all different types of people, white, brown, and black – and I could not sit here and allow a few people in that parish to be maligned by hon. members, even some of my colleagues. It is unfortunate to hear an hon. member, whether it is a Minister or not, come out in this year of grace – this is not 1937 -- and make that sort of contribution.

Now, Sir, as regards Independence for Barbados, we are on the verge now and there is nothing to stop us. The next step for Barbados to take is to enter into Independence. Therefore to listen to some of my colleagues on this racial issue, I want to say that there is not such a thing as a white Capitalist and a black Capitalist; so to get up in here, especially now that we are playing up the tourist industry and hear racial issues spoken about, it is not a good thing because when we go into Independence, it will not be for black or white; it will be for Barbados as a whole, not for the black people alone. I feel very incensed when I hear a contribution like that.

On this question of Federation, do hon. members realise that as recent as 1962, Federation has proven to be a dastardy failure? No less a person than Mr. Grantley Adams was the first and only ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies Federation. He was regarded as an experienced politician and I believe he still is. If Federation was a failure under him, why all this talk about Federation?

Each and every little island of the East Caribbean is surrounded with a vast amount of sea water, and you find a small-time politician in each of them wanting to run his own affairs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on the question of Federation. Many hon. members of the Opposition tried to press their case on us to prove that we should go into Independence within a Federation; but none of them said anything about how much money the British Government was willing to give or from what source the $15 million that would be needed would come. They never said anything about what was to be done to prevent the people in the other islands swamping Barbados and causing more unemployment here. We have 18,000 unemployed in this island and under Federation I envisage to have more of them.

Hon. members talked of trade and what it would mean to us if we go into Independence alone, and not in a Federation. As far as Federation is concerned, the Federation which is being attempted, or should I say was attempted, is of a unique nature. We have a vast expansion of sea water around each island, and because of that for hundreds of years the average working class persons have not been aware of conditions of life and all the other facets that ob-

tain in St. Kitts. They do not know of what even obtain in St. Vincent, St. Lucia or Grenada which are islands near to us. In order to know, we have to board a ship or plane.
2.25 a.m.

It is not possible to pay cheap railway passages or bus fares as in other places, with the result that the Federation such as the one we are thinking of, is almost impracticable, at least for the time being. Another point is this. The small-time politicians or Ministers or whatever they are, want to maintain their little possession of power in the islands on a federal basis. Over and above that, the British Government has not come out and said: "We will help you with £50 million so that the Islands will be bought up to standard and opportunities be given to the islands generally." In the absence of finance, what sort of Federation are you talking about? The British Government has devised some scheme, and the United States of America and Canada have sent out survey teams, the usual bluff, to fool the ones which have developed. But these tricks do not impress me. They should be willing and ready to bring us into Federation instead of twisting and finessing now they hear that Barbados is going it alone.

Barbados has enjoyed a certain measure of self-government and self-rule. It is true that white people were allowed from the very outset to possess a certain measure of internal self-government in the last three hundred years. Another point is that Barbados was chosen as the experimental place when the British Government thought of introducing a Ministerial system of Government, because they felt that we were the most educated and sufficiently advanced and responsible to be decided on for undergoing such an experiment. They selected Barbados before Jamaica and Trinidad as being sufficiently educated and ready for an advanced system of Government. Sir Grantley Adams has said that he fought for adult suffrage; but still Barbados was the last of the Islands to attain adult suffrage although this Island was the experimental ground for this Ministerial System. Barbados in 1946, 1947, or 1948 was the island chosen to decide whether the White people were sufficiently advanced and educated enough in order to run their own affairs. I happened to be one who, without a dollar in gasolene for compensation, served in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries and the Public Works Department so that I cannot allow certain things to pass without saying certain words -- I cannot do that in view of posterity. If we have had an internal system of Government, how much more should we move on? We have had adult suffrage, we have had a Ministerial system and full internal self-government since May last year and we have had a Federal system. As the hon. senior member for St. Philip has explained, we have enjoyed and we are enjoying full internal self-government today. In other words, the Ministers have complete control of affairs, and it is only in matters of defence that we will have to be taken care of as in the War years. It is only in external matters and matters of defence that we have not got control today; so that when the Constitution is written up as widely as in 1964 which has been explained very carefully, that is the Constitution which will be used in Independence. I see no reason why we should not decide on moving on to Independence in this year of grace 1966. You will see that the British Government has seen fit to make certain constitutional proposals to the Leeward and Windward Islands which, in effect, amount to giving them a Constitution which is similar to the Constitution which we now enjoy in Barbados. In other words, it is a question of full internal self-government. In the same proposals you will find that the Leeward and Windward Islands had no given time for them to move into a unilateral declaration of Independence such as the country of Rhodesia.
2.35 a.m.

If the Windwards and Leewards from this start attain full internal self-government, they have been given the assurance that whenever they desire they can assume Independence with certain slight safeguards; and if they are given that undertaking now, why should Barbados which has enjoyed a certain measure of self-rule for a number of years, just as Bermuda and the Bahamas have done, stand idly by and not assume Independence as a right without any of the trappings that hon. members on the other side seem to think will be involved? The proposals which were given were not for Barbados; they were for the Windwards and Leewards and copies were sent to the Government of Barbados, and the Premier had a copy and told his Cabinet many weeks before they were published. These proposals were not for Barbados; so this question of sitting back and amusing yourself with talk about a two-thirds majority in the Lower Chamber and a majority in the Upper Chamber, and a referendum, is just a lot of wishful thinking and wishwash. These things do not apply to Barbados because the Barbados Constitution does not have that in it. This is not a Constitution for Barbados which they have now invented; it is for the Windwards and Leewards, and was only sent here to us by way of information so that we would know what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, Barbados more or less has its independence already; it is only a question of working out the details of the Constitution, financial implications and matters like that. The Constitution is there already, and to go to England is a formality more than anything else. When we go to England for independence, we are going to hobnob, because there is really nothing in this case to discuss, so that it may be possible in launching into Independence to see what money we can get to assist us in becoming independent. Be that as it may, the fact remains that Independence is ours and nothing can stop it.

On the question of development, the hon. senior member for St. Philip spoke at length and we certainly thank him for what he was doing. He did constructive work while he was Minister of Trade, Labour and Development; but to say that since he has gone everything has come to a lull is a misstatement, because I think that within recent months, Mr. Speaker, the entire Ministry of Development is better organised, and everything is more systematically done and better channelled from the technical angle; so to say that the machinery of that Department has broken down is not correct in that we have in the Ministry economists who devote their time to that work alone, so that applications are more expeditiously dealt with now than in the past. Of course the hon. member said that the prospective applicants will not have the incentive. Let me state here and now that if we develop the Free Trade Area as was explained by the Hon. Premier and the Minister of Trade and Labour, we will have a better chance of developing than even in the Eastern Caribbean movement, because the market will be as big, and each of these islands, whether it is Grenada, St. Vincent, St. Lucia or else, will have to join the Free Trade Area sooner or later whether or not they want it. Antigua has come in; and though Trinidad has not yet come in, she sent her External Affairs Minister as an observer, and St. Vincent also sent an observer. Very soon, therefore, they will join the Trade Pact for their own preservation.

I would say then that all the islands in the Caribbean — Jamaica, Trinidad, St. Vincent, Dominica and the others, Dutch, French and British — will see that they have to join this Caribbean Economic Community which will be the guiding feature on the economic front of the entire Caribbean area. (Cheers). This idea that with the breaking up of the proposed Federation there will be no markets, no employment and no incentive to encourage investors to come here is a lot of baloney. British Guiana is a vast country larger than the United Kingdom, and with the mineral resources untapped, and with that country going into Independence in the right hands of Mr. Burnham, having American capital to back it up, with Communism pushed aside and Jagan in the back benches, and with development and a Free Trade Area, we can envisage the population of British Guiana being six million instead of 600,000, and of that number at least one million will be Barbadians in another twenty-five to forty years from now. All those Barbadians who need living space and elbow room will find them in British Guiana, and British Guiana has all the natural mineral resources to maintain a population not of 600,000 but of six million in another ten years, and probably sixteen million in 100 years from now.

At one time, Mr. Speaker, Great Britain bought our sugar with which she built up her country, but today our sugar is not so well appreciated. They have many ways of getting around paying a proper price.
2.45 a.m.

You hear about the International Sugar Agreement. Since Cuba has gone Communist, it has not co-operated fully on the international basis, so because of that, the whole International Sugar Agreement has gone by the board.

The Commonwealth Sugar Agreement enables us to sell at a negotiated price 130,000 tons of sugar per year roughly and this is the only mainstay which we have up to now; but there was a time when King Sugar built up places like Great Britain. Today sugar is down. The cost of producing one ton of sugar is probably twice the world's market price. Today you are not allowed to go to Great Britain in large numbers. They have put up all sorts of devices to keep out our people. The figure is probably 18,000 to 20,000 Barbadians; so for practical purposes you can say that the door is closed as far as emigration to the United Kingdom is concerned. We have to look somewhere else to emigrate our peopl e, and it is a blessing in disguise to us now to have such close relationship with British Guiana. In time, Barbadians will find employment there, and that will be the Panama and Brazil of tomorrow. British Guiana will be to us as those places were thirty or forty years ago.

As other hon. members said, the quota to the United States of America will be increased by our going into Independence. Already it has been increased, and instead of 600 or 700 now we would have a quota of 2,000. We are grateful for small mercies and we feel that entering into the exercise with British Guiana which our Premier did and for which he had the full backing of the Cabinet, was a move in the right direction and will prove a salvation to the people of Barbados in time to come. Therefore, to get there and criticise the Free Trade Agreement, is not in my opinion a wise thing to do because we look forward for some results out of the Free Trade Area. I feel sure that all the islands of the Caribbean in the not too distant future will join in and build up their economy in that way.

Sir, I do not think that I need speak at length because it is no point really in repeating what other hon. members have said. In any case, it is late in the night — or early in the morning; but hon. members must realise that we can rise to the occasion if we stay until six o'clock. We can stay and see it through. The Good Ship Independence has almost been launched and I will implore one or two hon. members who have not see their way to come in on this side. Even at this late hour they should decide to get on the ship, which has the wishes of the vast majority of people in this island. Many of them probably would feel that we will have great prosperity overnight; but Independence calls for hard work and greater responsibility. However, there are many benefits to be gained from independence.

Sir, with those few remarks I will now give my support to the passing of this Resolution. I will emphasize that in one of the preambles it reads:-

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Barbados, reaffirming its dedication to the principle of Regional Association, will continue after Independence to work in close co-operation with the Governments and Peoples of other Commonwealth Caribbean Countries to promote by joint endeavour the complete political, social and economic emancipation of all classes in all territories,"

We cannot wait on Federation any longer. We want Independence now, and we hope that our brothers will see the wisdom and make a better effort to co-operate on a proper and regional basis towards Federation. We must realise that we in Barbados cannot allow our people in general to suffer at the hands of foreigners — when I say foreigners, I mean the people in the other islands — because they would cause our living standard to drop. We cannot allow St. Lucians -- and when I refer to those people, I refer to the other people in the other islands as well -- to come in greater numbers than they are coming to cause our people to have lower standards of life by those people accepting to work for lesser wages and things like that. Our standard of living is better than formerly, and we enjoy a fair living wage. We cannot allow the St. Lucians to come here and cut the wages which the Barbados Workers Union, under the aegis of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, has worked and toiled so hard day and night for the last twenty-five years to get for the workers in order to raise their living standard. We cannot allow them to undermine that. We have to see about our own people first. We have to see after our interests first. We cannot allow strangers to come and cause us more unemployment and more problems and cause our health services to be cramped and bogged down at the Hospitals or the Almshouses. We cannot allow that to happen because we have 240,000 or 250,000 people whom we should look after first.
2.55 a.m.

If we have got more jobs and made opportunities for the people who are leaving the schools — and there are thousands of unemployed people and they are being deprived of getting any employment — we have to see that they are getting jobs which are remunerative. To talk about Federation now is a very nice phrase, but Federation has been tried in recent years and it has proved to be a failure. The present Government under the Honourable Premier and some of the Ministers have had the privilege of attending meetings in trying to bring about a change, but they have found that with these meetings the Leaders will hardly get together. We will move on to Independence now and we will have the necessary safeguards — freedom of speech, freedom of movement, freedom in our homes and freedom of worship. There will not be any dictatorship because this will be a democratic set-up; it will be based on the British Commonwealth. Although it may be said that I opposed the Resolution at one time, what I really opposed was the question of a Mandate. I felt that we did not have the full Mandate for Independence; although that was written in the Manifesto, it was not the full Mandate. The matter has been explained island wide now and, as far as I know, I can say "Yes, we have a Mandate." When we have voted this morning, Barbados shall be led to Independence.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it will be surprising if I adopt all that has been said by the Hon. Minister and others on this side of the House. From the last days of December, 1965, when I saw and read the Constitutional proposals for the Windward and Leeward Islands I became strongly convinced that Barbados must go independent alone. Mr. Speaker, to me the attempt at Independence for Barbados alone was too strong and is too strong to be successfully resisted. I have said to myself that I did not think a debate on this Resolution was necessary; I think that it remains a question of the Opposition Party coming together and just settling down to the form of Constitution which is desirable. I say that without any form of prejudice against the right and privilege of hon. members to discuss this Resolution. Indeed, I think it serves a very good purpose that this Resolution has been implemented. The public including myself have heard it, and what they did not hear was not said. I think that in fairness to the island, I, as an elected representative, in fairness to my constituency and in fairness to myself, must say why I support this Resolution and I must give my reasons for supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, when this White Paper was introduced in the Legislature, I signed an amendment along with my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Philip. I am not making any apologies for doing so because I think it served a very good purpose. The object of that action was to create and provoke discussion throughout the island and particularly in my constituency. Nobody would have the feeling of my constituency as I would have, and most persons think that it is necessary to have political mass meetings so that they may be able to feel the pulse of their constituencies. I am certain that since this discussion throughout the island was carried out in connection with this White Paper, a very large percentage of the people who did not understand Independence are today convinced that Inde-

pendence is for them, and that independence is what they want. as far as I am concerned, this is an issue which surpasses all Party or personal consideration.

My Speaker, when I signed the amendment to the White Paper, I did it of my own will, based on my own impression of the people of my constituency, and it did not matter to me whom I pleased. Because of that, I do not have to make any apology to any one. If I do anything which I feel is in the interest of my constituency, I may be sorry if it has displeased them; but I will not bow down to anybody and say that I am sorry I did it.
3.05 a.m.

The Hon. Premier in his remarks said that he is an angry man, and he may be justified. I am an angry man too, but for this reason: if one favours Independence alone for Barbados, the reasons given by some is that he is afraid of the Premier, or he expects a job or he has been bought out. On the other hand, if you favour, as the Opposition does, Independence within a Federation, all other motives are imputed to you. There are two schools of thought. I am not going to say like those who have criticised the members of the Government that because a man favours Independence within a Federation, he has not got the interest of Barbados at heart if that person is sincere in his convictions. The fundamental principle is that a man or woman must be sincere in his or her convictions even if they are wrong, and a person's character should not become involved if he is in favour of either.

Mr. Speaker, all kinds of slanderous remarks were used. A man could be good for 364 days of the year, and if he goes one side or the other for one day he becomes the worst individual in the world. I cannot subscribe to that. I am not only an angry man, but I am a disappointed man. I am disappointed because there are certain persons in this community whom you expect to be responsible, and because your wishes or views are not consonant with theirs, they adopt every kind of tactic and plot to influence you to their side. However, Mr. Speaker, I am not a disillusioned man, because when I vote for this Resolution, as I will tonight, the whole of St. James will be behind me. The question of an election is a matter for the Government, and it does not matter to me whether it is held now, tomorrow or next year.

What in my opinion are the effects of these proposals for the Windward and Leeward Islands? To me the Windward and Leeward Islands are farther away, or are not as within reach of internal self-government as Barbados is of Independence alone. One issue which has puzzled the minds of most people in this country is the break-up of the Federation. Some people were saying that it was the fault of the Government, and when they say the Government, they specify the Premier; others were saying that it was the fault of the Chief Ministers, and others said it was the fault of the British Government. In my own mind, Mr. Speaker, when the British Government not only promised these islands internal self-government but went further to talk Independence to them, it was painfully clear that Barbados should have it. There is an argument that it may be that the British Government is making an attempt to bring these islands up to the status of Barbados, but I am saying, Sir, that Federation will not come by the dictates of the Colonial Office; it will not come by the union of Barbados to these islands; it will come by experience, lapse of time and force of circumstances. One may say that the British Government does not want to force Federation down the throats of the islands, but again it can be argued otherwise. It has been said that during the Federal exercise there was the question of how much money the British Government would guarantee if we were federating, and there was no response to that, while at the same time the British Government gave millions to Malta. But putting that aside, what are we to do? Are we to wait? We are balancing our budget. The position is different with the other islands. Are we to sit and wait until they get self-government and probably go on to Independence for us then to seek Independence for ourselves? It does not seem practical, and shows we are cowards.

Are we to wait, Mr. Speaker, until these islands come from so far behind and attain our level and then probably go beyond for us then to act as though we have suddenly awakened from sleep and say we want Independence, when Independence alone for Barbados is the natural course? Few persons, if any, would say Independence within a Federation is not the ideal thing, but we can no longer be idealistic or Utopian in our outlook. We have to be practical, and what is the practical thing to do today? There were certain things which the Hon. Premier mentioned and which, if I understood him correctly, could not be mentioned before because of their confidential nature, and they have not been contradicted. If the inexperience, the shuffling, the going forward and going backward, and the frustration being caused by the inconsistency of the Chief Ministers in the islands are correct and there is nothing to the contrary, there is no other course but to forget them for the moment. I maintain that there will be a union of these islands by force of circumstances, and I am emphatic that Federation cannot come through the dictates of any superior country. The time will come when they will have political independence, and then after a lapse of time, experience no doubt and force of circumstances, they will one day realise that we must move forward; we must have a nation.
3.15 a.m.

Now, Sir, I am going to be frank with you tonight. I have been talking with quite a few persons and they are convinced about the arguments put forward by this Government that Barbados should go it alone. That is what persons have told me. All that some say otherwise is, "Are you trusting Barbados in Barrow's hands?" I will say this. The present Premier of Barbados is not the first Premier and I do not think he will be the last. Every Barbadian, every West Indian man or woman has a price, and that price is not measured in terms of money. The same tide that is carrying Barbados ashore to Independence will in no way uproot the foundation of the liberty of the subject. I say that seriously.

It is true to say that this debate has been one of the most discussed in this country, but other subjects of importance have been discussed. There have been different views by the Government and the Opposition, but that has not interfered with the liberties of the subject. Therefore, I say who is afraid of any Premier is a coward first, and must die many times before his death.

Sir, I told those people who were a bit chary that you would have a Constitution and safeguards written into it. But those people replied: "Look what has happened in Ghana and Tanzania, and those other countries!" We are in Barbados: have no fear. There are members in this Government and on this side of the House — and I am one of them -- who would not be prepared to let any Premier do anything which would shake the foundation of the subject. I would be the first to die. I am just saying that because I think I am known for my strong views.

Now, Sir, I want to make this clear. Since I signed that amendment, I kept away from any Minister or Party member. If I had to speak with them, I never declared my stand on this matter. That has been even so with my own brother, and I do not think anybody has the sort of love for him better than I. I want to make it clear that my changed decision to support this Resolution for Independence has not been caused by any member of the Party, by any Minister, or by any person supporting the Party. The decision I have taken as a member of the Government has been taken after careful consideration of the circumstances and the suggestions I have got from the people in my own constituency as to their views about Independence.

Mr. Speaker, it is getting late — or early -- but I am going to crave your indulgence to quote from an editorial written in the "Truth" newspaper. I regard the "Truth" as an up-to-date newspaper. In the editorial of the 5th January, 1966, it was stated that I was a member of the Cabinet. I was never a member of the Cabinet. I was never a member of the Regional Council of Ministers. I am not associated with any clique politically. I know nothing about it. What I did was to sign that amendment. I have no axe to

grind for any politician or any member of the House. Some of the members of the Opposition are my friends, but none is my real friend. There are just cordial relations between us. We were never very close friends, nor are we enemies. What I say, I say squarely and fairly. I congratulate the editor of the "Truth" in writing this editorial, but it is not favourable to me although my name has been mentioned along with my colleague, the hon. junior member for St. Philip. There is no trickery on my part.

Reference was made that if I support this Resolution now, what would my clients think of me as a lawyer. I say this. I sit here not as a lawyer, not as a banker, not as a grocer, not as a dealer, but as a human being and as a representative of the people in the House of Assembly. Further, I would say that even as a lawyer sometimes I take a case and go into court and, Mr. Speaker, you know very well when you have certain instructions which you take in good faith and go in court working on those instructions, after the first witness gives evidence and you cross examine that witness, you must ask your client to indicate to the judge that he would like to change his plea. You then may get a short adjournment. You know that if you persist with the case that you will waste the court 's time and you will end up in a way that your client may find himself in jail. In a civil suit for damages, after the case has got half-way, you may find that it is best to throw in the sponge and by so doing, the damages and costs to your client may be cut.
3.25 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, if you enjoy the pleasure of a thing -- things have their pleasure and also their sacrifice. There is nothing which is worthy to be attained if it does not entail some form of sacrifice. It is not a question of looking at what will happen today, tomorrow or next year. It is not a question of Independence for the Government Party in power; it is not Independence for any particular group of people, but for the island as a whole. It is for the benefit of posterity. The Constitution and all the safeguards which can be found in any problem for Independence would not be for any particular people, party or otherwise; it will be for the island as a whole. It will be for every man, woman and child.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy on this occasion to address this House. I was very sorry to listen to the nonsensical arguments from some of the members on the other side of the House. The Premier did say that he was an angry man and the last speaker also said that he is an angry man. Well, Sir, I am not an angry man, but I am an ashamed man to see that hon. members who have been members of this Chamber for some time have not been able to impress either the House or the Electorate, and after the Hon. Premier had introduced the Resolution one would have expected any self-respecting citizen to have recanted. We still saw that some members on the other side of the House have used their filibustering attitude. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph read out almost all the speeches of hon. members *verbatim* and I have never read or heard of any member of parliament adopting such a low and depraved attitude. When the hon. member came to my speech I did not properly anticipate his ignorance. When he read the first part of it, his advisers might have told him to read that part and not the entire speech. When he came to the second part, he said: "The road to destiny is the road to independence. Towards this goal the country must press on." It is true that those words were not expressed in the same tone as was the first part of the speech, but it may be he had to read them in that way.

As to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, one who was a school teacher, one would have expected that he would have set a better example. For children who are growing up to take an example from such a model, surely it was regrettable. Even the members of the Opposition recited *en bloc* their speeches on the platforms for the past couple of months and I was not disappointed at the stand which they took. The hon. senior member for St. Peter made a very intelligent approach to the subject so that any boy or girl who was listening to his speech would have something to emulate. I was happy to see the Leader of the Trade Union take such an honest stand. The members on the opposite side of t he House who, it was thought, thought favourably of the Resolution took a different turn. It is not an easy task to convince the majority, but when an occasion such as this presents itself, surely one must feel happy to be in the presence of such a person.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of visiting all the islands in the Eastern Caribbean, but none of those hon. members took the trouble of running about the islands and fortifying the people. I saw the situation at first hand in the islands, and I told the Hon. Premier that it was a correct thing for him to introduce this Resolution because I thought that some of the people in these islands were jealous of the Hon. Premier. As far as I can see, they felt that the Premier was of too great a calibre. As to the other Premiers, I compared them with the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. junior member for St. Peter. They are of that stature intellectually and otherwise.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order. Is the hon. member making personal reference to my intellectual stature? Whatever that is, Sir, he could never attain to it.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Peter in the course of his remarks on this Resolution said these words:-

"Are we to close the door to Federation now, because if we go into Independence the door would have been closed". And he said that within twenty-five years we will be desirous of coming into Federation.
3.35 a.m.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has misquoted me. I never used the word "desirous". Let him refer to Hansard if he wants to quote me correctly.

Mr. BATSON: The hon. junior member for St. Peter went on to talk about manufacturing similar items, and said what a calamity it would be for the islands if Barbados went independent alone. If you go into Independence or Federation, the items will still be manufactured and the people who have money and require them must buy them. That is the type of argument we had to sit down and tolerate.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the point remains that there would be a cessation in the manufacture of products here, and there is the likelihood that we would find ourselves with the products manufactured in this island on our hands. The hon. member does not understand words, and I pardon him.

Mr. BATSON: The hon. junior member for St. Peter went on to say that this talk of Independence is causing some druggists who travel around the islands and trade to lose their self respect, and they are not permitted to go into respectable homes.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say "druggists". The hon. member is misquoting me and he had better refer to Hansard. I am not here to assist him.

Mr. BATSON: I may tell the hon. junior member for St. Peter that I have had the privilege of visiting some of these druggists, and they have told me that they would be happy if Barbados became independent, because they would be able to establish their identity as citizens of a nation. Of course the hon. member has to retract his statement because he is ashamed and the forces are against him.

Mr. HUSBANDS: On a point of order, I am not retracting any statement. The hon. member is continually misquoting me and I am not here to assist him, but I will put him right.

Mr. BATSON: I am happy to see that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is getting up so often. I hope that when election time comes he will be getting down faster than he is getting up here.

Mr. Speaker, imagine the hon. junior member for St. Joseph making a statement in this Honourable Chamber in the hearing of intelligent people to the effect that if the islands did not buy goods from us, what would become of us and our goods. Imagine that coming from Mr. Fix-it-Right who opens on Sundays and gets extra work because the people who can do the work are closed. The hon. member has motor cars coming to him on Sundays to get tyres fixed when the other places are closed, and he is doing a handsome trade to make himself independent. This sort of thing is very disgraceful.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Dominica for a short while and I attended a political meeting. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph reminds me of Mr. Baron, the ex-Chief Minister. During the course of his speech at the political meeting, some of the people in the audience inquired about the $2 million which the Canadian Government had given to erect two secondary schools. One was constructed and some of the people asked about the other school. Mr. Speaker, do you know what he told them? He said that the other school was in St. Kitts. That is the kind of politician we have to deal with in this enlightened age, when every man, woman and child of ability is looking to Independence.

I can talk, Mr. Speaker, because no man can say that I have ever asked him for a job. I have always been independent. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that some people believe that after Independence they would not have to work. What kind of people could entertain that thought? When people leave their homes and go looking for some kind of enlightenment from people of this House at public meetings, that is the kind of argument they get, and when they return home they find their houses broken. One member on the other side said that these poor honest St. Lucians work for less because they are hard workers. Imagine that! The hon. senior member for St. Peter works hard at the Union to raise the standard of living of these workers and asks for increased wages for them, but the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is encouraging employers to employ cheap labour, which is a contradiction of the philosphy of the Barbados Workers' Union. For a leader who claims to be a Socialist to encourage employers to rob employees by employing cheap labour and then selling the commodities expensively is detrimental to the economy of this country.

When this Government took office on 18th December, 1961, there was a Federation in being and therefore the Government had to support the Federation. After that Federation collapsed, this Government was asked to do its best in order to establish a new Federation and a very successful attempt was made; but during the course of three and a half years, it was discovered that some of the leaders in the islands were not true Federalists, and this Government decided that it would not only be a waste of taxpayers' money, but a waste of time. I have had the privilege like some hon. members of travelling to the Mother Country, and when I went to Ireland, I was asked by a Member of Parliament there when my country was going to be independent, as he had heard of the independence of Jamaica and Trinidad. My answer was that my Government was working towards that end.
3.45 a.m.

The people in those big countries are watching Barbados and asking us when are we going to take our place in United Nations. We want to be internationally recognised and those persons are not opposed to us. We want to stand in United Nations to express the things Barbados needs to express.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to cut short my address and I do so wholeheartedly because I see that the Hon. Premier has just taken his seat and I can understand what is going to happen. I admonish hon. members of the other side before they make their last plunge – they still have the opportunity; the vote is not yet taken – to change their views and vote in favour of this Resolution. Some people get on platforms and express a certain point of view, but then when the time comes for them to make a decision, they make it in the opposite direction. Let it be seen that you vote in the right direction. Let it be seen in the newspapers that all members of the Barbados House of Assembly recorded their vote in favour of Barbados becoming a nation.

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would be failing in my duty if I did not speak on this Resolution. It is true that we hope to have this Resolution discussed finally today.

Sir, if you were keeping yourself up-to-date with the history of Barbados you will remember that as far back as July, in 1663, you will find that Lord Willoughby made a Declaration of Independence and that was even against the desire of Parliament. The Legislature of this country was of the opinion that Barbados should be independent although the British Government was against it. They tried to demand that two members of the Parliament should sit in the House of Commons to represent Barbados. That was the mentality of the Legislature of this Island at that time. They always felt that Barbados was independent; so, Mr. Speaker, from 1663 you will see that they meant that Barbados should be free and independent.

Now, Sir, I believe when they first attempted Federation, it was done as a protest from giving Independence to this Island. The first attempt was made in 1711. That attempt failed and after 87 years another attempt was made. That was in 1798 and that attempt also failed. If we were to notice carefully, it took a breathing space between these attempts. Thirty-five years after, another attempt was made and that was in 1833.

Mr. Speaker, thirty-six years after, they made another attempt and two years after that the Leeward Islands came together. But then seven years after – and I believe that most of the Barbadians around me should remember -- there was another attempt at Federation. That was in 1876 and that is the only Federation which Barbadians knew about up to the time of 1958 when The West Indies Federation was established. The 1876 Federation was one which caused eight lives in Barbados.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, to show that there were many attempts made to federate these islands, but each time they failed. When you look into the matter, you will find that prejudice has caused these to fail. There was another attempt in 1885 and all these attempts, according to the hon. senior member for St. Peter, failed.

In 1947, which happens to be sixty-two years after, another attempt was made at Federation and that attempt dragged on and on from that time until the West Indies Federation was established in 1958. It is true, Mr. Speaker, to say that that Federation lasted four years and then another attempt was made at Federation. This time there have been three and a half years of consultation and you will find that over eighteen members of this Party made a contribution in favour of Federation.
3.55 a.m.

You can see the zeal that was placed on Federation for the establishment of it. I find that in the THE VOICE OF ST. LUCIA Mr. Bousquet decided to join in a Federation with Barbados. In that way, you would have had rich Barbadians and poor St. Lucians to join a Federation with Barbados; you would have had the educated hierarchy in Barbados and the poor scrubbers in St. Lucia. He also said as to the Federal Capital that if that were put in Barbados, you would not be doing the right thing if the Capital had been re-sited. All of these things Mr. Bousquet had said and he said quite a lot more. Imagine Mr. Bousquet being a Minister of the Government of St. Lucia, and in his fury the end of the Federal Draft Scheme came by his tearing it up! It is true that I contributed to the support of Federation, but after hearing what a Minister in the Government of St. Lucia had done, I completely changed my mind. After the White Paper was laid, I felt it appropriate to support my Party and thereby support the principle of Independence for Barbados. It is true that in 1964, Sir Ellis Clarke, C.M.G., of Trinidad and Tobago, had to re pre-

sent Barbados at the United Nations, and this is what he said:-

"If, Mr. Chairman, freedom means freedom to starve, freedom to be unemployed, freedom to see chaos replace law and order, above all freedom to become the satellite of the highest bidder, then these countries indeed are being offered freedom. But if freedom implies the right to an infrastructure which gives a reasonable possibility of standing on one's own feet and seeking to solve one's problems with self-respect, of finding food, shelter and employment for one's citizens, of taking one's independent place in the family of nations, then freedom is certainly being denied to our neighbours and relatives."

Mr. Speaker, it is freedom which we are seeking today and although we have been opposed to Independence for Barbados, I am happy to think that within a few minutes from now, whenever the vote is taken, we will have a unanimous vote for Independence. Barbados has enjoyed its self-respect without any internal strife throughout the years. It is true that we differed at times, but I am sure that the opposition is not against Independence for Barbados and we will see a recording of the vote in favour of Independence for Barbados.

I remember that during our campaign in 1961 after I saw that victory was in sight, I told the Premier this: "Let us stop talking politics and tell the people how to vote." Now I see that victory is here and I would say: "Let us appeal to the Opposition for a unanimous vote." The Hon. Leader of the House has asked me to speak for only five minutes and I will therefore end up by quoting one of the favourite words of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew: "The ship is on the right course. We have the current and the port is Independence." Therefore, we are going, Mr. Speaker, the ship will sail into port a few hours from now.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, it is true that on this occasion if I did not say a few words on this Resolution, I would not be doing my duty to the people of Barbados. In the first place, I am proud to say that we have Independence.
4.05 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this Chamber, I came as an infant willing to learn, and if I had to depend upon many of the speeches and many of the rantings and ravings from senior members of this Parliament, I would be displaying what I saw displayed here yesterday. Let us consider all the aspects of Independence, and all the things we can gather therefrom. Children are born and parents take control of them; but there comes a time when the child says to his father "I am a grown up, it is time for me to seek my own livelihood and independence in this world".

Mr. Speaker, it is nothing new where Barbados is concerned. Independence was always in the offing for this country. In 1962 I supported Federation, but in 1966 after realising all the indifference that has transpired to pull the people of Barbados down to the lowest ebb in the sight of the nations of the world, I can do nothing else but support the Resolution for Independence. With Independence we must all realise that we must go forward with a united front and with harmony; not for one sector of the community and not the next, because when we go forward we go forward for Barbados. It is not my intention to belittle St. Lucia, Dominica or else, but this will be a striking example and a lesson to them that if they do not fight to develop their territories and join the economic structure, they will be found wanting.

Mr. Speaker, when I sat here and heard certain remarks from certain hon. members on the opposite side, it gave me a shiver to think that in the Twentieth Century people could still be thinking in the Eighteenth Century, because any person who is not prepared to measure freedom in its true context is not yet ready to take part in this exercise.

There is a certainty, Mr. Speaker, that within a few minutes more this Resolution will be passed, and Barbados will be an independent country for the betterment of the people of Barbados.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am exercising my right in spite of the fact that the amendment which was given notice of will not be accepted. The amendment reads as follows:-

"To omit all the words after convene and to substitute the following words therefor:-

"After the holding of elections in Barbados to decide whether Barbados shall proceed to independence, within a Federation comprised of such territories in the Eastern Caribbean as are willing to join in such an association, or alone, a conference representative of all political parties to arrange for the implementation of the decision taken and for the constitutional, financial, defence and other measures for the establishment of an independent nation at the earliest possible time."

This brings us practically to the end of the debate, and in putting in this amendment, we conscientiously feel that we are doing the right thing, and therefore, Sir, I do not think there should be much time wasted upon it. All that could have been said for and on behalf of Independence alone and for and on behalf of Independence within a Federation has been said.

I was very happy that the hon. junior member for Christ Church did not refer to the hon. senior member for St. Peter as a political rogue. The hon. senior member for St. Peter castigated three of us over here -- the hon. senior member for St. Michael, the hon. junior member for Bridgetown and myself -- for being black men, having no respect for our heritage and having no right to be anything but Socialists.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, only a political fool would speak about another person's right. You have a right to be anything. I did not say that he had a right to be a Socialist, because I would never expect the hon. member in his life to be a Socialist since he does not understand what Socialism means.
4.15 a.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is a matter of opinion; it is too early in the morning for us to have any controversy on this matter. This amendment has come from the three of us, but members of the Barbados Labour Party are in the same frame of mind; therefore, do not say that this has come from the Conservatives alone. It represented the authentic view of the Socialists who are of another group. All of us have one conviction, and it is a conviction of thousands of people in this community.

Mr. Speaker, we stand by this and we do not see any reasons to change our views. We feel that we would do the same thing if this Resolution were to be debated the next six months. However, I see that you have decided to run it through in spite of this amendment and although we warned you that such is not a wise step.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member of the three hon. members who are yet entitled to speak on this matter, desirous of doing so, the Learned and Hon. senior member for St. John can avail himself of this opportunity, if he desires, to reply.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I should like to assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and my friends on this side that he has a democratic right to move the amendment; but I am questioning whether one should move amendments to things of a national character which in truth and in fact would turn out to be a substantive motion aimed at dividing the House on the Government's Resolution. However, I do not have the right to challenge his right in bringing in his amendment.

I will not attempt to be long in my reply. My function merely is to deal with some points of substance which may have been raised by hon. members on the other side

during the course of the discussion or to elucidate or to clarify some points which may appear to be somewhat obscure. My colleagues have been very studious during my absence, and I assure hon. members on the opposite side that even although I was not here for the greater part of the time when they were speaking, I have been keeping in touch with the course of the debate. As Your Honour had pointed out, the function of the Hon. Leader of the House is to be present, and he is the person who keeps closer to the debate in order to answer any point which may arise from the opposite side.

As far as I can see, there are no points of substance. I cannot term them speeches with which the Assembly was treated because those speeches had been made time and time again and were a mere repetition. They were well rehearsed by the speakers on the other side.

When I started this debate, I said that I was an angry man and as the debate continued, I was overwhelmingly filled with compassion because of the exhibition which hon. members on the opposite side put up in order to exculpate themselves from the position which they had put themselves in for the sake of gaining reward and for any glory which would inure in times like this, as the glory of fighting on the side of might rather than fighting on the side of right.

We always make miscalculations. I think a democracy can function if there is a true understanding of the nature and principles of democracy. It is essential that there should be some kind of dialogue between those who govern and those who are governed; between those in the seat of authority and those who are on the other side. It is essential that a continual dialogue should be kept going on between the parties. The mistake which was made by the Opposition was their jumping to conclusions. They made assumptions which may turn out to be valuable, but they did not avail themselves of the facility as representatives of the people to consult because they jumped at what they thought was an opportunity to destroy this Party.

I want to say, as I said before, that the first person to whom I made any disclosure was the Hon. Leader of the Opposition – other than one or two members of the Regional Council of Ministers -- and I explained to him, his assistant or his deputy, with the hon. senior member for St. Peter and the hon. senior member for St. Philip in Your Honour's office, what was the position. I would not like to say that we discussed the matter together until the wee hours of the morning, but I would say up to a late hour of the night.
4.25 a.m.
The amazing thing is that the people of the Opposition have always looked to us as being slightly ingenuous in having these discussions with the other territories. There are quite a lot of things which could be said. I understand that the hon. senior member for St. Philip went into a long harangue and diatribe completely irrelevant to the great issue at all. He is a man who had the privilege of membership of the Government and who had been brought back into political society with his colleagues. If he chooses to go into the political wilderness that is a matter for him, but no one else is going with him. The hon. member miscalculated things because he thought that he had so many people with him in March last year. I do not think that anyone misled him, and if he is now sitting there in this Chamber in this year of grace 1966, the same year which coincides with our Independence and it also coincides with the end of his political career, he only has himself to blame. I do not have any compassion for anybody on the other side; if they choose to commit political suicide, it is a matter for them. What I very much deplore is that members of this House, responsible members of the community, should get together and try to destroy the credit and the fair name of Barbados outside of this territory and inside of it, but more so outside of it, where the people of this country would not have been aware of what was going on.

During my opening remarks I said that I deplored people from other political parties coming into this country, availing themselves of the hospitality of the people of Barbados and at the same time they are trying to undermine the Government and the people of this country and I called names. We have to evolve these blessings of our own in the West Indies. We must not be satisfied with second-hand blessings. We are fortunate in the West Indies in having people like Mr. Norman Manley and Dr. Eric Williams who can criticise any country, but certain things were done here which would never have been tolerated in any other Caribbean territory. I am not discussing any Federal Constition. I am not telling the hon. junior member for St. Peter that I think the Declaration of Human Rights should go into the Constitution because we are not discussing that. We have to go back to the people who have to preside over our destinies, who have been presiding over our destinies for all of these years, and we will have given them our Constitution already. Fortunately, the transition is one which we can make. The kind of Constitution which we will adopt was brought into operation when His Excellency the Governor made his Speech from the Throne. The White Paper was a cold-blooded recital of facts, and anybody except some people who have no right, and who were not in a position, to know what was going on – nobody has been able to refute a single fact which has been set out there. It showed why we are getting out of it. If some of the members on the other side of the House who were filibustering for the last 24 hours had read the White Paper, by the time that they got half way through, they would have realised what was happening over all these years.

Mr. Speaker, it is nonsensical to give the impression, whether in the newspaper or otherwise, that the Secretary of State for the Colonies can tell this Government when the Elections are to be held in Barbados. The Elections in Barbados will be held on or before the 4th of December, 1966. That is all we know and it is all we need to know. I gave this House the assurance that the Elections could only be held beyond that date if this House had made an amendment to the Representation of the People Act. You have the ex-Senator 'Pope', like the hon. senior member for St. Philip, a man who in British Guiana in March, 1965, sat around a table along with the Hon. Minister of Education and myself and told us that we are impugning the Government of Barbados and should not even attend the next meeting, but should serve notice on the other territories to clear out of the premises.
4.35 a.m.

This is the colleague now of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown and the hon. senior member for St. Philip. The hon. senior member for Bridgetown would not know that the same Senator said that in no circumstances should British Guiana be allowed to get Independence before Barbados, and that the Hon. Minister of Education pointed out to him that it would not be possible for Barbados to have the constitutional instruments handed over by Her Majesty, and he said that Barbados is a special case. This is a year ago. This is a member of my Cabinet who guided the White Paper in the Other Place; this is a man who after discussion with the Prime Minister of British Guiana – a fact which you know about -- and with the now Sir Lionel Luckoo who was appointed to be High Commissioner for British Guiana in London, when I had been asked by the Prime Minister of British Guiana to view the fact of the long association of that gentleman in that territory in a high tradition, and that he would be acceptable to the people of British Guiana to represent us jointly in Canada -- before the White Paper was published, the Senator said "You had better give me Washington"; and this is the man who would get on a platform and say that he is in favour of a Federation with the Leeward and Windward Islands who are not in favour of a Federation with Barbados.

As I said before, Sir, it is remarkable to relate that during this long crisis of three months not one single island has held a single meeting or sent a message to the Secretary of State asking him to convene a Conference either with themselves or with Barbados, either a Conference on Federation alone or a Conference of Federation with Barbados. We are asking them to have a Conference on Independence within a Federation, but they have not asked for a Conference on Federation at all! They have asked for a

meeting to set up their own premises in London. We have all the files here. They had made conditions so intolerable that when the former Minister of Trade returned from his excursions to Italy when we had sent him to Geneva -- he had spent more time in Italy and was rejected by the Government.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, on my return from Italy, I submitted a document to the Cabinet which was not rejected by the Cabinet and on which further action was projected, and I propose to public it in the newspapers of this colony to explain what was the nature of that report and why I went to Italy.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not know how that is a point of order, but up to now the hon. member has not submitted any more information on a project which my Ministers said was an invitation to carry on a large scale transfer of traffic in the other direction of young Barbadian families to Italy where they could not speak the language, and his colleague, Mr. Ward, did not agree. I do not want to say what I thought about it, because up to now he has not presented us with the details.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, that is not correct. The hon. member just said that I gave the Cabinet a report. What more details does he want? The Cabinet set a proposed action which he knew was impossible; but the report was not rejected.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Every time they get and make these statements, I will only ask them one thing: if I present a certified copy of the Cabinet Paper to His Honour the Speaker showing that the hon. member had presented a skeleton – I would not like to say hastily drawn up -- proposal, and we asked for details, and he was to present the report but retired from politics in the mean time.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: If I presented a report, how I could I present another report? Do you want two reports?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would not worry to go into that and what this Government thinks about that kind of thing. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is there. After years of agitation by the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sugar Producers' Association to send a tripartite team to Geneva to the International Labour Organisation Conference, a meeting which lasted some twenty-one to twenty-three days, we sent the hon. senior member for St. Philip, and the records of the proceedings show that the hon. senior member for St. Philip attended between four and five days out of twenty-three and was absent all the rest of the time.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, that is not correct and the records are there which I can publish in this country. As a matter of fact, Sir, the hon. senior member for St. Peter some days after.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us not have this question and answer. It is early in the morning and some of us are not as fresh as we might be. I would not assure you that I am.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, I am very sorry for Your Honour, but I am quite fresh.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. senior member for St. Peter was there. Anyhow I will not waste time on the hon. member; he will be dealt with. What I do not understand is that people can be so hypocritical that they can get up and say things they do not know to be true for the sake of political expediency.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I am not having the hon. member accuse me of saying something which is untrue, because the report is there, and I will have it published in the newspapers next week and the island can judge it.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not even discussion that, Sir. I have finished with that. We are not exporting domestic servants, because we have a country and we have to get away from this concept of petit bourgeois people aspiring to a different stratum of society and different types of association saying that they are going to find jobs for domestic servants in foreign countries where they cannot even speak the language. They would not be interested in Independence; they would be interested in slave traffic in the opposite direction. It used to come from the East to the West, and the ambition which they have for the people of this country is not Independence, but a slave traffic from the West to the East, to the European countries where they only end up in the business of large scale prostitution and organised vice.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order.....

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member is not entitled to get up on a point of order because I have not called his name.

Mr. CRAWFORD: When they go to Canada they go to be prostitutes too!

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order!

Hon. E. W. BARROW: At least they speak the English Language, and the Eastern Caribbean territories have a Commission in Canada. We will soon have a High Commissioner's Office in Ottawa, and we will have one in New York.

When I passed this building about an hour after the resumption after dinner, I heard the hon. member say that in the neighbouring territory of Trinidad and Tobago there was debate by every Trinidadian before any Resolution was passed. I was in Trinidad a couple of weeks before that. I had gone to see Dr. Williams. Nobody said that it was not in the mnnifesto of the Trinidad and Tobago People's National Movement that Trinidad and Tobago wanted Independence. They had elections on the same day that we had them.
4.45 a.m.

Shortly after or before the days of the elections coincided around the 8th, 9th or 10th November, I went to see Dr. Williams and spent a whole night sitting down beside the swimming pool at Crown Point Hotel and I had a conversation with him. I took off from Tobago at five minutes to six the next morning and spent the whole night with Dr. Williams, with the Education Officer and the Financial Secretary Secretary sitting on the opposite side. I asked Dr. Williams what he intended to do and he said he did not know. I showed him our Manifesto and told him: "if you cannot tell me, we would have to come and demand it." This is on the record and any hon. member can refute that. I told him that the day of the opening of the Legislature was the 19th of December and that we had won the Government of the country. He said that the first thing we should do is to abolish the Legislative Council and we said that we were going to abolish it from the first of May. Dr. Williams kept on and on insisting that I should abolish the Legislative Council before we had an opening of the House and I said that we had no machinery to do so.

When we arrived in Trinidad on the 17th December, there would have been no discussion of the Legislature on Independence. Dr. Williams picked the time from the Opposition for discussing the matter, but not in the Legislature. When the Right Honourable Reginald Maudling came along they fixed the date between them. The date was fixed in Trinidad without going to the Legislature and the hon. senior member for St. Philip said that I was misleading the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In May 1961, long before, Dr. Williams had a meeting in Woodford Square after he and Sir Grantley Adams had a row.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you. I am making my speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. senior member for St. Philip risen on a point of order?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I heard it myself when I was in the House and I discussed it in the Legislature, I said that Dr. Williams had over 280 delegates from every single type of organization in Trinidad and discussed the Constitution which they drafted before Dr. Williams went to England. That is the gospel truth.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point is that 260 people from outside could not be the Legislature of Trinidad. I want to get this clear, Mr. Speaker. What I am against is the deliberate attempt made by people to completely misrepresent what is taking place. We have a system of democracy from which Parliament is suffering today. When I was elected leader of Her Majesty's Government I was not prepared to discuss anything until I came to the Legislature. What do find? The Hon. Leader of the Opposition did send to the Cabinet some kind of amendment to our Resolution and I feel the proper place for it to be discussed was not in the highways or byeways, but in the Legislature. When you come to a Constitution you have to distinguish between a Resolution on Independence and a Constitution. I am saying that the Trinidad ruling party before they fixed a date with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Right Honourable Reginald Maudling, fixed the date for Independence.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is not correct. As a matter of fact, Dr. Williams had Sir Ellis Clarke in London for over a year before that discussing the Constitution.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is serious; here you have Sir Ellis Clarke in London discussing the Constitution befor the 260 delegates, as the hon. members said, got together to hold a Conference and before anybody said anything at all!

I want to say this. I would not have been angry if it were not for the distortions, the deliberate libels and the defamatory libels which emanated from that side and were published in other foreign newspapers. They got a foreign writer, one John Crocker, to write an article in the "Montreal Star" in order to establish that I was setting up a dictatorship and was going to make myself President for life.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier has said that this matter is sub judice; therefore, I am not willing to discuss that matter at this stage. I will do so if and when the right time comes.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: What I do not understand is how an hon. member like the hon. junior member for Christ Church, who should have enough business acumen, should allow the Editor of the "Bajan" Magazine to question his honesty. Nobody pays much attention to him. Then he can associate with people like the hon. senior member for St. Philip who can only ruin the economy of the country and pull down the people of Barbados. We can understand the hon. junior member for Christ Church. They have business in St. Lucia and they are afraid. However, they had this business long before the talk of Federation; and if he treats people right and he does not discriminate, if he pays proper wages to people of a certain pigmentation, his business will begin to thrive.

Mr. SPEAKER: His business has nothing to do with Federation and this debate.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: When he allows himself to be led by somebody like the hon. senior member for St. Philip and goes to a newspaper and talks about dictatorship and making me a Life President, I just want him to know that this House passes the laws; I do not pass any laws.

4.55 a.m.

Some people in this island have the inexhaustible potential for doing wrong all the time. It is absolutely difficult for them to do right. Even if it is in their interest to do right, they will do wrong. This Document states exactly what we said three years earlier and I did not fully quote it. The last thing I was told in January 1961 was that I do not know what is going to happen to Trinidad; I was told that Barbados should be independent within the next three years, and we are wasting our time with these people. I did not accept what was told to me. I deserve all the vilification for being stupid. I do not mind that; I will handle that situation myself, but I resent the attempt of a Barbadian to pull down the Government; he cannot pull down this Government at all. They want us to hold a Conference with him, the Chief Minister of St. Lucia. Governments should help Governments, but we have splinter factions in opposite parties. When the Chief Minister of St. Lucia came to Trinidad, what did he do? He told me to tell the then Secretary of State for the Colonies Mr. Maudling that Federation was nonsense and that his Party was committed to a Unitary State with Trinidad. That is the man whose praises are being lauded to the skies. In this document there is the Declaration of Independence. There is no meeting of the Legislature and no White Paper. This is what it says:-

"AND WHEREAS the Federal Government, the smaller Territories of the Federation, even Jamaica itself, and the opposition both internal and external, to PNM in Trinidad and Tobago, have, since the Jamaica referendum, embarked on a campaign to substitute for the disintegrated Federation of 10 Territories a truncated Eastern Caribbean Federation of nine Territories and to bring pressure on Trinidad and Tobago to participate in such a Federation,

AND WHEREAS a Federation of the Eastern Caribbean will involve a nation of 1 1/2 million people with a revenue in 1959 of $219 million and an import trade of $593 million, as compared with the original Federation of over three million people with a revenue of $376 million and an import trade of $922 million,

AND WHEREAS Trinidad and Tobago will occupy in such an Eastern Caribbean Federation a position which it represents 55 per cent of the population, 75 per cent of the import trade, 75 per cent of total revenue, 80 per cent of income tax revenue, 65 per cent of revenue from import duties, 73 per cent of total expenditure, and in which in comparison with the eight other territories in 1959 it had a revenue of $133 million as against $50 million, an income tax revenue of $55 million as against $12 million, an import trade of $448 million as against $145 million an expenditure of $167 million as against $73 million;

AND WHEREAS a Federation of the Eastern Caribbean in which Trinidad and Tobago will have to assume major responsibility for a net public debt of $46 million in other territories, will involve, in return merely an additional potential market of 670,000 consumers with whom Trinidad and Tobago out of a total external trade of $897 million, now enjoys an annual trade of a mere $16 million, more than half of which represents export of oil, cement and fertilisers,....."

This is not like our statement which first saw the light of day when it came in here. I am not interpolating any words; I am quoting it exactly. This is what it goes on to say:

"AND WHEREAS there are signs that the Jamaican proposals which led to the break up of the original Federation are being increasingly followed by injudicious duplication of such industries as cement, beer, oil refining in some of the very units which would comprise such an Eastern Caribbean Federation,

AND WHEREAS the six best Caribbean Markets in Trinidad and Tobago's exports over the six-year period

1955-60 were in order of priority Curacao, British Guiana, Jamaica, Surinam, Barbados and Guadeloupe, five of which are countries outside of the proposed Eastern Caribbean Federation and provide more valuable outlets for Trinidad and Tobago's oil exports than the Eastern Caribbean Territories which accounted for $60 million of the total of $279 million exported by Trinidad and Tobago to all Caribbean areas in these six years, or 2.6 per cent of Trinidad and Tobago's total domestic exports to the world in this period;

AND WHEREAS the eight smaller territories of the Eastern Caribbean have adverse trade balances which would constitute for Trinidad and Tobago the nucleus of a serious problem in any Eastern Caribbean Federation,

AND WHEREAS the cost of administration -- executive, legislative and judicial -- in the West Indies is particularly high, amounting to $9 1/2 million in 1960-61, of which the Federal Government accounted for $1.58 million, the Windward and Leeward Islands for $1.56 million, Barbados for $0.58 million, as compared with $2.9 million for Trinidad and Tobago;

AND WHEREAS the smaller territories of the Eastern Caribbean with the exception of Barbados are grant-aided by the United Kingdom to the extent of some 20 per cent of their annual expenditure exclusive of Capital grants, the four Windward Islands, for example with a population of 314,000 and a revenue of $16 million, of which $7 million come from import duties and $2.6 million from income tax and having an annual expenditure of over $22 million and a net public debt of over $18 million, receive $5 1/2 million annually from the United Kingdom by way of grant-in-aid, and have received capital grants from the United Kingdom averaging over $2 1/2 million annually for the past 10 years;

AND WHEREAS the recent decisions of the United Kingdom Government to apply for entry into the European Common Market and to control West Indian immigration into Britain will inevitably impose even greater economic and social hardships on an Eastern Caribbean Federation comprising nine units with their present unintegrated economies and the current disparity in their levels of development, illustrated by a comparison in the 1957 Gross Domestic Product at factor cost per capita which was $822 for Trinidad and Tobago, $443 for Barbados, $259 for the Leeward Islands and $240 for the Windward Islands;

AND WHEREAS these hardships on the smaller Eastern Caribbean Territories will automatically expose Trinidad and Tobago to all the difficulties and dislocations of unrestricted freedom of movement forshadowed by the migration from the eight smaller territories of over 10,000 to Trinidad and Tobago in 1958 and 1959, and nearly 37,000 to the United Kingdom between 1958 and September 1961, as compared with the migration of less than 5,500 from Trinidad and Tobago to the United Kingdom during the same period;

AND WHEREAS the population of the smaller territories is increasing at a rapid rate (in some cases over 3 per cent annually) the proportion of females being 53 per cent and over in all territories, the proportion of young persons under 15 years of age being over 40 per cent rising to almost one half of the total population in the case of St. Vincent, the proportion being 40 per cent between the ages of 15 and 45, and 20 per cent over the age of 45, freedom of movement in an Eastern Caribbean Federation would impose a serious strain on the resources of Trinidad and Tobago in terms of school places, maternity hospitals, housing accommodation, social security, old age pensions and competition for jobs....."

This must be in the record. You can get up at a public meeting and tell people anything and then they cannot check it.

5.05 a.m.

Dr. Williams at no time asked the United Kingdom to make capital grants available for the smaller territories; he wanted Independence for the nation and he was going to carry on from the jump, as you will see from the White Paper. It is all there. The Governments, said Dr. Carleen O'Loughlin, of the territories unanimously asked for a declaration from the United Kingdom and they did not get it. If I really deal with them on the other side, they would have to leave the country; the people would drive them out.

"AND WHEREAS no indication has yet been given by either the United Kingdom or the United States of the extent of financial assistance that would be provided over a number of years at least for the smaller territories to make up for the deficiencies that are being left behind by centuries of mal-administration and under-developed by the United Kingdom;"

Next week will mark four years that Dr. Williams wrote this. Four years after we are in no better position. Trinidad with vast resources of oil has not played the Good Samaritan or rich uncle, and the people who rant and rave say we are taxing the poor man. I read my Budget Speech on the inception when the last Government left us with a deficit. Three months after the Commissioner reported, the House passed a Resolution approving the Civil Establishment increases, and we came into power and had to find every penny, and because we put four cents on rum, people like the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the members on the other side ranted and raved; but now they are willing to pay $4 million or $5 million a year to take over the responsibility of the United Kingdom Government. They could not find $2 million to pay their own school teachers, their own policemen and their own Civil Servants and four cents had to be put on rum. Miss Ursula Hicks in her Report said that Federation would throw a $4.9 million additional burden on the taxpayers of Barbados.

I would be failing in my duty to the people I represent if for sentimental reasons I was at any time afraid to say I had made a try, but I made an honest mistake; it was a waste of time. I am saying that now: it was a regrettable waste of time. They would not help to the extent of offering a single delegate from any of these islands a drink over a period of four years, but pick up money and go to this island and that island trying to cajole and induce the Ministers to come here, and it is my opinion that they have not succeeded because these Ministers know that as a result of the stand that the Government of Barbados has taken, within a month from now they will be going up to the United Kingdom to enjoy a constitutional status that never in their wildest dreams did they anticipate.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members cannot take it now. They are complaining now. They want a coup de grace. They do not like taking a slow, lingering death. If it is tortuous to them to listen now, they will have to listen a little more. I do not intend to adjourn for anybody. I will be magnanimous with them when it comes to discussing the Constitution. I will let the Attorney General and the Ministers discuss the Constitution with them, but I will not sit around a table with them, because they through decency should not sit around a table with a person whom they claim wants to lock up everybody in Barbados, set up a Republic and make himself President for twenty-five years.

Thou, O Lord, will not despise a broken and a contrite heart. I do not know how broken and contrite they feel now. I want them to die a lingering death; so do not worry to hurry me. I am not stopping a long political death, and the

more people interfere with me, the longer I will go on. This is my prerogative. I am Leader of the Government and I think I have the right to wind up this debate, and I am going to wind it up in the manner that I want to wind it up. This is my constitutional right; it is nothing I am arrogating to myself, and I am going on, Sir, because it has got to get down in the records.

"AND WHEREAS it has been estimated that the initial cost of Trinidad and Tobago of independent services such as diplomatic representation abroad....."

Mr. Speaker, a member on his feet is expected to be heard in silence, and I should like you to warn those who are yelping now, all those who have their tails between their legs and cannot bark now, and are infected with rabies that they are not entitled to yelp at this moment when I am on my feet.

"AND WHEREAS it has been estimated that the initial cost of Trinidad and Tobago of independent services such as diplomatic representation abroad, a National Guard, and a University would not exceed the contribution Trinidad and Tobago would have been required to make to the annual Federal revenue of $29 million discussed at the abortive Lancaster House Conference;"

Mr. Speaker, now that the members on the other side know they cannot win, they want to create disorder on the other side. I enjoin you to stop them, and I will finish my speech if I am allowed to; and the strangers in the Gallery should keep quiet as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member calling attention to strangers in the Gallery?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not calling attention to strangers in the Gallery. Why I am doing this is because hon. members got in here and said all kinds of things; they said that somebody told them so-and-so, and everything was said about me, and now that I am getting the facts on the record, nobody wants to listen. They want the job done quickly, but I am not going to let posterity see the record of filthy lies that emanated during the past three months. 5.15 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, you are allowing hon. members on the other side to get disorderly, and I implore you to stop them and let me finish my speech.

I am saying this. I want to get the record straight, although nobody wants to listen. They want the job to be done. I want posterity to record the filthy lies which emanated from hon. members. The hon. junior member for St. George got up and made a statement to the effect that this Government was stampeding the Resolution through the House so that we can get up to the United Kingdom before the other "boys". I want hon. members to understand that if we did not pass it before, at the expiration of three months, which is next week, the Resolution would have died a natural death. Therefore, you can thank the hon. Minister of Education, the Hon. Leader of the House, who has recalled the House to come and debate this Resolution when the House was in recess.

Under a new constitution granted to the Leeward and Windward Islands, they are allowed to make a unilateral declaration of independence after three months have expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is not correct. Where in the world can the hon. member say that the Leewards and Windwards have a period of three months? This is not correct.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The hon. member knows probably more than I know. What really caused the downfall of the hon. member is a question of conceit. If hon. members had come and discussed the matter with me.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: What downfall is he talking about? Is he talking about 1941 or 1966?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to say that there are some people who feel that they know everything and they should not come and ask anybody anything. None of these members on the other side can expect to know anything from me at any time because they have forfeited their right to be even considered as members of this society.

Mr. CRAWFORD: None of us is.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I have been interrupted incessantly and I ask you to rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to remind hon. members of the rule which states that while a Member is speaking, all other Members shall be silent or shall confer only in undertones, and shall not make unseemly interruptions.

Mr. WALCOTT: If the Hon. Premier would give way, I would like to say to him that we have had a long debate, and I feel sure that hon. members want to get home. He may feel angry but it is now after five o'clock. I appeal to the Hon. Premier to see that we have dealt with all the issues already and to satisfy himself. It is after five o'clock and I would like to go home: but I would like to register my vote on the Resolution. Therefore, I am appealing to commonsense; I am not begging.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I appreciate that, but I cannot be expected to accept it normally when I say something and you have a member jumping up and saying "You lie!" (Loud Asides)

All I am saying is this, Mr. Speaker, again I am being interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will do my best: but because of the time, hon. members have not surprisingly become very restless.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am suggesting that members are on the verge of grave disorder. I do not want to be drawn into that trap. If an hon. member from their side was speaking, they would be prepared to sit down and hear what he is saying.

Sir, I just want to say this. As far as this Resolution is concerned, this is not a constitutional debate; I will have a debate on the Constitution. As far as this Government is concerned, anybody can write anything in the newspapers on when to hold elections, but I would decide that. I would decide when and how elections would be held, and the Opposition would be consulted as regards the Constitution. They will not know what I intend to do until I tell them.

Now, Sir, in my introductory speech, I pointed out how previous attempts had been made to impose the will of a foreign Government on this Government; how it was resisted and repulsed. The only reason I am going to quote an extract of a debate which took place in this House many years ago is because I want to end the debate on a high note. It was a speech made by Sir Charles Edward Grey, a Governor of the island in 1844. He came to the Legislature and said:

"You have already the right to say that you and your predecessors on this island have made a portion of that African people to whom the West Indies are so deeply indebted for whatever riches they possess, the happiest individuals of their whole innumerable race which now spreads from the Red Sea to the Andes; that they are in all respects the most favourable specimen of that race which exists and the most full of promise for the future."

He was trying to get the Legislature to have some kind of Federation because the British Government wanted that.

He went on to say:-
5.25 p.m.

"This is your best title to honour and in that source lies also the strength and power which is sufficient, if you please, to unite and assimilate to yourselves the other islands of this Government; and it depends mainly upon your

own choice whether, half a century hence, every square foot of the five Windward Islands shall not be cultivated to the hill tops, and filled with at least half a million of labourers, as full of vigour, as patient of toil, as earnest to subdue the earth to the uses of mankind, as orderly and as well disposed as the people who now live under your immediate rule and guidance with so much benefit to you, and so large a share of contentment and of happiness for themselves."

This is the year 1844. This is an Address from the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Officer administering the Government of Barbados. Compare this with the kind of conduct that went on during the course of this debate. These are people who were not supposed to have any souls. This was the reply from the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Officer Administering the government of Barbados. It states this:

"With respect to the high and proud career which Your Excellency has been pleased to sketch out for Barbados, and to suggest as not beyond her means and capabilities, the House would indeed rejoice to behold her in the lofty and conspicious position in which, by the accomplishment of Your Excellency's views, she would unquestionably be placed; at the same time, without at all desiring either to overrate the difficulties of Your Excellency's Scheme, or to underrrate the resources of the colony, they frankly avow that, at present, they entertain no larger hope for Barbados than that she may continue to move in her present orbit, with her light undimmed and her usefulness and importance undiminished. (Cheers)."

Mr. SPEAKER: There is an amendment to the original motion and, in conformity with Standing Order 23, the amendment will precede the original motion so far as the vote is concerned. Accordingly, the amendment will be put in this way. The question is that the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question. Hon. members who are of that opinion .....

Mr. HUSBANDS: (sitting): Mr. Speaker, would you just refresh us with the wording of the amendment?

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:-

To omit all the words convene and to substitute the following words therefor:-

"After the holding of elections in Barbados to decide whether Barbados shall proceed to independence, within a Federation comprised of such territories in the Eastern Caribbean as are willing to join in such an association, or alone, a conference representative of all political parties to arrange for the implementation of the decision taken and for the constitutional, financial, defence and other measures for the establishment of an independent nation at the earliest possible time.

Mr. WALCOTT: (Sitting) Will Your Honour please read Standing Order 23 and let hon. members understand how the question is to be put?

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 23 reads as follows:-

"1. Upon an amendment to leave out words, the question is proposed from the Chair "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question."

2. Upon an amendment to insert or add words the question is proposed from the Chair "That those words be there inserted."

3. Upon an amendment to leave out words and insert other words instead, a question shall first be proposed from the Chair "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question", and if that question be negatived the question shall then be proposed "That those words be there inserted."

4. When notice has been given of a subsequent amendment to words which are proposed to be left out by a previous amendment, the Chair shall, if possible, propose the question on the first amendment in such form as will enable the subsequent amendment to be moved, if the first is not carried."
5.35 a.m.

Standing Order No. 23 (3) says:-

"Upon an amendment to leave out words and insert other words instead, a queston shall first be proposed from the Chair "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question", and if that question be negatived the question shall then be proposed "That those words be there inserted".

The question is that the words proposed to be omitted stand part.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, hon. members seem not to be clear on what you have put. You have put the question that "the words proposed to be omitted stand part"; so if members vote "No" from the Government side, they would be taking out the original words. They would have to vote "Aye".

The question that the words proposed to be omitted stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES: Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. BATSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. LOWE; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. COWARD; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. CARMICHAEL — 14.

NOES: Mr. CRAWFORD; Mr. HUSBANDS; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SMITH; Mr. SEALEY; Mr. LYNCH; Mr. GODDARD and Mr. MOTTLEY — 8.

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

AYES: Hon. E. W. BARROW; Hon. J. C. TUDOR; Mr. BATSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. LOWE; Mr. YEARWOOD; Mr. CORBIN; Mr. COWARD; Hon. N. W. BOXILL; Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. CARMICHAEL — 14.

NOES: Mr. CRAWFORD; Mr. HUSBANDS; Mr. HOLDER; Mr. SMITH; Mr. SEALEY; Mr. LYNCH; Mr. GODDARD and Mr. MOTTLEY — 8.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: This being a Special Meeting at which there was only one item on the Agenda which has been duly completed, and there being already an adjournment of this House until Tuesday, 11th January, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon, this House now stands adjourned.
5.43 a.m.