

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 29th March, 1966.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M. A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Trade and Labour*).

Prayers were read.

Hon. E. W. BARROW and Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I regret that there are no Minutes yet available for confirmation.

PAPER LAID

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I now lay the Registration Rules, 1966.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 59/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Michael is now ready.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 92/1964 asked by the hon. senior member for the City is now ready.

Mr. HOLDER and Mr. HUSBANDS entered the House and took their seats.

SELECT COMMITTEES REPORT

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that two Select Committees have prepared their Reports and they have handed them in.

The first is with respect to authorising Grace Taylor to erect a groyne and seawall at "Four Aces", Dover, Christ Church.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise Grace Taylor to erect a groyne and seawall at "Four Aces" Dover, Christ Church, met and I beg to present the Report.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next is with respect to George Sugarman to extend and enlarge a parcel of land between Sand Street and the Sea in the parish of Saint Peter.

Mr. HUSBANDS: The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise George Sugarman to extend and enlarge a parcel of land between Sand Street and the Sea in the parish of Saint Peter, met and handed in its Report.

The Select Committee is aware of the fact that under the existing law it cannot proceed any further with this Bill.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time and I am advised that the Reply to Question No. 79/1964 which stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Michael, is ready.

Mr. SEALY: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Will Government as soon as possible repair and extend Glendairy Road, St. Michael to the Gully which separates the said road from Glendairy Prison?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

Consideration will be given to the repair and extension of Glendairy Road up to the Gully which separates the road from Glendairy Prison when the Road Works Programme for the financial year 1966-67 is being prepared.

CONTRACT FOR HILTON HOTEL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next is Question No. 92/1964 which stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

1. Will the Minister state the name of the firm, person or persons awarded the contract for building the Hilton Hotel, and the price at which the contract was originally awarded?

2. If such a contract has been so awarded, will the Minister state whether there has been any revision in the terms and conditions of the said contract since the date of the original award, and the details of such revision (if any)?

3. Will the Minister also state, if any such contract has been awarded, whether such contract has been awarded to a firm, person or persons other than a firm, person or

persons who tendered for same in accordance with the public advertisement in this behalf?

4. If the answer to (3) is in the affirmative, will the Minister give the reasons why?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Question No. 92/1964 is as follows:-

(a) The Contract for the construction of the Hilton Hotel was awarded to Token Construction (Barbados) Co. Ltd. on the basis of a negotiated price of \$3.5 million.

(b) There has been no revision in the terms of contract since the date of original award.

(c) The award of the contract was made on the basis of a negotiated price and not on the basis of the advertisement for tenders published in January, 1964.

(d) The Barbados Development Board in reviewing the tenders in April, 1964, considered that it would be better served if a firm price was offered. Due to the inability of Anglin Norcross, the lowest tenderer, to produce this firm price within the time recommended by the Board, negotiations were entered into with Token and the award of the contract followed these negotiations.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Was the \$3.5 million American or West Indian dollars?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Interpretation Act of 1949 will tell the hon. member.

Mr. GODDARD: Does that contract price include the main building as well as the two ancillary buildings?

Hon. E. W. BARROW: The contract price is not the cost of getting the hotel opened; it is the cost of construction and what I call the mechanical services, which includes electrical services and matters of that kind. The interior decoration, in so far as the Hilton Hotel is concerned, will be negotiated separately by Hilton International Limited.

The cost of the 100 rooms, construction-wise, from the ground floor to the roof will be \$3.5 million and then in addition to that we have 56 additional rooms. Even before we started construction we decided that they would be necessary.

I should also inform hon. members that it is considered necessary to have another 100 rooms on the other side of the hotel.
2.55 p.m.

There are plans for the additional 100 rooms, but we have not embarked on any undertaking to construct these rooms. I do not think that we will construct them for another two years. The cost of these 56 rooms which are being constructed by the Project Manager for the Hilton Hotel, formerly the Director of Highways and Transport, is around \$890,000. Since we have made these plans, we have also decided to construct a swimming pool which is half-way done, as far as I can see. This will be undertaken by the Project Manager, and it will cost another \$30,000 to \$40,000. The Barbados Development Board is now engaging with some of the Commercial Banks in Bridgetown to finance the Shopping Arcade for which they have to have permission. As far as I remember, the cost of that is about \$230,000. Again they are not precise figures. When the Hotel is finished by the end of July this year, the total cost will be more in the vicinity of \$8 million and not \$3.5 million as the newspaper states. We have been mixing up the cost of construction with the overall cost of getting the hotel ready.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only other Question to which the Reply has been laid is Question No. 59/1964 standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, who I observe, is not now in his place.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

SUGARMAN LAND EXTENSION BILL, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Peter:- To move the Third Reading of a Bill to authorise George Sugarman to extend and enlarge a parcel of land between Sand Street and the sea in the parish of St. Peter. The Report of the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and report on this Bill was laid this afternoon by the hon. member.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted. The Report reads as follows:-

"The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise George Sugarman to extend and enlarge a parcel of land between Sand Street and the Sea in the parish of Saint Peter have the honour to submit the following Report:-

1. With the coming into operation of the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Function) (Amendment) Act, 1965-59, power is granted to a Minister to grant a licence to use any lands vested in the Crown in right of its Government of this Island for any purpose or for such purposes as are mentioned in the licence;

2. The Committee are therefore of the opinion that the Bill referred to should be discontinued and application made under the above mentioned Act for a licence for the enlargement of a parcel of land at Sand Street, St. Peter.

Dated this 29th day of March, 1966."

I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to second that.

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

BILL WITHDRAWN

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to withdraw this Bill and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (AFTER A PAUSE) There being no objection, leave is granted. This Bill is now deemed duly to have been withdrawn.

PERCIVAL BASCOMBE PENSION BILL POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip:- To move the Second Reading of a Bill to authorise the Southern District Council to pay to Percival Bascombe a gratuity and pension.

I am informed that this Bill is still in Select Committee.

GRACE TAYLOR (CONSTRUCTION OF GROYNE) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church:- To move the third Reading of a Bill to authorise Grace Taylor to erect a groyne and seawalls at Four Aces, Dover, Christ Church.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the position with this Bill is similar to the one which has been dealt with a while ago. I beg to move that the Report of the Select Committee be adopted.

The Report reads as follows:-

"The Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise Grace Taylor to erect a groyne and seawalls at 'Four Aces', Dover, Christ Church, have the honour to submit the following Report:-

1. With the coming into operation of the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) (Amendment) Act, 1965-59, power is granted to a Minister to grant a licence to use any lands vested in the Crown in right of its government of this island for any purpose or for such purposes as are mentioned in the licence.

2. The Committee are therefore of the opinion that the Bill referred to should be discontinued and application made under the abovementioned Act for a licence for the erection of a groyne and seawalls at 'Four Aces', Dover Christ Church.

Dated this 29th day of March, 1966."

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to second that.

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

BILL WITHDRAWN:

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to withdraw this Bill and if there is no objection, leave will be granted. (AFTER A PAUSE) There being no objection, leave is granted. Accordingly, this Bill is now deemed duly to have been withdrawn.

THE WEST INDIES HOSPITAL FUND LIMITED (REPEAL) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for the City:- To resume debate on the Second Reading of a Bill to repeal the West Indies Hospital Funds Limited Act, 1964.

As hon. members will recall, when this matter was last before this House, I undertook to give a considered, and therefore, a written ruling on a point which was raised by the honourable and learned senior member for St. John. I have done considerable research in this matter, and although my mind has been practically made up, I am not in a position to give the House today my considered Ruling which I intend to give in writing for the benefit of hon. members.
3.05 p.m.

That is the position, although, may I say this, that as I am at present advised, it is my view that the Bill may be further considered and may be proceeded with at the pleasure of the House; but my written ruling is not yet complete due to certain office holdups. Hon. members will appreciate it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do appreciate the expression given by Your Honour, because this would take some research as Your Honour has said, and due to routine office business, Your Honour is unable to give a written report. Therefore if it is the desire of Your Honour that I postpone further consideration, I bow to Your Honour's suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, we will proceed to Order No. 5 which stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George, whom I observe is not instantly in his place.

May I mention that in respect of the Order Paper, unless it is fixed otherwise, Order No. 2 that is the matter standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip automatically goes up to Order No. 1, and Order No. 4 in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition

goes up to No. 2; then the next Order of the Day standing in the name of the hon. junior member for St. George who is not in his place.

Order No. 6 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church; to move the third reading of a Bill to Incorporate the Barbados Family Planning Association.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am not yet ready to proceed with the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for Christ Church is not in a position to proceed today with this Bill, and therefore I will proceed to Order No. 7 which also stands in the name of the hon. junior member for Christ Church; to move the third reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Mutual Life Assurance Society Act, 1851. This Bill has been referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee has not yet reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Committee has not unfortunately reported. That brings to an end Private Members' Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no other business, Government Business may now be proceeded with, and the first Order of the Day under Government Business stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church; to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932.

THE MIDWIVES AND NURSES REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1966

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will remember, this Council was established by the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932 (1932-1) and provided for the registration and better training of midwives and Nurses for the sick, and to regulate their practice. All registration and examination fees payable under the Act are paid into the Treasury. These have in the past varied from \$240 to \$300, but it is estimated that with the increased number of examinations, they will amount to \$1,000. It is for that reason, therefore, as the Objects and Reasons fully explain, that we are asking that the sum which may be expended by the Nursing Council to meet miscellaneous expenses be extended and not restricted as at present.

We propose to reorganise the various Nurses Training Schools and it is considered that these expenses will increase, and that the Council will be unable to function efficiently if the above limitation is retained. This Bill therefore seeks to amend the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932, so as to remove this restriction.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

3.15 p.m.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this closes Government Business for today's sitting.

Before I move the motion for the adjournment, I would just like to draw the attention of hon. members to the item listed as No. 2 on today's Order Paper which we do not intend to proceed with today. The Hon. Premier has asked me to say that he would like to initiate debate on this item when we resume from the recess and he hopes that all hon. members will by that time have ample opportunity to study the Draft Constitution and would be able to make a contribution to the debate.

The Hon. Premier has also asked me to say that it is the Government's desire that the widest possible interest should be taken in this matter and that he has accordingly made arrangements for copies of the Draft Constitution to be circulated with his compliments to every conceivable social and other organization in this island. Copies would be therefore sent to the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacture's Associations, the Service Clubs, and other Social organizations, the Barbados Workers Union and the Civil Service Association so that the respective members would have ample opportunity for studying it and commenting on this most important document. As I have said, it is decided not to initiate debate on this Draft Constitution until after the recess.

Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 19th April, 1966 at 2.30 p.m., and I take this opportunity to wish Your Honour and hon. members a joyous Easter.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I notice what the Hon. Leader of the House has said and I actually assume that in the names which he mentioned to whom copies of the Draft Constitution will be sent, they include the Barbados Bar and Law Society.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if they are not already in receipt.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the motion I have to discharge two Select Committees whose Reports have been dealt with, and I thank the Select Committees for the expeditious manner in which they completed their labours.

On behalf of hon. members and myself, I thank the Hon. Leader of the House for wishing all of us a joyful and happy Easter.

The question that this House do now stand adjourn until Tuesday, 19th April, 1966 at 2.30 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

3.25 p.m.

THE

Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th April, 1966.

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

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Hon. E. W. PARROW, B.Sc., (*Premier*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*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*); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*); Mr. J. R. YEARWOOD and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Trade and Labour*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to state that there are no Minutes yet ready for several past meetings of this Chamber.

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter dated 19th April, 1966, addressed to me as Speaker with four signatures which have been duly authenticated, in the absence of Mr. Clerk, by Mr. Deputy Clerk. The letter reads as follows:-

House of Assembly,
Barbados, W. I.

19th April, 1966.

His Honour J. E. T. Brancker, Q.C.,
Speaker of the House of Assembly,
Speaker's Chambers,
House of Assembly,
Bridgetown.

Dear Mr. Speaker,

The undersigned will not be in attendance at today's meeting of the House for the following reasons:-

1. The only matter for discussion on the Order Paper of the House of Assembly for today's meeting, 19th

April, 1966, is the moving of the passing of a Resolution to approve the Draft Constitution for Barbados.

2. Constitutional changes of the kind proposed in the Draft Constitution are not usually effected by a majority vote in the Legislature but after broad agreement between all major political parties in the countries or, if this is not attainable, in the final analysis, by reference to the electorate by way of an election or, in some territories, of a referendum.

3. This broad agreement between the main political parties is normally arrived at by conference between the parties and the final constitutional instrument is settled by a conference at which are in attendance the Government Party, the Opposition Parties and the Imperial Power which is granting independence or other concessions.

4. It would be pointless for the opposition to participate in a debate in the Barbados Legislature at which it would disclose its objections to the Draft Constitution but at which its proposals for variations in the Constitution would be subjected to an adverse vote in both Houses by the majority party.

5. To participate in the proposed exercise would be merely to provide the Government Party with the opportunity to present the Draft Constitution at the June Independence Conference in London as the Constitution approved by the Legislature of Barbados. This would render the opposition parties powerless at the London Conference.

6. We are not prepared to be a party to any manoeuvre to present the United Kingdom Government with a Draft Constitution which, it will be claimed, represents the wishes of the people of Barbados in consequence of the fact that it has been passed by the Government's majority vote in both Houses of the Legislature.

Ernest D. Mottley
Leader of the Opposition

Frederick E. Miller
Parliamentary Leader of the
Barbados Labour Party

W. A. Crawford

K. N. R. Husbands

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I beg to lay the following:-

The Customs Duties (Materials for use in the Manufacture of Furniture) Order, 1966.

The Customs Duties (Machinery, Apparatus, Tools, Equipment and Vehicles) Order, 1966.

The Customs Duties (Computing Devices) (Meteorological Equipment and Spares) Order, 1966.

The Customs Duties (Raw Materials including chemicals to be used in galvanizing processes) for use in the manufacture of hairpins, wire clips, tacks, nails, screws, staples, bolts, nuts, chicken wire, barbed wire and chain link fencing) Order, 1966.

Barbados Statistical Service Selected Monthly Indicators -- December, 1965.

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for twelve months ended 31st March, 1966.

The Labour Welfare (Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund Reimbursement) Regulations, 1966.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Annual Report of the Director of Medical Services for the year 1963-64.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following:-

Statement showing the 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 December, 1965.

Statement showing the 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 January, 1966.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$1,650 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1966-67, Part I -- Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate No. 1 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders, 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

QUESTION TIME

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time and I am advised that Question No. 91/1964 standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is ready.

Mr. COWARD: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

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

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

Hon. E. J. BARROW entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"Yes, Sir. The houses on the highest part of Braggs Hill range from approximately 1,080 feet to 1,100 feet above sea level whereas the top water level of the Castle Grant Reservoir from which the area is supplied is only 1,105 feet above sea level. It is therefore impracticable to provide a gravity supply of water to these houses.

The alternative method of supply of tapping the pumping main entering the Castle Grant Reservoir has been examined and is technically and economically not feasible.

In order to improve the water supply to the lower area near Clement Rock, consideration will be given to the extension of the main in the Sugar Hill -- Chimborazo area for a distance of about 900 feet when the Development of Water Resources Programme for 1966-67 is being prepared."

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, will the Government consider the question of extending the water main from Clement Rock to Orange Hill in order that the people in Orange Hill may be supplied with water?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that a supplementary question at all. That is really another question which I would have to investigate before I can give a reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is not ready to give a reply, I am sure the hon. senior member for St. Joseph will take the necessary steps to ensure that he gets an effective reply.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, Orange Hill is between Braggs Hill and Clement Rock.

QUESTION re LOW WATER PRESSURE IN SUGAR HILL-CHIMBORAZO AREA

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 84 stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. COWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware of the inconvenience caused to residents in the Chimborazo-Sugar Hill area as a result of the low water pressure?

2. Will Government in view of the fact that many of these residents have water borne systems make an effort to alleviate such sufferings?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"1. Yes.

2. The low pressure is due to the height of the Chimborazo-Sugar Hill area (1080' - 1100' above sea level) in relation to the top water level (1105' above sea level) of the Castle Grant Reservoir which serves this area. In order to improve the supply in this area, consideration will be given to the laying of the new water main when the Development of Water Resources Programme for 1966-67 is being prepared."

DISREPAIR OF TENANTRY ROADS IN NORTHERN PARISHES

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 69 stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned member for St. James whom I observe now to be in his place.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is Government aware that many subsidiary and tenantry roads throughout the Northern parishes of the Island particularly in the parish of Saint James are in a very bad state of disrepair?

2. Is Government aware that these roads accommodate properties of persons in the Northern parishes from whom the Northern District Council derives a considerable amount of income by reason of payment of their taxes?

3. Will Government set about the repairing of these roads without further delay?

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"1. Government is aware that some of the subsidiary Roads in the Northern District Council area are in a bad state of disrepair.

2. Repairs to these roads will be carried out in accordance with the quantum of available resources and established priorities. Government has not yet undertaken the repair of private Tenantry Roads."

QUESTION *re* CONDITION OF CHILDREN'S EYES

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 100 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware of the number of children whose eyes are in very bad condition, and who have been on the waiting list for approximately a year without receiving either treatment or glasses?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister devise a scheme whereby the children can be examined without delay?

If the answer is in the negative, will the Minister make a full inquiry into this important matter?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:-

"1. Yes, Sir. Proposals for re-organization and improvement of the ophthalmic service for school children were approved by the Legislature in November, 1965, but the implementation of them has been adversely affected by a shortage of the requisite medical staff. It is expected that this situation will shortly be relieved.

2 & 3. Do not arise."

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no more Replies laid, 3.05 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Item on the Order Paper stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. John: to move the passing of the following Resolu-

tion: A Resolution to approve the Draft Constitution of Barbados, March, 1966.

STATEMENT BY PREMIER *re* VISIT OF HAILE SELASSIE, I

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before the first Item of the day is proceeded with, I am asking leave of the House to make a short announcement.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty the Queen has notified His Excellency the Governor that in the course of a few days, on Thursday, His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie I, is expected to visit the Island of Barbados on Thursday at 8. a.m.

There is no programme; it is now in the process of being printed, and within the past few days certain officials of the Government have been in liaison with His Imperial Majesty's staff in Trinidad, and the programme, which would be very short, has been approved by His Imperial Majesty. I should like to inform this Honourable House that this programme will be circulated in due course.

I am sure Your Honour and this House will receive this information under Government Notices with great pleasure and only regret that His Imperial Majesty, as originally planned, will not be able to visit the Legislature and sign the Visitors' Book. He had hoped to do so some few days ago.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE DRAFT CONSTITUTION OF BARBADOS 1966

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, the first Item on the Order Paper of Government Business is a Resolution to approve the Draft Constitution of Barbados, March, 1966. The Resolution reads as follows:-

WHEREAS on the 8th day of January, 1966, the General Assembly passed a resolution requesting Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to convene, at the earliest opportunity, a Conference to arrange the constitutional, financial, defence and other details incidental to, and arising from, the assumption, by the people of Barbados, of Sovereign Nationhood within the Commonwealth in 1966;

AND WHEREAS on the 24th day of January, 1966, the Senate concurred in the said resolution which was assented to on the 25th day of January, 1966 by the Governor of this Island;

AND WHEREAS Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State has agreed to convene such a Conference on the 20th day of June, 1966;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed necessary that the Legislature and the people of this Island should be made aware, prior to the convening of the said Conference, of the natural and constitutional rights and the legal provisions according to which it is fitting that they should be governed, a Draft Constitution, embodying these rights and provisions, has been prepared and was laid before the Legislature on the 15th day of March, 1966.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House approve the said Draft Constitution.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that a few minutes ago Your Honour read out a letter purporting to be signed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Minority Opposition and by two other hon. members of this House whose political affiliations have not after all these years been fully determined. I think, therefore, that before I initiate debate on this Resolution, I should draw certain correspondence to the attention of hon. members of the House who are in their places, and to place on record that no member of the Opposition parties has availed him-

self of the opportunity to debate this issue of great national importance, I will also like that it should be noted on the record that they have not been present to express their view. It is highly probable that they do not understand the Constitution since they play their politics by air.

I should like, with Your Honour's permission to read this document — and I am prepared to make them all documents of the House.

First, is a letter received from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition which is dated 12th April, 1966.
3.15 p.m.

BARBADOS NATIONAL PARTY

Telephone 4151

Headquarters Office,
Pinfold Street,
Barbados.

12th April, 1966.

The Hon. J. Cameron Tudor,
Leader of the House of Assembly,
Government Headquarters,
St. Michael.

Sir,

With reference to the Resolution seeking the approval of the House of Assembly for the Draft Constitution laid before the Legislature on 15th March, 1966, I have to inform you that the members of my Party do not consider that any useful purpose would be served by discussing a Resolution in the terms submitted by you.

Your Resolution can only be regarded as an attempt by the Government to give to the Draft Constitution a spurious authority by stamping it with the approval of a majority vote in the House of Assembly.

However, if your Resolution were changed to read "Be it therefore resolved that this House approve the said draft constitution *as the basis for discussion at the London Conference in June*," we would be prepared to participate in the debate.

I must add that if this suggestion is unacceptable to you, the members of the Barbados National Party will take no part in the debate either in the House or in the Senate.

A reply to the suggestion made above is requested by noon on Friday 15th April, 1966.

Yours faithfully,

E. D. Mottley
Leader of the Official Opposition,
Barbados House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Barbados is not run in the same manner as the Bridgetown City Council. We have certain democratic procedures to which we adhere and which we observe. It is highly contemptuous, insulting and arrogant that any member of the House, be he Lord Mayor, Pope, General or Field Marshal should address the Leader of the House informing him that in the normal course of Government business he must make a reply to the Opposition by noon on a particular day.

We cannot teach people good manners; we cannot even teach them constitutional procedure. The Minister of Education referred the matter to the Cabinet and in due course was instructed to reply in terms set out by the Cabinet. On the same day the Leader of what the hon. member describes as the Official Opposition — on the same day that he gave the Minister of Education a deadline to reply to his letter summoned a Press Conference — according to the Local Press — and delivered to the Press the text of the letter

which he had written to the Minister and also his comments thereon.

The Cabinet has authorised me to deliver a copy — a photostat copy: not even a typewritten copy — of the letter which was sent in reply by the Hon. Minister and Leader of the House. This letter was dated 19th April, 1966 and it reads as follows:-

Government Headquarters,
Barbados.

19th April, 1966.

Dear Mr. Mottley,

I addressed you by letter dated 9th April, 1966, informing you that the Cabinet had agreed *inter alia* that three parliamentary members of your Party would have their travel, hotel, transportation and other expenses for the London Independence Conference defrayed by the Government. You have not acknowledged receipt of this letter but on the 12th April I received a letter from you requesting an amendment to the text of the Resolution tabled in the House of Assembly on 22nd March relating to the draft constitution. You stated that, if this request is not complied with, the members of the Barbados National Party in the House and Senate will not take part in the debate.

2. It is clear from the insulting tone of your letter that neither you nor your Conservative colleagues even at this late stage understand or appreciate the full implications of the System of Parliamentary democracy to which we in the Government adhere.

3. Your reference to the majority vote in the House of Assembly as a "spurious authority" clearly discloses a contempt for parliamentary institutions and an intention to perpetuate the system of minority rule by the wealthy interests which you represent, despite the enfranchisement of the adult masses of this country over fifteen years ago.

4. On a previous occasion you were reminded in a letter written by the Honourable Premier on the instructions of the Cabinet that the proper procedure for the introduction of amendments to resolutions which have been set down for debate on the Order Paper of the House of Assembly is for a member to move the amendment after the substantive motion has been moved and seconded on the floor of the House. It is not even possible to move an amendment by submitting the text of the amendment to His Honour the Speaker.

5. The members of the Barbados National Party have threatened in your letter that they will take no part in the debate on the draft independence Constitution either in the House or the Senate unless the Government's Resolution were changed in the manner suggested by you.

6. Quite apart from the procedural impropriety disclosed by your request, your threat not to take part in the debate unless Government joins with you and your satellite Labour Party in a conspiracy to destroy Parliamentary Institutions can be regretted only by those hapless persons who were looking forward to representation from a person on whom the dignity of Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition had been bestowed so recently as four years ago.

7. The Government has given full publicity to its constitutional proposals for several weeks. Neither the public nor the Government will have the benefit of your Party's views on the draft Independence Constitution if you persist with your threat to abstain from the debate.

Yours faithfully,
Leader of the House of Assembly.

Sir, I have much pleasure in making these Documents of the House.

Now, Sir, the correspondence which I have read speaks for itself, and therefore I do not think we owe any apology to anyone in this island or outside of it for observing what we ourselves consider to be the proper constitutional procedures in matters of this kind, particularly in matters of great national importance. I can only say that the leaders and followers in the Party or Parties on the other side of the Table have demonstrated how completely unsuitable and ill equipped they are for the great exercise of Parliamentary democracy. They have further demonstrated their unfitness to be considered representatives of the Electorate of this Island.

There are one or two matters to which I would like to refer so that they may go on the record. In the first place, the Government a long time ago set out its policy about Barbados becoming independent. The Government was met with the bitterest opposition by the Conservative wealth of Paymasters on the other side of the House and the most virulent attacks inside and outside the Legislature and in the columns of the Press, all controlled by the members of the other side.

The Government said at the outset that they would not only introduce a Resolution, but we did what no other Government in the whole of the Caribbean, if not in the whole of the British Commonwealth, did; that is, we gave a period of three months for the study of the proposals set out in the White Paper on the Federal Negotiations so that they could be discussed in all the highways and by-ways before legislation was introduced in this Chamber.
3.25 p.m.

The members of the Opposition Parties and the Independent members took part in that debate. They attempted to insinuate an amendment before the matter was debated by addressing letters to the Cabinet Secretary setting out the amendments instead of putting the amendments on the floor of the House. These amendments, much to their consternation, were defeated, and the Government stated then -- and even before then -- that it would be coming down with a Draft Constitution, and that that Draft Constitution would be published and time would be given for the Constitution to be examined. The Government invited the views of all sections of the community and any other person interested in this exercise of constitutional progress. All this was done and all this will be on record. The members on the opposite side themselves on one occasion after another said that they hoped the Constitution was going to be brought to the House. Not only that; the Secretary of State made it clear on more than one occasion that he would normally expect the Constitution to be discussed and approved on the floor of the House before he convened any Conference in London.

Now we are getting new Rules being improvised from day to day by a lot of half-baked, and what some Barbadians would describe as salt water, constitutional experts, embryonic politicians, obsolescent politicians and those who are about to become obsolete and redundant. They are improvising new Rules which cannot be found in the ancient usages and practices of Parliament, and Rules which cannot be found on any treatise in the British Constitutional system and the systems of Western Parliamentary democracy which are improvised and promulgated in the Press from day to day and given the stamp of authority and sanctity merely because they have emanated from people on the opposite side of the House. They have now introduced an entirely new concept which is not even acceptable to the most oligarchic society, the new concept of minority rule; a concept in a democratic state of minority rule that because the minority says something, therefore the majority is not to get it because the minority is not with it. The minority is objecting; therefore they are abstaining from attending. Not that we expected any intelligent offering from them in the course of a debate of this kind, because they only understand the politics of abuse. They do not understand that you must have a country, and you must have patriotism and try to make a contribution. As long as an opportunity is given you as a member of the community, you have no cause for com-

plaint; but when you are not given an opportunity to make a contribution, this is where your complaint comes in. Now the complaint becomes legitimate if no opportunity is afforded the members of this community; but the mere fact that you fear the outlandish proposal which you put forward may not find acceptance with the majority of people either in the Legislature or in the country does not give you any right to say that you are not going to put them forward at all, because it would be giving you the right to say that as a minority whatever you say must be accepted. It is as simple as that.

As long as this Government is in power, we are not going to run this country either by what is said or felt in the Bridgetown City Council or the Northern or Southern District Councils, or in the Chamber of Commerce - that was done in the last Government, and they are getting the two Labour Parties mixed up - or in the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Red Cross Society or any of the other halls where people of this ilk tend to congregate and assemble. The Government is going to be run out of the Ministerial offices with the approval of the majority vote of the Legislature on all issues. There is no issue, in other words, which our Constitution demands that we must have the prior consent, acquiescence, approval and agreement of the Lord Mayor of Bridgetown or any other mayoralty in this country, or that the Leader of the Opposition's consent to any matter relating to the Constitution of Barbados is a condition precedent for discussion either on the floor of this House or at a Conference in London.

There is another thing which I should like to warn the members on the other side about, and it is this: a lot of them are fooling themselves, colonial-minded as they are, that some how or other it does not matter what is discussed in the Legislature in Barbados, that the Secretary of State for the Colonies can tell the Government and people of Barbados like some schoolmaster that this is what is good for you. It is for that very reason that the Federal exercises broke up, because the Secretary of State wanted from time to time to adopt the attitude of telling you what is good for you. The only way in which the West Indian peoples and the people of Barbados can progress at all is if they devise for themselves from time to time, bearing in mind the experience of their forefathers and people in other territories and lands, the institutions and forms of Government which will be able to carry the masses of people of this country forward in the way in which every man and woman of goodwill would like to see them advance. The institutions and forms by which the people of this country will make these advances cannot be improvised or contrived at Lancaster House, Marlborough House or elsewhere. They can only be fabricated and manufactured, fashioned and moulded within the confines of the Atlantic Ocean and the Caribbean Sea that wash our shores in this island, and particularly in the General Assembly and the Legislature of Barbados.

The whole *rational* e of Government is based on the policy-making functions being vested in people who have similar ideas and who are able to control the majority vote of the electorate. It is as simple as that. The policy making functions, as I said before, can never be abdicated by a Government and surrendered to people of ill will in a malevolent society. This is a time in our history when all the people in this country should be putting their armour on to present a common front in trying to get the utmost in the way of, let us say, economic support and the guarantee of markets and so on from the United Kingdom and from other countries. That really is the purpose of the exercise which we will initiate when I have summoned or issued invitations to all the Caribbean Countries from Bermuda right down to Guyana to draw up our joint proposals which we will present to the Government of Canada in Ottawa on the sixth day of July, 1966.
3.35 p.m.

This is the first time in forty years that such a consultation will have taken place, and it was done because we here in Barbados put up the proposals for a Conference

at that time. History will think very poorly of the people who, because they have an insatiable lust for power and for plunder, have absented themselves from taking part in this debate. When I say that they have an insatiable lust for power and for plunder, first, they must get the power in order to plunder, and because we stand in the way of their getting the power, they think that we are the worst people in the world. Their one ambition in politics is plunder, and they only see the authority of Government as a device and as a means whereby they can get their hands in other people's pocket - in mine and other people's.

This is the social policy which binds them, and it is therefore not surprising to us in this Government that you find the leader of the so called Labour Party walking hand in hand with the Leader of the Opposition, and planning with the Conservative elements in this island who openly profess as a religion that conserving what they have is the by-all and end-all of social philosophy. We do not subscribe to that philosophy. We think that the authority of Government is the by-all and end-all in order to do the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Sir, this is not time for mincing matters at all because issues in this country can very often become blurred by vilification and distortions in the organs of public opinion. Sir, you never see that the hon. member on my right has any full page advertisement to give to the newspapers of this country. The people who are making profits out of this country are the people who give these advertisements, and the money which they spend on the newspapers is money which is not spent in any social or useful manner because the broad masses of people in this country have no alternative but to buy goods from these people.

Therefore, Sir, we have to be very careful from time to time that we should have a re-statement to remind not only people on the other side what we are here for, but to remind ourselves, and - what is more important - to remind the general public who tend to forget and look for immediate personal advantage or for charity instead of looking for the broader issues which I do over and over every single day of my life in the same way that some people religiously read the Bible. I do not know it as readily as the hon. senior member for St. Andrew, and sometimes I go to him for instructions on various passages. I do not read it every day, but I remind myself of it by reading some document on social philosophy; so you will see Sir, that I remind myself of what I am here for.

Now, Sir, the debate as to whether Barbados should become independent or not is not handed in at this stage because by an overwhelming majority of both Houses of the Legislature, they approved the Resolution which was tabled here last year some time towards the beginning of October asking the Secretary of State to convene a Conference. However, the struggle going on between the Opposition is that the Government is not giving them enough representation at the Conference. Just a few weeks ago the Hon. Leader of the House in accordance with an undertaking summoned the leaders of the Majority Opposition Party and the Minority Opposition Party to Government Headquarters to discuss the representation. The Hon. Leader of the House put forward that the Government was sending five Parliamentary members as comprising the Government's delegation, and let it be known that the Government was prepared to give them collectively the same representation of five members by giving them three from the Official Opposition Party and two from the Minority Party. They have not come out in the Press and said that the Government has offered them the same number as what the Government is taking. The Cabinet agreed to the representation put forward by the Minister on the 12th April. With 26 or 27 members of the Legislature as against the two Opposition Parties put together with only ten members, which means a division of nearly three to one, we of the Government gave them the same representation and their reaction to it was that it was completely illogical. They were probably surprised at the Government representation, but they said that they wanted

more than five. Of course, to get that they said that they felt that the Government was not adequately represented, and that the Government should at least take twenty people at the Conference. They said so so that they could at least ask for ten or twelve people.
3.45 p.m.

But when the Government said we only need five people to handle these things, they said: "It is not fair; you should have twenty." This is the first time they have ever offered us anything. I want this to go on record. Then we have this strange anomaly in which someone who is not a member of the Legislature and who is partially unemployed can say that certain members of the Legislature cannot take part in the debates. That same gentleman presented himself at the meeting to discuss representation, and he is not a member of the Legislature.

This is an exercise in which representatives of the people should be present. We cannot take, as has been done in some instances, all forty-five members of the Legislature to a Conference of this kind. In the first place, it is a question of expense, and in the second instance it is not a Debating Society. The debate should take place here and now. This is a preliminary exercise. No one would be so foolish as to say that every single comma, fullstop and line in the Draft Constitution will necessarily appear in the Bill as approved and assented to by the Houses of Parliament because Parliament may make changes as a result of representations made, and it may be considered advisable to make certain changes either in substance or form.

It is silly, Mr. Speaker, to pretend that by participating in this debate and approving the Draft Constitution you are thereby short-circuiting the process of having a Conference in London. I wish it were so. Seriously, that would be a consummation devoutly to be wished; but it is not so.

To suggest that if the Government does not change the wording of this Resolution you will not take part in the debate is to disclose an abysmal ignorance of the process of Parliamentary democracy. After the Independence Resolution was passed, these groups went into hibernation for a short period of time. When notice was given that the Constitution was laid, they were surprised that it was done in such a short time. Not one member of the Opposition has come out and held a public discussion not in any way fettering debate in the Legislature, but they were given an opportunity to hold discussions and joining with other Parties in holding discussions or anything else they liked on the proposals.

The only conclusion I can come to is that they do not understand exercises of this nature. They always have to be running asking someone's opinion. After beating the drum for such a long time and calling down the wrath of Heaven upon the heads of the Government, they found a Constitution which excels any constitution in any part of the Commonwealth in the safeguarding of the fundamental rights and freedoms and the preservation of the rule of law. They now say that they are not here today - perhaps they do not know what to say. They try to becloud the issue by saying that if they attend it would be taken that the House has approved the Constitution. They are saying that the Secretary of State or the Officials in England will ask: "What have you come up here for?" and they will have to go back home because the House of Assembly has already approved the Constitution, and the whole matter is fixed already.

I should like you to know this, Sir, in 1962 the Government went up to the U. K. and discussed certain proposals for the formation of the Eastern Caribbean Federation. As far as I remember, Sir, there was no debate on any constitution for the Federation. After we came back down we introduced a Resolution approving the proposals for which we had no mandate whatsoever, not even from the Electorate. The Leader of the Opposition was the sole member of the Opposition present. There was no querying how many people should go to the Federation Conference.

He sat and approved the proposals. He did not say he approved them in principle or as a basis for discussion. Mr. Bird said so. He made it clear that as far as he was concerned he did not like the way the Secretary of State had run the Conference, and the most that he would promise to do was to try to seek approval in principle. Because we did not want to appear to be breaking up anything or introducing an atmosphere of doubt we brought forward a simple and straight forward Resolution asking for the approval of the Legislature.

At the meeting one of two tentative amendments were put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. junior member for the City which were defeated. We then unanimously voted for the Resolution which sought a straightforward approval of the White Paper, Command Paper 1746, in June of 1962. These people should be consistent. I would like to go back a little further. For many years this Government Party constituted the Official Opposition in this Chamber. Year after year several Conferences and matters of great constitutional importance were held. Throughout all that time not one single member of the Opposition was ever invited to any Conference, even Conferences which were deciding Independence of the West Indian nation and therefore Independence of Barbados as well.

One person was invited - Your Honour. That was an invitation issued to you personally and not an invitation issued to the Opposition Party, although of course we would have selected you. The Barbados Labour Party did not want to take the risk of a choice being made by the Official Opposition by asking us to nominate someone. They only issued an invitation to Your Honour because they were fighting against Trinidad and Jamaica and they wanted to say that both the Government Party and the Opposition Party supported them.

I want to make all of these things public - of course they will be published before the end of the month by Professor Lewis and Mr. John Mordecai. The only place the Leader of the Opposition ever went was New York until this Government came into power. Then within a month he found himself in a first class compartment for London on the invitation of this Government.
3.55 p.m.

What worries me is that people like him are dishonest enough to get up and accuse this Government of dictatorship when he owes the position he holds today to our recognition of democratic procedures; and if the other Government had been in power, the ones who are around him now, he would not sit until Thy Kingdom come and would not see a Conference held in Carriacou or Grenada.

Let us get the record straight. When we posed that the Official Opposition should have representation, at least one seat, in the Senate, the attitude of the Barbados Labour Party was articulated by Mr. Ian McLeod, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, because he would have to go by what the Premier for the time being advised him. The attitude of the Party which we presented to Mr. McLeod was that there should be representation of the Party in the Senate, whatever the Opposition may be. We were not asking for a seat for ourselves because we were then in Opposition, but whatever the Opposition may be, it should be represented up there. Mr. McLeod told this Government Party which was then the Opposition Party -- and you were present when he told us so, Mr. Speaker -- that it was desirable to retain the non-political character of the Legislative Council, and therefore they could not agree to the proposal that we should have the Opposition represented in the Other Chamber. These are the facts of history and they must be recorded.

Let us see who is democratic and who is not democratic. When in 1958 the Leader of the Opposition won the majority of seats in the Bridgetown City Council elections, there was a question of six Aldermen being nominated by the Officer administering the Government of the country, and the Barbados Labour Party with whom he finds

himself now as a very strange political bedfellow in a state of unlawful concubinage - bitterly opposed the idea of any of the nominations being made on the advice of the Leader of the Party that had won the majority of seats in that election. I want that to go down on record too, and he should read these things just as he reads his prayers every night, and the Lord will open his eyes and set him on the right path. I did not say he reads his prayers; I said he should read them, because I have no guarantee that he says his prayers at all or reads them. When His Excellency the Governor, after taking legal advice and advice from Her Majesty's Government, nominated Aldermen to the Bridgetown City Council, the Federal Prime Minister, Sir Grantley Adams, who is Leader of that Party said that the Governor would have to go.

Let me get something else on the record. Take the administration at the Bridgetown City Council. For over one year there are employees down there with families who have not been paid their wages. Do you think the Government of Barbados as it is presently constituted, the legitimate and lawful Government of Barbados, could attempt at any time to hold public servants and deny bread to members of their families for more than six weeks? If you pay wages later than the 26th, people will talk about going on strike from the Central Government. Let us see who is democratic. Just this morning the Chairman of the Southern District Council came to me and said that the Councillors were annoying him, not about salaries because they do not get salaries, but that they were held up with six weeks' travelling allowance, and the thing would come to a crisis if they did not get the travelling allowance; and some get a larger travelling allowance than Ministers. It is not a question of families waiting on the legitimate earning, and although the matter has not reached me because nothing stays in my office for more than 48 hours -- not eighteen or twenty-three months and that kind of thing -- I promised the Chairman I would look into it. You can have in a country like this when people are talking about democracy people down at the Bridgetown City Council attending work every day and not receiving wages for a whole year, although the money was voted in the Estimates. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to draw swords and do battle with me, he has chosen the right person.

It is a matter of general knowledge that the whole Public Health staff rejoiced the day they enjoyed freedom for the first time, because they were constrained to go out and canvass for the Leader of the Bridgetown City Council instead of being allowed to do their work, and if you did not agree, you were ostracised down there. Who is he now to start talking about procedures and that this will happen or that will happen? Let us look and see what happens in this country. We intend to rule it out, and that is why they are cross with us.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter frequently says that the Leader of the Opposition and I were friends. Not true. I would like to get that clear. The point is that there are a lot of unpalatable things that you find yourself having to do when you are in a Government, because people expect you to do them; and therefore, once you know what a man's outlook is, you know what to watch for, and therefore you should not start off with the assumption that you have to be hostile inside and outside the Chamber to somebody because he is in Opposition, and therefore you have to try to maintain a type of perpetual dialogue between the Opposition and Government. That is the way democracy can function best; and if I extended to the Leader of the Opposition the courtesies which I now discover he never deserved, it is only because I am overwhelmed with a sense of my duty to the community, although I may be doing something personally distasteful and unpalatable to myself. I have other unpalatable functions to perform from time to time, like sitting down and listening to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph which is one of the most disgraceful exercises to which anyone can be subjected from time to time. Going to cocktail parties is another thing I do not like to do, because if you stay away too frequently -- that is the kind of abstention I believe in -- when, say, the Chamber of Commerce, the Cricket Board of Control or

one of the foreign Governments invite you, they begin to think the Government is opposed to them and they begin talking about the Government, that this is an anti-social Government, and you are not doing anything to be on good terms. So you have to do these distasteful things like going to cocktail parties, and like sitting down and listening to the harangue and diatribe which emanate from the opposite side of the House. This is the price you have to pay for democracy, unfortunately. Democracy is the most expensive exercise in the world, because it imposes on its participants strains and burdens which the normal human being is not confronted with from day to day. I want people to be abundantly clear where I stand on every issue. There is nothing more that they can do to the members of this House that they have not done already. They have tried everything and you can take that from me.

4.05 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate on Independence. I want to make that clear to my colleagues on this side of the House. This is not a debate on independence; this is a debate on the Draft Independence Constitution. We have passed the stage where, but to the most doubting members of this community, independence is an issue; and we would be making a great mistake, just like what the Opposition is making, if we are trying to convert this discussion on the outline of the Draft Constitution into a discussion on when Barbados or if Barbados should have independence.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to issue one further note of warning to those hon. members who should be present on the other side of the Table. We want to disabuse their minds, whether they are Conservative or Labour, that members of the British Government, whether they are Conservative or Labour, are so absurd as to think that when we come we would be discussing things like dates of election or that nonsense, because that is of no concern to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Hon. members of the Opposition can check on it if they like. We have cabled the Secretary of State for the Colonies about the matter and he has cabled back and said that the date of elections is a matter solely in the province of the Premier. Therefore, what are they going down there to discuss? They think now that they can have a second trial on the postponement of Independence for the people of Barbados by discussing the date of election. I want them to cable the Secretary of State for the Colonies and ask him if he has not said that that is a matter for the Premier of Barbados. They do not understand the Constitution. They would like to see this country with a Constitution inferior to other countries of the world. Barbados is not even a Crown Colony because we had a Constitution since 1661 which far transcends any Constitution.

In 1939 -- 40 there were people on that side of the House -- and, Mr. Speaker, you will be aware of this -- who went so far as to suggest to the Moyne Commission that Barbados should be turned into a Crown Colony, and the surprising thing about it is that it was not said by the Leaders of the Conservatives at all. Of course, they had things their own way. But it was said by the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party, supported by a former Minister of this Government, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, suggesting that Barbados should remain a Crown Colony.

Therefore, Sir, it is not surprising to me that they would not want this country to be independent because that kind of thinking represents a bygone age, and it is not consonant with the thinking of progressive people in this country today. Those people are completely out of tune with what is going on and, as I have said, I just want to make it clear that maybe now they know that the die is cast, they will decide to turn out for the continuation of this debate. Do not go up there with your proposals in your fob pocket and do not say that I do not want anybody to see them.

Sir, we have a lot of work to do before the visit of His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Lion of Judah, King of Kings. It is going to be a very brief visit and I should like to remind Your Honour that the invitation to His Imperial Majesty was issued as early as September 1964.

This is not a last minute thing. Unfortunately, we are a Colonial territory and this is another disadvantage of being a Colonial territory. As far as foreign affairs are concerned, the Government of Barbados runs its own affairs, but the only thing I can remember that I asked the British Government to do for us was to issue an invitation to His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I. I must say that the official side of the British Government did not act with the promptness which I would like. I do not want to say anything more, but I am sure that if we had handled this matter ourselves, the matter would have been settled already.

As it is, the members of the Government have many matters to deal with now in preparation of this visit.

Mr. Speaker, we have received representation from the Law Society and from the Barbados Chamber of Commerce regarding the Draft Constitution of Barbados, and we are in the process of investigating the validity of some of the submissions which they have made. We hope to finish this debate in a matter of a couple of days -- I do not mean today or tomorrow. For that reason and in view of the fact that no further submissions have come in, I am prepared to accept a motion at this stage that further consideration of this debate be postponed, at the same time reserving my right to continue my speech on the next occasion.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that further consideration on this debate be postponed, and in so doing I think the Hon. Premier should be pleased now that the members of the Opposition decided not to turn up to this debate today.

4.15 p.m.

It shows that they are complete political dunces who should be superannuated from seats in the House of Assembly. They are unworthy to be members of the House of Assembly because they do not have one clue as to what is going on in the political sense. Political Science should be an exercise for every politician whether he goes to the University or not. A man cannot practice politics like a man practising to play a guitar by going to the seaside and looking at the waves.

Now that we are considering an important matter they have decided to withdraw, to contract out. I think the Premier should consider doing something in Barbados about people who challenge the Parliament of this country. They should be told bluntly and squarely that there will be no more of this continual nonsense, that when Parliament has passed a law or something unanimously or by majority vote some of the members can get the idea that the law can be flouted. It was not a law, but the Resolution which was introduced on one occasion, and after approval by the Legislature these same back-door methods were used. This House of Assembly went down as voting for Independence. During that debate there was an amendment put forward that before Independence an Election should take place. That was rejected by this House, and a similar amendment put up in the Senate and was rejected by the Senate.

The Chamber of Commerce is now going to hold a Conference. Another House is going to meet at the Marine Hotel. So we have two Parliaments, one in the Lower Green and another in Hastings.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member moved that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed?

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that in moving that further consideration be postponed I wanted to say something first.

Mr. SPEAKER: Therefore, it is a motion.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: That clarifies it during the absence of the Clerks.

Hon. E. W. BARROW: I hope that the Clerks are not abstaining also.

Mr. WILCOTT: On the threshold of Independence we must serve notice on all and sundry that productivity at all levels is one of the essentials of progress. We shall have to do some very hard things to some people. This is the sort of disrespect of Parliament that makes Parliamentarians act stupidly, because they take too many things for granted. The Clerks must treat the House with greater respect than withdrawing completely from the House and leaving the Table empty. The price we pay to keep that Table filled is not insignificant.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that these members of the Opposition who decided to stay outside of Parliament today and who have written you that letter appear to be challenging Your Honour's office in the House. To write a letter to the Speaker saying that you as a member of the House are not turning up to a meeting shows what a complete dunce you are. You do not have to write to the Speaker telling him that you are not attending a meeting. You are not cooks or washers who have to write and say: "I am not coming out today because I had a bad cold last night!" The Clerks would have to inform Your Honour that they cannot attend and even they would not have to do it in this way, because they are entitled to sick leave *et cetera*.

I gather from this letter that it is not only stupid but a gross insult by members to their own institution. Imagine saying that to participate in this proposed exercise would be to provide the Government Party with an opportunity of pressing the draft Constitution at the June Independence Conference in London as a Constitution approved by the Legislature of Barbados, and that will render the Opposition Parties powerless at the London Conference! If they are going to the Conference with any understanding that they have power they could as well stay at home.

This is a courtesy that the Government has accorded to the Opposition with seven members in a House of twenty-four, and the Government Party with fifteen out of twenty-four; and they are talking about a majority. If it was carried in the House by a majority, that majority would have been a substantial one in any House.

They wrote in the Press telling the world that if there was a majority vote in the House and in Parliament approving something, it would be giving it a spurious authority. Have you ever met such ignorance? Writing words that you do not know the meaning of! How can you talk about parliamentary authority as being spurious? Parliament is Sovereign. We are being told about the spurious authority of Parliament if it passes something by a majority vote although the Government Party was elected by the people by a large majority.

I think it should be said that this question of Independence was settled by us. There was a feeling that the people of Barbados were opposed to their own independence. Can you conceive in 1966 any country not wanting political independence? It shows how childish they are. Before we are in a position to talk about the economic aid we would like to see, they are telling us that they cannot participate in a debate on the Draft Constitution on Independence because they do not want to give it the stamp of approval. 4.25 p.m.

The people who have signed this — and I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition is not here — are completely incompetent to deal with these big national issues. The Leader of the Opposition is purely an ordinary parish-pump parliamentary machine, and the pump that he strokes is no longer working. A matter like this is infinitely beyond his capacity to deal with. People talk about another leader in the Barbados House of Assembly, but there is something we should tell the Secretary of State for the Colonies quite bluntly and forcefully now, because we would not have much opportunity after independence to work these things out. There are seven members in the Opposition; four in one Party and three in another, and you are making up two Oppositions to carry them away with you, calling them Opposition Parties.

In the United Kingdom, has Mr. John Grimond ever been anywhere to represent anybody because he is Leader of an Opposition Party? If the Prime Minister treats him with the courtesy of discussing a matter with him, that is as much as he would do. As the Hon. Premier has rightly asked, where did they go during the regime of the last Government? Who was carried them to London before? Formerly they were saying that the Premier was going to take away everybody's rights by independence; but here the Draft Constitution has been put before all and sundry. If he were going to London with it in his briefcase, they would say that he had a Constitution that nobody knew about and that they would like to see it.

Mr. Speaker, only a dunderhead would withdraw from Parliament where he is a representative. A dunderhead is a parliamentary dunce; and all they have shown is that the confidence which the people have reposed in them has been sadly misplaced on persons incapable of dealing with large national issues. As I said earlier, impotent people cannot run a Government. When it comes to these things, they run away. They run away from dealing with fundamental national issues that can be discussed within their own Party. They are so Colonial in concept that the only person they can consult with is the Secretary of State; but when it comes to discussing these matters with your own people, they withdraw.

The Leader of the House said here some weeks ago that they were giving everybody in Barbados an opportunity to see the Draft Constitution. Prior to that, they were saying that the Premier will turn this island into a dictatorship, that if you have a potato field, they were going to carry away your potatoes, or take away your pear trees or sheep. Now that the Draft Constitution has been printed for everybody to see, they cannot use the argument about democracy or dictatorship; they are finding another argument. They want to create something new in the minds of the public. They are operating on the basis that they must always create a crisis, because they are crisis politicians. They would be glad to hear that the House of Assembly is burning so that they would have something to say although it would be costly. A crisis gives them something to talk about, just as some people would listen religiously to nothing else but death notices. If they are politicians they have to stop and listen, although they have not been to a funeral in fifty years, because a funeral sounds like a crisis. They must hear that the Garrison or some big place is burning down, because it gives them something to talk about; but if nothing takes place and they have to initiate something out of the clear, blue atmosphere which needs hardwork and original work, you get nothing from them. Their original attitude is to create an atmosphere of discontent.

Mr. Speaker, these same members challenged us that we could not win the independence vote in Parliament. We won that vote. What more must we win? The second stage now is to deal with the Constitution, but they are saying: "Not in the House of Assembly." Can we reach the stage where a member of the House of Assembly is saying that the Legislature is not the best place to discuss the most important issue there is? That is why I call them political dunces. We are giving approval to what we want to put forward, and if they are not in favour of what we are putting forward, when they get to the Secretary of State it would not mean anything. They should let the people of Barbados know their views, unless the people are not as important as the Secretary of State. In the Draft Constitution you can write whatever you like, and you can add or take out and amend, and as the Premier rightly said, Constitutions are for lawyers. This is a lawyer's paradise, because after we have the Constitution, lawyers will make more money, because every now and again they will tell somebody that they offended the Constitution, and down in somebody's pocket they will go to defend the cause, and though the person may lose, the lawyer still gains. In all these things I have never seen in Barbados a lawyer go to prison or even pay a fine for something; so even if he loses an easy case, he still wins. There was only one

very important case of which I heard where the woman called back for her money, and the lawyer was so offended or annoyed that he gave her back. I know that your office is in Coleridge Street, but I do not mean your office. They are giving the impression that writing the Constitution will deprive them of something. Then there are the two other members, the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. junior member for St. Peter. You can liken the hon. junior member for St. Peter to one of those mock-birds which you use for keeping away other birds when you have things planted in your yard. He is a political mocking-bird. He only has to hear something going, and if he thinks what is going sounds good, he sings the same tune; so he is saying that he is not turning up to the House. How often does he turn up anyhow? If members used to be paid for every meeting they attend, the hon. junior member for St. Peter would have been the first in a seat today; but you are paid even when you are away.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member for St. Peter that his motion is a dilatory one.

Mr. WALCOTT: In moving the postponement of the debate, I am still entitled to make some comments. That is one thing with our Rules; they are very flexible and elastic.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is the Mover, but it is I to determine what is in order. According to Standing Order 31 (2) - I am only reminding the hon. member, I am not telling him - "the debate upon such a motion shall be confined to the matter of the motion" - "that further consideration be postponed" - and a Member who has made or seconded such a motion shall not be entitled to move or second any similar motion during the same debate."

Mr. WALCOTT: The matter I am dealing with is the postponement of the debate on the Draft Constitution, and Your Honour is well aware that the reason for moving the postponement is quite in order; so I will only take this opportunity of saying that these gentlemen who believe that they will be forcing us to postpone the debate have not treated this community with any courtesy. As the Hon. Premier has said, some people have sent in information that he feels should be analysed, but what he is worried about is that the public is treated with discourtesy by the public forum and by the representatives who come here not giving the public that kind of representation they deserve.
4.35 p.m.

Why should four members join together to write a letter saying that they are not coming to the House of Assembly? We would be political idiots if we did not comment on this. They are four members and they are representing four different points of view. One is the Leader of the Official Opposition, one is the Leader of the Minority Party and the other two are allegedly Independent members; so we have four different points of view in collusion. They

say that they are not coming to the House of Assembly today. I think the Public should know how their business should be conducted and that there was no question that the Government did not know what they are doing. The Government served copies of the Draft Constitution to the various Service organizations and gave us four weeks to discuss the matter.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is bereft of his ability as a Leader of the Opposition. To give you an illustration: when the Hon. Leader of the House said that at this meeting we would discuss the Draft Constitution, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had ample opportunity to state then that he was not participating in the debate. If I had my way about it, not only would they not debate in this House of Assembly; they would not take part in any debate about the matter in London. One of the reasons why they are going to London is because they are going out of the expenses of the people. If they had to pay their own expenses, they would also withdraw from taking part in that discussion too. If I had my way as to their contracting out, I would treat them as if I was an industrial employer. I would say: As you have walked out, therefore there you must stay." Sir, that is the reason why I beg to move that further consideration of this debate be postponed.

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

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until next Tuesday 26th April, 1966 at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

In connection with the continuation of this debate I should be writing Your Honour requesting the use of the equipment of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to record the debate on the Draft Constitution.

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

Hon. E. W. BARROW: Before the question is put, as I understand it the purpose of recording the debate is in order to facilitate the printing of it. It is not for the purpose of broadcasting the debate. We have received a request from certain quarters that very prompt submission of the Hansard should be made in the course of this debate and this is the main purpose of the recording of the debate.

*The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday 26th April, 1966 at 2.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
4.45 p.m.*