

X

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 31st May, 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. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Mr. E. ST.A. HOLDER, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; and Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (*Minister of Trade and Labour*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret once again to have to inform the House that there are no Minutes ready for confirmation.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. and Learned Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1966."

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

A Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1966.

A Resolution to place the sum of \$50,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1966-67, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1966-67, No. 4 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

A Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941.

A Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to place the sum of \$10,000 at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1966-67, Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1966-67, No. 3 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Messrs. LYNCH and BATSON and Hon. N. W. BOXILL entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I should like to give notice that it is my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply later in today's sitting to deal with those two Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given. The Resolutions will themselves be circulated to hon. members shortly.

QUESTIONS

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

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:

Will the Minister state whether it is the intention of the Government to implement the recommendation made for a playing field from the Northern District Council, for the parish of St. Joseph?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state if it is a possibility that the Playing Field will be available this year?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Package Tax Act, 1941, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Customs Act, 1962, was read a first time.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed further, there is a Message here from His Excellency the Governor, signed by His Excellency's own hand which I am commanded to read to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the House proceed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the Message reads as follows:-

Message No. 1/1966

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that at the request of the Secretary of State for the Colonies he will be attending the Barbados Independence Conference due to commence in London on 20th June. His Excellency proposes to leave

the Island on Sunday, 12th June, and visit Montreal en route to London to hold discussions in his capacity as Chairman, Regional Council of Ministers, with the Acting Commissioner for the Eastern Caribbean in Canada. His Excellency expects to return to the Island about the 16th July.

During His Excellency's absence, Mr. Justice W. R. Douglas, Chief Justice, will act as Governor under the provisions of paragraph 3 (1) (b) of Schedule 2 to the Barbados (Letters Patent Consolidation) Order, 1964.

John Stow
Governor.

Government House;
Barbados.
31st May, 1966.
(M.P. 3800).

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

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

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

INDISPOSITION OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have with great regret to inform the House that a member of our Staff of Official Reporters is gravely indisposed, and, I am informed, is now a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which maintains our number of casualties at two-thirds of the Staff of Official Reporters. If it is the wish of this Chamber, I will convey the sympathy of the House to our ailing Staff Member.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly think hon. members on both sides will wish Your Honour to do this.
2.55 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

The question was put and carried nem-con.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. John.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I am asking leave to take charge of this Item.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, leave is granted, and the Hon. Leader of the House may now proceed to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1966.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members will see quite easily what this Civil Establishment Order is all about. The Order provides, as hon. members will see, for the following adjustments in the Staff structures in the Town and Country Planning Office and in the Water-works Department. In respect of the Town and Country Planning Department it is proposed to establish the post of Town and Country Planning Officer on a permanent and pensionable basis at a fixed salary of \$9,120 - per annum. At present this post is managed on a contractual basis and it is proposed to put it on a pensionable basis. With respect to the Water Works Department several things are included in this Civil Establishment Order. First of all there is a proposal to up-grade the post of Assistant Superintendent from \$3,528 - \$4,464 to \$3,528 - \$5,136 making a higher

maximum, and then consequently to replace the salary structure of the post of Apprentice Draftsman to break it down so to speak with a Junior Draughtsman in the scale \$1,872 - \$2,832 as maximum and the pupil draughtsman \$1,200 a year to \$1,776 as maximum, and thirdly to establish the key scale post of Waste Service Inspector at a salary rate of 54 cents to 68 cents per hour in the scale \$1,200 to \$2,352 at the maximum. Fourthly, to establish the key scale post of Chlorination Assistant with a scale of \$1,872 to \$2,352 E.B. and from then on \$2,472 to \$2,832. Fifthly to upgrade the post of Senior Machine Operator and to call this post Water Rates Supervisor in the salary scale of \$1,872 to \$2,352. Next to create the post of Draughtsman in the salary scale of \$3,096 to \$3,960 and lastly to establish permanently three present temporary posts of Clerical Assistants. The above regradings in the staff structure of the Water Works Department are designed to benefit more adequately the duties and responsibilities of such posts and also to assist in the recruitment and retention of Officers.

The three additional posts of Clerical Assistant replace three temporary post which have been provided over the past seven years, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. I am sure my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, will be happy to supply the House with any additional information.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

3.05 p.m.

FINAL APPROPRIATION BILL 1966

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with this Bill which stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned senior member for St. John.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will, of course, be familiar with this annual exercise. This Bill is the Final Appropriation Bill in respect of the Financial Year which has just ended on the 31st March, 1966, and it provides the final legal authority for the expenditure of the sum of \$1,804,402, and for the Appropriation of such a sum for the Services and purposes set out in the Schedule. This covers the Supplementary Appropriation Bill.

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

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

The Preamble was called and postponed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Clauses 1 to 5 were called and passed.

The Preamble was passed.

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

On separate motions of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title read and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the hon. senior member for Christ Church, and it is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the Service of the island.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1966-67 (CURRENT) (No. 2)

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to take charge of this Resolution which stands in the name of the Hon Premier and Minister of Finance.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$460. It will be seen from the Addendum that the amount is required to purchase a duplicating machine primarily for the Cabinet Secretariat and office of the Premier. The provision of such a machine has become necessary for the more efficient functioning of the Cabinet Secretariat and other departments accommodated at Government Headquarters.

This machine is essential because Cabinet papers have to be duplicated, and it is necessary to have this work done by other agencies. It will be seen, therefore, that this expenditure is necessary and desirable and I am asking that the amount be voted.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

3.15 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, 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. FERGUSON, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. WALCOTT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Philip, and it is the third reading of a Bill to authorise the Southern District Council to pay to Percival Bascombe a gratuity and pension.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, I am asking leave that Order No. 4 under Private Members' Business be the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Peter is asking leave of the House that he may proceed with Order No 4 standing in his name as the first Order of the Day, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

This Order is to move the passing of a Resolution relating to the low wages paid to workers in certain sectors of the economy of this Island.

Let the hon. member proceed.

RESOLUTION re MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have been giving consideration to this matter for many years, and I loathe the idea of bringing before this Chamber a Resolution of this nature, but in recent months I have been forced to take this step because of the attitude of some sectors of our private employment in this Island. I think I have phrased a Resolution that is simple, and it reads as follows:-

WHEREAS the low wages paid to workers in certain sectors of the economy of this Island make it impossible for the said workers to enjoy a standard of living compatible with the minimum needs of life;

AND WHEREAS there is urgent need for a close examination and appraisal of the situation, and for a concerted effort to be made to improve the lot of the said workers:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government to set up a Committee to examine the wage structure existing in the Island as applicable to workers in all segments of the community and to recommend a minimum wage for the said workers that would ensure the attainment by them of the normal requirements of life in a modern society.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I loathe the idea of bringing this to the Chamber because I felt that by direct collective bargaining and negotiations, employers in this Island would have seen the necessity for providing workers with a wage that is in consonance with any decent standard of life. I have had it from the horse's mouth, from the mouth of the Premier and Minister of Finance as he said at the May Day Celebrations, that we were speaking to the converted, and I hope the Minister of Trade when he replies will be able to say the same.

In this Island people believe that \$20 a week, \$1,000 per annum is enough for a human being to live decently on. There are small shopkeepers - and maybe today we are going to hear from the Leader of the Opposition that we are going to put the small shopkeepers out of business,

but I do not know whom the small businessmen are putting out of life. If we are putting them out of business, they are putting people out of life, because it is tragic to think that in Barbados you look upon an able-bodied man or woman and give them \$20 a week. I am not talking now about the domestic servants, because some domestic servants by wages, services and other benefits earn more than \$20 a week; but some small businessmen want to get rich at the expense of a cheap labour force. \$1,000 per annum is not the sort of money we can envisage on which to build a decent, viable progressive society.

Last Saturday, I read that there is a minimum wage of \$20 a week for shop assistants. Unfortunately sometimes the minimum becomes the maximum, and this is for people over eighteen years.
3.25 p.m.

The businesses in Bridgetown have been expanding, and I do not want to scare people; but I believe what will bring people to their senses in Barbados is if all the lorry drivers, store porters, the hundreds of manual workers decide on one day that they are not going to work for these wages and bring life to a complete halt in Barbados to focus public attention on this public scandal that still persists. I have been negotiating with employers, and I have, without calling the names, two of the biggest firms in Bridgetown with capital that runs into millions offering these kind of workers the ridiculous increase of \$2 per week on wages of \$20.00 per week - ten percent! I do not want to comment on the Commissioner of Salaries' Report, but just taking a rough glance at that Report I read that in some instances he had made recommendations, I think, for as much as \$1,000 per annum for some people, which is the total annual income of some of the people that we have working in the City of Bridgetown. What is an increase for some - and I have not said that I agree or that I do not agree - I have not read the Report. Not that I am not in favour of an increase of \$1,000 per annum because I have just come from a meeting that I have submitted an increase for some workers of \$600 per annum - workers working in the Port of Bridgetown. I am not against the idea of any one receiving an increase equivalent to \$1,000 per annum; but what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that a man's total wage \$1,000 per annum. It seems to me fantastic for any employer to ask us to expect and accept an increase of 10%, \$100, per annum, \$2.00 per week. Good cigarettes, I understand, to good smokers - good tobacco to good smokers cost them more than \$2.00 a week. Good whiskey cost more than \$2.00 a week, and good Barbados Rum will cost more than that. I feel that in Barbados - it is true the basic economy in this country is sugar and it has been tied to slavery - a slave economy was not based on wages - and we are about to move people up from their beginnings of slavery and thinking, and make them appreciate that a living and a decent wage is the right of every working man and woman. The businesses in Bridgetown - and they threaten the workers, whenever there is an attempt to give them a living wage, that they are going to dismiss them and they hold a threat of a dismissal over their heads like the sword of Damocles. Now, I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that I would be fair to a large sector of workers not to bring this to the attention of this Chamber. We cannot increase prosperity until we increase the prosperity of the persons at the lowest of the economy and we do that by increasing the purchasing power of those at the lowest ebb of the economy. It is true that in some instances we are going to be forced to examine the very economy itself. The majority of people who operate the economy of Barbados at the centre - and this is where I have the greatest - and where we collide at the greatest point - the Opposition and myself - because Conservatism within the context of the Barbados economy means the preservation of low wages and high profits, and the control of the economy by a handful of people - and I cannot see the Leader of the Opposition perpetuating a situation in which he is underwriting this sort of obnoxious and atrocious economic situation in 1966 and it is time that he must see the light. No man with a conscience can sit down and see owners of stores in Bridgetown buying buildings after buildings, investments after investments, and telling us to pay people wages of \$18 and \$20 a week and ask them to look for house-rent, food,

clothing and for one of the natural biological elements of life - procreation of the species. Marriage to a man working for \$20 a week will be a memory, and it is no wonder that when they chide us about illegitimacy and promiscuity, vice, ignorance and disease, these are the contents of low wages, low standards, poor upbringing. The businesses in town - I watched the balance sheet of one company and I said to the Directors there is no point in putting into your balance sheet an item of charity and making people think that you are charitable and you are going to give money to charity because we believe in the old adage that charity begins at home.
3.35 p.m.

Before employers can attempt to be charitable to those outside of their gates, they must in the first instance be charitable to those within. I feel that the time has come when in Barbados you must bring to the attention of the public that there must be a minimum wage approximating and in consonance with what can be regarded as a decent living standard. You must express that as something that the Legislature is going to underwrite.

It is not my intention Mr. Speaker, to ask this Chamber today to say what the minimum wage should be. I am asking the Chamber to agree to the setting up of a Committee to examine the wage structure in Barbados and to make the appropriate recommendations.

I, as leader of the most vocal Trade Union in this Island representing a number of underprivileged people, masses of working class people, I am aware of the struggle that we have had to put up for the last twenty-five years even to do what we have done. We are not satisfied with all that we have done. We are aware that there are some workers unorganizable in character. Some are organizable in character, but at the same time we have reached a stage where notwithstanding the fact that we represent a wide sector of the economy of this island, there are some people still without a foundation and for whom we must place a foundation so that we can proceed to build on that foundation.

There is an army of shop assistants who can be organized and who should be organized; but because of *laissez faire* or intimidation there are being exploited. I have been told that in some instances some of these workers are forced at times even to sign for wages that they do not receive. There are men who work on lorries; there are handy men and there are people engaged in building construction; and as regards the last that is something which the Government in constructing has to watch.

There are people who work in the construction of nice homes; but the ones who do the work in the creation of these nice homes have to live in misery because they do not receive adequate wages for the work they have to perform.

Some people have been complaining about the productivity of workers; but let us examine ourselves and do a little introspection. Let us ask ourselves this. In 1966, are we saying that \$20 a week is enough to live on? I am satisfied that some members of this House if they had to exist today on \$20 a week would prefer to commit suicide than to go on living because it would be very near to that for some of them.

We have thousands of people whose employers are asking them to carry on this wage and some times lower than that and asking them to look cheerful and, what is more, to be honest. Now, what are we going to do? I am not making any proposition for domestic servants who get food in houses where they work; but even then I am hoping that there will be no necessity for domestic servants, because I hope that the economy would be so buoyant and viable that no one would expect a maid to cook their food or give them a glass of water. They will live as they do in the industrial countries where cooking food is either a job in the home for the wife or husband or a job in a restaurant.

I would say to people in Barbados that people in the U.S.A. who work for \$15,000 and \$20,000 a year cook their

own food. Some of our wives in this island have to have a little bit of reorientation. Some wives believe that when they are married they can sing that very popular hymn "Now the labourer's task is o'er". They think that after they are married things like washing and cooking are something of the past.

The social climate in Barbados is that if you do not have a servant you are not in the fashion. We are aware that because labour is cheap servants are available and the chores that servants perform are intrinsically jobs that have to be created; but it is better to create industrial jobs than domestic jobs so that the purchasing power of the community becomes greater. The purchasing power of a domestic servant is extremely low. Working for \$10 or \$12 a week represents a very low income because it is so near to the gross *per capita* income which takes into account several factors.

Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing this Resolution on any narrow grounds or for any political purpose. I am not interested in that. I am proposing it from a vantage point in the Trade Union sector.

I am aware that there are some employers for whom we have to legislate, just as there are some employers who would not want to give a day's holiday to a worker if they were not legislated for. There are some employers who will never pay a decent wage, and all of them are watching each other.

3.45 p.m.

There are some big firms in Bridgetown with joint stock owners like Wilkinson and Challenor, Mussons and DaCosta, the Shipping and Trading, who control the economy of this Island in a meaningful manner and the wage pattern is set by them. I have been meeting employers here for over twenty-one years; I have met them at Courts, at Banks Brewery, at Rediffusion, at the Electric Company, on the plantations, at Central Foundry and at all the little businesses around here. They are the same kind of directors. When you are not meeting Mr. Browne, you are meeting his cousin, or somebody married to his sister or somebody married to his cousin. The same people control the economy, and all of them live well; but the majority of people working for them are renting \$4.00 a week houses, living in the Petty Debt Court or in Mr. Bryan's house, running to the shop every morning, having to buy rice every morning and waiting until fish is selling at ten for a quarter to get some. That is the sort of economy they have to eke out. They wear a pair of shoes until when they walk you can see their heart beat when they raise the bottom of their feet, and you do not have to put a stethoscope anywhere near to their chest. They work clothes overtime and live without the proper amenities of life; and unless we put up a public bath, they do not know what it is to have water in their homes. They have to rely on the public services because of the wages paid in the majority of cases.

A young economist came here some days ago and analysed the situation in which he showed that people in the lower sector of our economy have not risen as fast as the others. It was unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that I did not have the opportunity of discussing this matter with him before I debated it, but I am taking the opportunity of bringing this before the Chamber's attention now, because I am satisfied that this country is in dire need of a minimum wage set at such a figure that can make a man have pride in his country. Now that we are on the eve of Independence, nothing would give me greater pleasure than to have an Independence minimum wage, so that on the day that Independence is declared, while the flags will be going up, the wages would be consolidated so that they would remember that from that day on, Barbados gave a minimum wage to the workers in this country which would make them feel proud.

Mr. Speaker, even the Leader of the Opposition whom I said is a standard bearer of the Conservative Party knows and he has seen from the City Council that the man at the lowest ebb of society is the man who spends money most quickly. The hon. member is a director of the Civic Society,

and the only directors of the Civic Society are the directors of the Civic. I am a member, but I have not drawn anything yet from them. Maybe when I draw I am going to draw very big. I have been a member for nearly fifteen years, and I have never drawn sick benefits. (A VOICE: But you have drawn bonus.) That is drawing back my money. Bonus is when you get something on what you have paid. If you gave a man \$10 and he gave you back \$8, that is not bonus. I feel that is an example of where poor people turn over money.

Mr. Speaker, when you increase the wages of the man at the bottom his turn over in the economy is greater, because he has no need to bank it; his bank is in the necessities of life; clothing, food, shelter, something for his children, but it keeps the economy viable. To add \$500 to the income of a man getting \$10,000 per annum does not have the same circulative effect as \$500 at the lowest sector of the economy. If you want to see what it means, take at Christmas time or during the reaping season when the man at the bottom possesses more money and you can see a vibrant and pulsating economy. I feel that employers in this Island must be completely re-orientated to the concept that good wages - not on the narrow hide-and-seek basis - do not mean that you want to run a person out of business. Without calling any person's name, I know a man who exploited people like this, and he died and left an estate valued at \$180,000, and he never paid income tax in his life. In a community like ours where there is a lot of available labour, it would therefore be cheap; but the legislature, especially one like ours, should not underwrite cheap labour because it is inimical to the best interest of our community, and it is against our social conscience.

I know, Sir, that I am preaching to a Government that agrees with this philosophy; otherwise I would not be a member of a Government Party which did not agree with this philosophy. I know, too, that all members of the House will join me in stating that the present wages in certain sectors of the economy are below what the economy can afford. The economy can afford to do better, can afford to allow people to live better, and can afford them to have a better life.

3.55 p.m.

I want to say this to the small business men. Sometimes we try to excuse small business men by saying that small business men cannot afford it. Small businessmen run small concerns and they are not required to employ large numbers of people and they must be prepared to share the prosperity of their businesses with those who help them. As soon as a man requires someone other than himself to work with him he must be prepared for the consequences. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that all members of this Chamber should be prepared to agree to have this examination because we cannot afford to do without it. I see big men, able-bodied men riding on lorries on Roebuck Street at \$18.00 per week and employers believing that they are paying them well. There is a psychological angle to it also. The lower the wages you pay a workman, Mr. Speaker, the less he feels he belongs to anything. He does not even feel he belongs to society. He feels that society is an enemy. The more he gets out of society, the more he feels he belongs to society and the better citizen he would be. You will note, Sir, that some of the worst citizens in society - not all, but in the majority of cases, the worst citizens in your society are those at the lowest ebb because they do not have much to lose. At the better end of society - these are in the minority and I hope that hon. members will see that this is an attempt not to be political and I do not have to be - by my very nature, but by my work and business everyday I see it. All of this morning all I was doing, Mr. Speaker, until I came to this Chamber was sitting down for three consecutive hours trying to persuade employers not poor employers - some of the richest in this island, that the persons I was representing were in need or that they could afford to pay them the wage; and what has brought this vividly to my mind was some five weeks ago I sat down at a table with representatives of two of the biggest firms in Barbados and saw that they had the effrontery to sit down and offer a man working for \$20 a week, \$2.00 a week more. As an example

I told them that in the Union that I have the honour to represent, where we have nothing of the earnings of their company we pay a Maid \$25 a week and the Messenger \$25 a week, and last Christmas gave them four weeks' money as a Christmas present because we regard it that the Messenger and the Maid have a right to eat food, and there is no "maid food" because to buy rice she pays the same price as I do. When she goes to buy milk, she pays the same price as I do. When she goes into a store she has to pay the same price as I have to pay for the same item, and I cannot see how a big firm could be offering a man \$2 a week and we were only asking for \$3.00. Not that they could not pay it, but if they paid \$3 they are disrupting the economic equilibrium in this community, because if they give a man \$25 a week it will give him paralysis or meningitis. There is the concept - and we must remove that from this country. There is the concept that there is a sector of people born to be poor everlastingly and nothing is done for them. A man who starts off life as a porter owing to the social cleavages of this community invariably dies as a porter. Therefore he has no scope for promotion if you strip his means of earning a livelihood and you restrict it only to the fact that he is a porter and this is where he should be and you do not give him a living because the worse it will be for him. For that reason people must begin to understand that you cannot build a community on low wages. You have to build a community on decent wages or productivity, purchasing power. When the man who is a working man leaves his home every morning he has the right to be able to buy clothes, he has the right to be able to buy food, he has the right to be able to sleep somewhere well, he has the right to have a little savings, he has a right to live a decent life. He has a right to look for a wife and marry, and he has a right to change his clothes sometimes. If we are going to accept those things, the only thing that can provide them is his income and he has the right to receive a decent income. I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that there is any excuse you can make for these things. There is no question of putting it off or finding an excuse for not doing it. It is a challenge to our society; it is a right that the workers are entitled to and now is the time for us to do it. I have the greatest pleasure in moving the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. CORBIN: I beg to second that, Mr. Speaker, seconding this Resolution I must say that I endorse plenty of what the senior member for St. Peter has said. It seems that there are thousands of people in Barbados who are getting high wages, and as I heard the senior member for St. Peter say, those with the big salaries have to buy the same food as those with the lower salaries. I am saying, Sir, that if those in high brackets are getting big salaries and have to buy the same food and clothing as those with small salaries, I wonder how those in the lower bracket are expected to live.
4.05 p.m.

The man working for \$100 a month may have three or four children and has to pay house rent. His children may not be going to a Government Secondary school and so he has to pay fees at some other school. At the end of the month the man's brain is strained. The arteries of his brain sometimes burst before morning.

On the other hand there are some who can store up \$300 a month out of what they are working for, while the poor man cannot save a cent. If you take the Report of the Salaries Commissioner you will see that it is recommended in some cases that the big man's salary be increased by \$1,200 a year which is more than the poor man is getting as salary for a year.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that something has to be done for the small man who carries the biggest strain upon his shoulder. He has the weight of the island on his shoulder and he should be recompensed and be able to feed himself, clothe himself and have a house with proper furniture. That must be done if we want this island to go right. The smaller man should be able to survive in a decent manner and should be able to eat, drink and feel as happy as any other man.

There are some people who feed their dog on beef, mutton and pork and their dogs have never contributed any-

thing to the economy of the island. At the same time the labourers in the field are perishing. They will be a time of reckoning. I remember that in former years the children of Israel were making bricks without straw. They were working half starved, but the God of Heaven sent his Son to relieve them.

Millionaires are feeding their dogs on beefsteaks and their servants are perishing; but, as I have said, the day of reckoning will come. There are businessmen in this island who are making millions of dollars and they refuse even to give a scholarship to the poor people who are working for them. They are all depending on the Government instead of looking into their own treasury and seeing what they save off the poor people. They could give Scholarships and so help the economy of the island.

Every man in this world is dependent on the poor. Without the poor every man would have to hide his head. What is the rich man doing? He is educating his sons and daughters and leaving the poor the same way, but a time is coming.

I remember a story in the Bible of the rich man who said that his land produced so much food. He said: "Eat drink and be merry, my soul!" And the Lord said "thou fool! I require thy soul today." What happened to all that he had saved up?

Mr. Speaker, I think that the rich man or the big man who has all these industries and who is in a position to pay better salary should do so without having to be forced.

Throughout the world when it comes to election time for a Government to get into power it has to preach about the poor people. They have to say that the poor is suffering, hungry, destitute and homeless and then the poor will give them a vote with the understanding that when they get into power the poor will get relief. I am so glad to see the facilities that this Government has given to the poor people - for example, free secondary education - to enlighten the darkness of the understanding of the poor. God has brought this Government into power, and this Government has opened the eyes of the poor by giving them free secondary education.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, if the rich man contributes to the poor people, it would relieve the Government of certain pressure and strain which it has to undergo. This Resolution which has been brought by the hon. senior member for St. Peter should be considered, and I am saying seriously, Sir, that the time is coming when the poor will resist even the very rich man and tell him that he has taken advantage of them. We have to think of the pensioners who have helped to build up the economy of this Island for many years by working for little or nothing. Some have worked for private firms and have gone home to depend on \$2 a month or fifty cents a week, because the firms for which they worked were not compelled to give them a pension or gratuity. I hope, therefore, that this Government will bring down some measure in future to help all categories of workers, and I hope that all those who are concerned in industries will assist the poor people and not keep all the profits for themselves.

I was travelling once behind a woman carrying a load up a hill, and I heard her bones crying out for lubrication just like the axle of a motor vehicle when it has run short of lubrication. She fell six times, but she had to get up and continue carrying the load in order to make a feed for her children. The day of reckoning will come. No factory or industry can continue to operate anywhere in the world without the help of the poor, because the rich man cannot do the job which the poor man does, since he has not the strength for the particular job. They are the foundation of any economy, and if we neglect the foundation, the building must come down. If I refuse to give my servant a pint of milk for milking my cow and he dies, I would have to go in the mud and water and milk it myself; so it is better for me to give him a pint of milk. If you eat all the food your land produces yourself, you will have to work the land alone.

Mr. Speaker, some of these people have millions of dollars in the Bank and invested otherwise, and their servants are hungry and in need. Could that be pleasing in the sight of God and man? Let the big man open his heart and give something to the poor. There are lots of people who allow all the water to run into their pond, but the people on the outside are dying and thirsty for a drop. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that every man who is an employer will look forward from henceforth and help all those who work for him. To those who work for the big man, I say: "Let every man give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, and by so doing, the wheel of progress will go forward." We should not take out more than we are putting in, but I am sure that someone is taking out the better part for himself.

In concluding my speech in seconding this Resolution, I would ask that it be given the full support of this Chamber in its passage.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for St. Andrew seconding the motion?

Mr. CORBIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to associate myself with the remarks of the Mover and Seconder of this Resolution. I realise that the time has come when something should be done for employees in the lower bracket. When we deal with increases in salary, I have always found that they have been set to start from the top, and when they get to the bottom, the small amount which is given to the employees in the lower bracket cannot meet their demands.

In dealing with this Resolution, Sir, I realise that we as members of this ancient and Honourable House should do our utmost to fix a minimum wage for the employees in the lower bracket. For too many years they have been suffering, and the meagre amount which they receive weekly cannot maintain them. Besides, you know that some of them have families; they must educate their children. This Government is giving free secondary education to certain children with the ability to assimilate the work; but even those parents whose children have the opportunity still have to think of bus fares, books, lunch and so forth. To say therefore that in this day \$18 or \$20 a week can maintain a man and his family is a reckless misstatement. We have got to do something about it, and especially now that we have seen the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner, we must think about people who are employed privately, and who too are contributing to the economy of this Island. These people live on starvation wages at present, and something should be done to alleviate them of their hardships which they must face daily.

It is true that some small employers will tell you that they are not in a position to pay a bigger salary, but we must consider the matter of fixing a minimum wage for employees in certain categories.
4.25 p.m.

Those are the people who are called on to do very hard work - work which we of ourselves never think about doing; and it is my opinion that we will have to consider them and we should give them a greater pay so that they may be able to enjoy some of the social amenities of life. They have to pay for electricity and they have to pay for water. These things all cost money, and we must do something to help people in the lower bracket - that is to raise their standard of living, and it can only be done by giving them a greater weekly pay so that they can enjoy some of the good things of this world. They have to concentrate on their children and we, too, feel that their children should be educated. Let us do our utmost to support this Resolution. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in giving this Resolution my wholehearted support.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support on behalf of the Government the Resolution proposed by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. senior member for St. Peter recommended that a Committee be appointed to go into the possibility of recommending a minimum wage for workers in this country. This Govern-

ment pledges its support to any project which carries with it the interest of the people in this community, and there is no reason why with this object in view the Government should not support a Resolution such as the one proposed by the hon. senior member for St. Peter. Only a few weeks ago the Shops Wages Council made certain recommendations which were approved by the Government, but even then the Government was not itself satisfied that the minimum wage which was recommended for shop assistants was high enough to meet the social economic problems of shop assistants; but until a proper survey is carried in mind the entire economic structure of the country, and bearing in mind the increase in the cost of living which over the past five years is worked out at 25%, that is what it costs a man to live on. Say in 1961 it cost him 25% less than it cost him now in 1966, so if the cost of living has increased by approximately 25% between 1961 and 1966, it is reasonable to think that wages should be increased commensurately. The hon. senior member for St. Peter is worried about the low wages structure and the high profits made in the commercial economy of the country. Some people seem to think that it is better to pay large sums into the Treasury than to pay large wages to their employees. You will note if you look at the balance sheets of some of the business concerns that quite a sizeable sum is paid in taxes. We on this side of the Government are pleased to receive the taxes because it is on the revenue which we receive that is paid in by industrial houses that we are in a better position to meet the social demands of a country; but if the economy of the country is more buoyant if there is more money going into taxes of the lower income bracket, the more buoyant the economy is, the more money that is circulated at the bottom, the better for the economy of the country and therefore the fewer the demands would be on the Government for social services. Let us take the question of public assistance. If there is more money circulated at the bottom, the more will be paid out in public assistance. As I said last week, I am not in favour of public assistance. I believe that everybody should work for his living. If the economy is more satisfactorily shared amongst the people in this country, it is better for us. I do not believe that, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, the money in this country should circulate only amongst a few people. I feel that everybody should have his fair share and therefore I pledge on behalf of the Government to support the hon. member in this Resolution.
4.35 p.m.

It is common knowledge that in 1961 when the Party now running the Government was aspiring to office, we criticised the Jacobs Report because we felt that not enough consideration was given to the worker or the employee at the bottom. We thought so then and we think so now; therefore in an attempt to see something done for the man in that category in so far as wage structure is concerned, I will certainly have a Committee set up as soon as possible to go into the whole affair. Some people may think that action such as this taken by the Government is an attempt to run people out of business, but it is not. If people are paid well for the services which they perform, there will be a greater spending power in this country, and a greater spending power means an improvement in business; and although a businessman will be making a smaller profit on his investment because he pays higher wages, from the overall turnover he will discover that he would have to expand his business to such an extent that he comes out with a bigger profit in the end.

It is to be noted that over the past two or three years, every year we came into this Chamber budgeting for a deficit, and in one particular year the deficit resulted in a surplus of \$7 million. This is because of the encouragement given to local industry, because of the windfall and the growth of the tourist industry. The growth of tourism means that more people are employed in the hotel industry, the taxi owners have more money available to them, and more money goes into the homes of the average man in this country.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter referred to the spending power in the crop season, and it is to be noted that employers who can but do not pay a satisfactory wage

to their employees are contributing not only to the destruction of the economy of the country, but to crime, because a starving man can be a very vicious man, and whenever employment in any country drops to a new low, it means that you get a crime wave. It is to be noted that during the out-of-crop season in Barbados, the crime wave is higher than in the crop season, because of the paucity of the necessities of life, and because of the small amount of money which is in circulation. That is why I support this Resolution. If employers do not pay proper wages, it leads the employees to be promiscuous, and to put it in our own language, to fall into the hands of the devil. When there is a crime wave in the country, the money which the employers hold back from their employees is ploughed back and spent on behalf of the employees, whether it is spent on them in prison or on their children in the hospital. One of our most serious incidents of sickness among children in Barbados is malnutrition, and this is due to the lack of money in the hands of the masses of the country, with the result that the children cannot be properly fed between the ages of one month and two years. How many children of the parents working for \$200 or \$300 a month do we find suffering from malnutrition? The Minister of Health will bear me out that the children who suffer from malnutrition are those of parents who work for \$20 a week. There are some who work for the ridiculous sum of \$5 a week.

Mr. Speaker, a young lady came to my office only a few weeks ago asking whether I knew of any form of employment which she could get to help keep herself and her child. I asked her whether she was working and she said 'yes'. I further asked her what she was working for and she said she was working at one of the established industries in this country and her take-home pay at the end of the week was the ridiculous sum of \$5 a week; so when the hon. senior member for St. Peter referred to \$20 a week, that hon. member is very generous, because there are some people who hardly see \$20 a month, and they are employed by firms in the City of Bridgetown. Now, these people can hardly be expected to be productive. It is true that more people can be employed if production increases, and it is the aspiration and aim of the Government in the near future to so encourage the expansion of industry in this country, that there will hardly be any unemployment in a few years from now.

The answer to our economic and social problems is industrialisation. This happened in Puerto Rico where they depended purely on an agricultural economy. Today agriculture has more or less died out to some extent except in the cattle industry in Puerto Rico, and there is an ever-growing industrial development going on there.
4.45 p.m.

The Government of Barbados sees the need and it is to be noted that early in our session, he passed legislation asking to make more generous concessions to industrialists who are coming into the country. We like to encourage industrialists to come in, but we also would like to see them pay the wages commensurate with their business. We do not want them to come and make profits for themselves and make our country poor. We would like them to contribute to the economy of the country. We would like them to see to it that more money is in circulation amongst the masses because the more money, the greater the spending power of the masses. The more the Government collects from consumption tax it means that the spending power of the masses is greater and there will be more independent people in our community and we will have an independent community, where every Tom, Dick and Harry can say he is a man he can put his hand in his pocket and pay for what he wants. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot more I would like to say on this, but I think I have been preaching to the Conservatives quite a long time. Even the more conservative of us would agree that our masses need greater attention where wages are concerned, and that we should not encourage industrialists to make large profits at the expense of the wages they pay to employees. It is true that some of us say that they plough back some of their profits in the business. On the other hand we have heard the argument that indus-

trialists in this country are afraid to expand because over and above a certain amount of profit it does not pay them to expand, because the money finds its way back into the coffers of the Government. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the Resolution tabled by the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for a quarter of 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. SPEAKER: Immediately prior to the suspension of the sitting a Resolution standing in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Peter was passed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that Government Business be now resumed.

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

The question that Government Business be resumed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and while in Committee, deal with the two money Resolutions of which notice was given earlier today.

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

The question that Mr. SPEAKER leave the Chair and the House go into Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Resolution for the sum of \$10,000 is a grant to assist the Barbados Olympic Association.

As honourable members will remember, when the Estimates for this year were being considered earlier this year, the Government gave an assurance that they will support the cost of sending this Olympic team to participate in the games both in Puerto Rico and in Jamaica. So in keeping with those terms, the Government has now brought this Resolution for \$10,000 which represents approximately one-half of the expenses involved.

Honourable members will remember and realise that we are now setting up a national stadium, and that every effort has been made, and every encouragement given at this stage, to improve athletics and all types of sport in this island, and it is for that reason that we introduce this Resolution today.

The Association proposes to participate in the following types of sport: Athletics, Basketball, Cycling, Football, Lawn Tennis, Weightlifting, Swimming, Water Polo and Shooting, and Barbados will be represented by 17 persons, all of whom are athletes of some promise.

It is well known, Mr. Chairman, that in the fields of Weightlifting, Water Polo, Cycling and Basketball - to mention a few - we have very promising and outstanding athletes, and if it may be considered that in some of the other fields we have not yet reached the peak of providing the best calibre, at least the exposure of the young athletes to international standards, and to enable them the opportunity of competing with athletes of the highest calibre

from the entire Caribbean and Central American countries, would give them all the encouragement they need.
5.15 p.m.

It is for that reason Sir, that the Government is anxious and ready and willing to provide this sum of \$10,000 to assist in sending these two teams to these two Games. In so far as the Central American Games in Puerto Rico are concerned, the contribution would be roughly \$8,000, and it will be \$2,000 for the British Empire and Commonwealth Games which will be held in Jamaica in August. I hardly think it necessary, Sir, to emphasise the necessity of assisting our local talent and local athletes in participating in such games which are of the highest level in these parts, and we can look forward to outstanding performances in many of the fields of sport, as by enabling our young athletes to participate at this stage, it will give them the necessary impetus, stimulus and encouragement so that in the not too distant future we should be in a position to feel proud of our athletes not only in the cricketing world, but in swimming, football, athletics, cycling and all the various fields of endeavour.

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$10,000 do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Minister and the Government in making this grant, but at the same time I would like once more to say a word about these good things which the Government is doing to help in the line of sports. I should also like to see the Government paying attention to some of these athletes when they show efficiency. We are sending some 70 people to Puerto Rico, but I think I have said in this House on many occasions that Barbados has been fortunate enough to produce a good footballer in Mr. Reggie Haynes, who went with a West Indian Football Team to the United Kingdom, and he is the only Barbadian who has had that distinction. I do not know what the powers-that-be have against him, but notwithstanding that outstanding and unique distinction - no other Barbadian has yet been able to get on a West Indian Football Team - the Government has not yet seen fit to utilise this young man's services in a more meaningful manner to enhance the sport to which he has made such an excellent and outstanding contribution. I feel that now that the Government is making this visible and conspicuous contribution to sport, when those who are the recipients of this generosity have shone as he has, the Government should pay some attention to them. There are little petty jealousies and things that people bring into these things; but let us take this young man out of the realms of wastage and put him into the atmosphere of usefulness for the benefit of his other colleagues and the younger generation in sport. I wholeheartedly support the Resolution.

The question that the Resolution for \$10,000 do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1966-67 No. 4

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, if hon. members were to consult the current Estimates, 1966-67, they would see that provision has been made under Head 24, Item 10 - Conferences and Delegations for \$75,000; but this amount as provided in the current Estimates will be insufficient to meet the requirements for conferences this year. Major commitments so far are approximately \$53,000 for the Constitutional Conference on Independence in London which is to take place within the next few weeks in June. There is also, as hon. members will know, the Heads of Government Conference involving all the Heads of Government of the Commonwealth Caribbean Countries, the Prime Ministers of Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, the Premier of Barbados, the Chief Ministers of the Windwards and Leewards, and I think the Government of the Bahamas as well and possibly one other. The expenses of this Conference which is to take place next week in Barbados and for which Barbados is the host, are in the neighbourhood of \$25,000; and then in July the Barbados Government with these other

Commonwealth Caribbean Governments will have to participate in the very important Canada/West Indies Conference which is to take place in Ottawa on or about 6th July.

Now it is clear that when you take into account these three important Conferences, plus others which are certain to be held in the course of the current financial year, the amount provided is not sufficient to meet these commitments. In order therefore to meet these extraordinary commitments for attending at and the holding of the conferences, we think that supplementary provision of \$50,000 should be requested in order to cover not only what is coming up in the next few weeks, but what is likely to come up between now and the end of this financial year. As a matter of fact, I would just draw this to hon. members' attention in case they may think the Government is pulling something over. If you take the \$53,000 which is the cost of the London Conference and the \$25,000 which is the cost of the Heads of Governments Conference here next week, that gives you a total of \$78,000, which is \$3,000 more than the amount already provided; so apart from anything else we would have had to supplement the Estimates in any case. I just draw that to hon. members' attention to show that there is nothing really to worry about.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

In saying that, having given the reasons for this request which we are now making, I should like to warn this House that it is very possible that we may have to come back later in the financial year to ask it to make supplementary provision as and when the need arises.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister ended up by saying that there is nothing to be worried about, but there is something to be worried about, because I have noticed here that the expenses of the Barbados delegation to the Independence Conference in London in June will be approximately \$53,000. Before this Resolution was introduced I understood that the Government would have been paying for the two delegates from the Barbados Labour Party.
5. 25 p.m.

The British Government has given the green light to the Barbados Labour Party for two advisers to attend the Independence Conference in London. I am asking the honourable member if it is the Government's intention not to pay for these two advisers, because this is a matter above party. It is the people's business, every human being is involved, and I feel that the country should be paying the expenses for all the delegates to the Conference. If it is not the intention of the Government to pay for these two advisers from the Barbados Labour Party, it is the intention of the Party to call on the public to contribute to the expenses of these two advisers.

So much money is being spent on this particular Conference - approximately \$53,000 - that I do not think it is fair to pay for only two delegates from this amount. We are now called upon to vote this money, and I feel it is my democratic right on behalf of the people to ask the honourable Minister if it is the Government's intention to pay for these two delegates, because this is the people's money, and the people should be represented.

We are not dealing now with a particular individual, or with a particular Party; what we are dealing with is the representation of the people. The Government, as well as the Barbados Labour Party, are representing people, and without the support of the electorate neither of us would be a member of this Chamber today; so the people should be treated in the right way.

I do not know the size of the Government's delegation, nor the size of the Opposition's delegation, but I know that the Barbados Labour Party will be represented by four delegates at the Conference.

If they are prepared to pay for only two delegates, they will be carrying out their own intentions but not the wishes of the people. Each Party is speaking for the people it represents.

Mr. WALCOTT: We are going to talk Independence.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I am asking for your protection. You are there to protect me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am protecting you and listening attentively to what you have to say.

Mr. SMITH: I am also being interrupted by another voice. You must listen for interruptions, Sir. It is somewhere there in the Standing Orders where you may exercise your powers when a member is on his feet and another one interrupts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know my duty.

Mr. SMITH: The present Government was in the Opposition before, and it is possible that they may find themselves there again, because if the people do not return you to power, you might barely get in here, and on the Opposition side at that; so it is not to say that you have a big stick in the corner that you can take it up and use it whenever you like. Some time you will look into the corner and you wouldn't find the stick; you may find something else. 5.35 p.m.

I do not think it is fair since the Government is going to spend \$50,000 on this particular Conference in London that they will be paying for two delegates only from the Barbados Labour Party which is also representing people. I am asking the Hon. Introducer to let us know if the other two delegates will be paid for from this amount, and how many delegates they are prepared to pay for on the whole. It is my democratic right to know that. I do not want to know the individuals by name, but I want to know how many delegates will be paid for from this amount. It is the hon. member's duty to let this House know, because there are other hon. members who would like to know how many will be paid for from this amount. We are signing the cheque. (Mr. WALCOTT: Which cheque are you signing?)

Mr. Chairman, you are sitting there, and I am asking you to protect me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am protecting you.

Mr. SMITH: In what way?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You do not need my protection yet.

Mr. SMITH: I am appealing to you, Sir, to ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter to take it quietly. He was speaking here for the whole afternoon and I would not even look up at him.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member said he is going to sign the cheque, and I ask which cheque he is going to sign.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. senior member for St. Andrew is not behaving himself as an hon. member should. If he is going to start it, I will start it with him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will take care of you then.

Mr. SMITH: You will name me. Now, the Chair must not be like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will protect you.

Mr. SMITH: I can protect myself, but just ask the hon. senior member for St. Andrew to behave. I have not seen "Licensed Seller of Liquors" at this door; this is an Honourable Chamber.

I was saying, Sir, that this is a very important Conference because we are changing the atmosphere of Bar-

bados at it, and every one of us must be protected and represented up there. I am sure that neither you nor I will be going, nor will certain other members of this House be going; so we must have the necessary protection. You will be protected because your Party will carry a full delegation, but when the hon. member says there is nothing to be unhappy about, I am letting him know that I am unhappy because it is not becoming if we have to go with hat in hand begging for 10 cents or five cents here, there and everywhere to raise funds to go to this Conference. I have not heard a thing like this happen anywhere at all. I have not heard of any Independence Conference where the Opposition parties had to beg to go to the Conference. This Government should hold its head high in the air as it is accustomed to doing and not look down. We always play big, and we are playing big even at this Conference. The British Government has given the green light to two advisers along with the two delegates; so even if it was not Government's intention to go any further, since it is the wish of the majority, they should pay for the two advisers.

I am therefore asking the Hon. Minister to let me know the number of Opposition members on the delegation. The Government holds the purse strings of the taxpayers and they know how much they can spend. They are spending \$53,000 and the Minister has said that we can expect them to come back later for more. It would not be fair to leave the Opposition hanging on a limb begging. I intend to beg even you, Mr. Chairman, and some of the Ministers, because we must get them up there, and I will not be ashamed to beg. Rather than my having to embarrass the Ministers and members of the Democratic Labour Party, I am asking them to do justice to the people of this country.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not answering the hon. member, but I have been in and out of this country for some time, and I have been hearing people talk so much about who is going up to the Independence Conference and so forth and who is not taking part in the Independence debate. I am a little bit surprised to hear the hon. member. 5.45 p.m.

The honourable member's Party is a shameless bunch. All of them who were opposed to Independence should do what Dr. Jagan did if they really want to carry out their objection, but it is typical Barbadian fashion. They are so enamoured about a trip to England, that they are going to participate in something that they are opposed to, and they want somebody to pay for them.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, my Party was never opposed to Independence.

Mr. WALCOTT: His Party was very opposed to Independence. His Party would be opposed to anything the Government brought in at any time. I would ask the honourable member to sit down, because he does not know anything about Federation. He has never even been past Pelican Island to a West Indian island to know what he would be federating with, whether it would be turkeys, fowls, ducks, sheep, anything. He is playing this by air.

His Party is opposed to Independence because the exercise of Independence is too much for their mental capacity. It is not criticising somebody, but it is building yourself up to something, and they cannot do the positive. Put them alone to operate and you will see what will happen.

They have just passed a Resolution sending people to the Olympic Games. If a man is opposed to running, you cannot put him in a race to stop the others from running. If he is opposed to running, you cannot send him to Olympic Games.

They are so opposed to Independence that they have not participated in any of the debates. The people who should be able to hear their views on Independence are the people here, but they are only going to talk in London.

The honourable member is a junior member in his constituency; his colleague with him today is a junior member; the other member is a junior member in his constituency, and the honourable member for St. George is a

junior member. The junior members got more votes than the senior members. Perhaps he would say that his colleagues got more votes than him, but there are only two seats in a constituency, and you run as one person, but then you say that you got less votes. That is the sort of ignorant mathematics they work out. They want flogging or something so.

The honourable member knows that his Party is opposed to Independence. The Conference in London is to talk Independence. So what are you going up there to let the people know? Do you hope to come down with Independence for St. Lucia or Trinidad & Tobago? What is the honourable member's Party going for? They don't want Independence. One is telling us that Barbados is incapable of being an independent country. The exercise that is now going on is one that his Party is opposed to, but they want an election before Independence. Are you going to tell Mr. Lee not to give us Independence till we have an election?

I would like to say this. The reason why these former colonies of the British Government have been getting these upsets is the result of this type of British intrigue - leaving this kind of nonsense with us after Independence. If, after Independence, they leave us with these types of intrigue within the community they may find that the community is being divided, because on the eve of Independence you got this nonsense being talked; in a country like Barbados in 1966 you find people talking about the Labour Party trying to divide the nation on the right to political emancipation.

This is the sort of division we have been experiencing in this country for the last six months, based on the mental ignorance of a Party who now wants to line up under the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

5. 55 p. m.

If the British Government had to take Barbados as a whole to give representation when Barbados was a colony, they would not have accorded to Barbados the sort of representation they are giving us now. To show you the thinking of the British Government, Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the British Government spoke for us on the Anglo-West Indian Commission, and we had to quarrel in this House to get one seat in the Caribbean itself, because they left the whole Legislature out completely at the beginning and took nominated people to the first Anglo-West Indian Conference at which they were speaking for us. Now they have the audacity to show that they are so magnanimous by having from the eight members in the Opposition who are singing the same tune a delegation of four. They are regarding the eight members who are sitting in the same pew as two groups. The total number of the Opposition in the House of Assembly is eight and they have a representation of 50 per cent. If you send that monstrosity as an Opposition to England, what will happen? England has over 600 members in the House of Commons; the Conservative Party has 200 plus; so see if they are going to send 100 plus members. Britain is going into the European Economic Committee and not one member is going.

We admit, Mr. Chairman, that an Independence Conference is an important conference, but it is important for those who believe in independence; it is not important for those who are opposed to independence. The Opposition has been accorded representation, and now the hon. member is beginning to talk about the cost of representation and who is to pay. The British Government has been using these territories for much too long in this sort of exercise. My idea is that if I had the Government to run, the British Government would have to come down here and talk if they wanted to talk, because too many people get the idea that you must go to London as if you are going up in the sky. I will go further and say that if the Conference had been taking place in Barbados, there would not be any group that would object and say they were going to boycott it.

Mr. Chairman, both the Barbados Labour Party and the Barbados National Party boycotted the discussions in here, which means that they are opposed to the Government pursuing or passing a Resolution saying that this country is in favour of going independent. The hon. member said his Party

wants to have an election before we take independence, which means that he is saying that the people of Barbados are opposed to Barbados becoming independent. Why doesn't he get a demonstration and bring it to town and stop work, or do like the Buddhists in Viet Nam? Why doesn't he burn himself and have some positive demonstration to show that the people are opposed to the country going independent? Let him stop the wheels of Government from working by bringing people off their jobs. They should try to have a national strike. A country usually does these things when they want to show their objection to something that is of a national character. If I were opposed to the Government doing something, I would tell the Government that I would call a general strike where the buses would not move off to show that I have the people with me. The hon. member is walking about like the Salvation Army begging the people for money. They are having Gospel Hall meetings and testifying and at the end of the meeting asking for something for the Lord's work, and the Lord's work is to send somebody to London!

Now, this Party which has been operating for twenty-eight years has operated so badly and is so poverty stricken that they cannot even rake up as much money as to send two of their members to London if it is a matter of principle that they feel their advisers should go. I am not speaking for the Government, because the hon. member may agree that they all should go. I am only dealing with my general view about it. The members of the Barbados Labour Party say that the Leader of the Government is a dictator, but if I were the Premier of Barbados, I would tell Mr. Lee that if he wanted them to come he would have to pay their passage, because so far as I am concerned they are opposed to independence. They are opposed to this; but they want the community to believe that they have some trick in some bag, and they want to impress the community that somebody wants to take away their constitutional rights. There was all this chat that the Government was going to imprison people purely on local political grounds, but absolutely nothing at all to do with independence. They so want to beat the Party in power that if the Party picks a pumpkin from the ground they would say it is a breadfruit, although a breadfruit grows in a tree, because they must say something different from what the Government has said. The hon. member is now pleading with Mr. Lee, but we must be able to tell Mr. Lee at some time that he does not pay taxes in Barbados. We are not making any Secretary of State believe any longer that we are any cap-in-hand secretary-of-State-boy politicians who believe that when he comes you have to fold up you cap and handkerchief and say "Yes, Mr. Lee, we hear what you have said". He is very lucky indeed that he is dealing with the Premier like ours and not a Premier from other parts who plainly refuse to go anywhere to discuss anything with him.

I see, Mr. Chairman, that in Rhodesia Ian Smith is giving them the dance of their life, and they have to go to his country and talk with him, and that is a colony too. He stopped paying the Governor and the Secretary of State has to pay him from Great Britain. The British Government called them rebels, but I have never seen a rebel Government treated like a Princess. Now, wherever black people run the Government and when black ones look as though they want to eat black ones, you get this nonsense. This is the sort of atmosphere that the Secretary of State likes where a bunch of black people run up there to him and make him believe that he is a God.

Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. member would say that they are so opposed to independence for Barbados that they were not taking part in any discussions whatever, but I believe that a little commonsense must have sprung up some where in their heads some time. Something lodged in their heads that the people of Barbados are not talking this tune of not wanting independence; so they want to get back by telling the people that they were not against independence, but they are in favour of independence with St. Lucia. Go and tell them about independence with St. Lucia and hear their answer. Some will tell you if you want independence with St. Lucia to go to Soufriere and tell them you want independence with Barbados and let them vote for you. You do not do as if the people of Barbados vote for

you first. You are talking as if the people of St. Lucia voted for you first and sent you up here with a barrel of mangoes. The hon. member is forgetting that the Barbadian people voted for all of us and we are asking for independence for Barbados. They are opposed to independence, and they were trying to encourage the people of Barbados that independence was inimical to their interests. Some of them even mistake what people say.
6.05 p.m.

I went to the Guyana Independence celebrations, and it was a lovely celebration. I did not see these Labour Party people; I did not see them anywhere in Georgetown. They were fooling the people that they were invited somewhere, but I didn't see them anywhere at all. I saw the junior member for the City. Maybe the others were invited to a different celebration.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that the Opposition in this debate can make any stand now. Positively the forces of the Opposition were opposed to independence for Barbados. There is no question about that. If they feel that Barbados should not be independent, they should stick to their guns, because they do not see any future for Barbados being independent, because they do not understand what political independence means.

The honourable member said that this was above Party. They have not treated it above Party, they have treated it as a pure and simple Party issue. He is talking about signing a cheque. What cheque is he talking about? One for the Fix-It-Right Garage?

We produced a document as a draft, and the honourable member said that he was taking part in none of the debate. So far as they are concerned, this was not the people's business. The draft Constitution was our business, but it is the same draft Constitution they are going to talk about when they get to London.

The Government produces a draft Constitution to its people. The honourable member is a member of Parliament, but he withdraws from discussing the draft Constitution which is going to be discussed in England. He is depriving the people who put him in here from knowing what views he has. All the debates in the Assembly are going to be in the Hansard. Are you not going to read the debate?

The Government has already set, and the House has already voted for, Independence for Barbados. Do you feel that in this year of grace that the Secretary of State for the colonies would tell us in this country that we cannot have Independence?
6.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, Rhodesia said she would declare independence unilaterally. That is what is now known as U.D. I. We are not doing that. We have decided to come to Parliament. What are they telling us? Are they saying that although Parliament decided this it is not what the people wanted? Are they saying that the nine members who voted against Independence are in a better position to determine this issue of Independence than the fourteen members who voted for it? I have never heard such a joke.

I want to hear what these gentlemen will tell Mr. Lee. I want to know if they believe that they can go to London now and open with Mr. Lee a question of Independence with Dominica. I want to know what the hon. member means. If he wants the Minister tell him how much money they will give his advisers, I would say to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that if I were in his position I would keep quiet and listen, because there is no lack of principle involved.

A number of people going to a Conference is always an arbitrary question. There is no rule to say how many people should go. I am satisfied that the Party is not going to send the hon. member. They have two advisers and the whole joke about this is that we are sending more advisers to advise Barbados which has a relatively small Parlia-

ment than other territories with a larger Parliament and racial issues.

I have heard this talk about having an Ombudsman. Mr. Whyatt after he was Chief Justice of Singapore, had a lot of time on his hand and he created this idea of an Ombudsman in the Scandinavian countries where the legal system is different from ours. You would have to change the whole legal system to have an Ombudsman. In Barbados even if you do not have money you can talk as you like. The newspapers can write as they like. You can sleep where you like even if it is in the Main Guard. You do not have any detainees here. There is no question of anyone's rights being jeopardised. Members of the House have switched from one Party to another and no one tries to tear off your clothes. Our society is completely different from some others. I do not see how this question of rights and freedoms being jeopardised arises.

This was not found necessary prior to the Ministerial system of Government. Since the Ministerial system of Government has been established, has something happened? Ministers have resigned. Ministers have gone out of power. The only danger which we have to watch is that when we become independent we do not get elements who cannot succeed constitutionally, but use subversive methods against the State as a means of succeeding. Then they will know that a British army is not there and they may only have to go and bring down their guns from the country.

The hon. member's Party has lost. They should play Sparrow's record in which he said "Australia, you lost." They have lost both in the election and in this debate. If they are waiting until the next elections, sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Do not take every occasion to say that the Government is not being fair to their advisers. What I think is that if the Secretary of State told them that they could bring two advisers they should have been told how they would be brought up.

Like the senior member for St. Joseph, I feel that in a matter like this which is of a national character what we should have done was to demonstrate to our opponents and the Colonial Masters that when we come shaking off the last vestiges of colonialism we are approaching this exercise seeing ourselves as one people who really intend to become independent. But we find the products of slaves who were brought here, and who after 300 years are, some of them, members of the Legislature refusing to join with their brothers in seeking Independence and to show the world that Barbados, a far flung corner in the world, is willing to have Independence.

Instead of that, we have had this bogus exercise of going around the country telling their fellowmen that they are not yet ready to govern themselves.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, all of us know by now the hon. member who has just sat down. I have known him for a very long time. The member has accused me or my Party of not being in favour of Independence. We had a Resolution before this House a long time ago. I do not know if the hon. member was in the island at the time; but I believe that at some time he should have the opportunity to read the Official Gazette.

Up to now the people of this country, and even some of the members of this Chamber, cannot understand what the Premier has said relative to Independence. The Gazette is there. Hon. members spoke in here on the Independence Resolution and you can think of what some of the members of the Opposition had to undergo. A lot of people, supporters of the present Government, got outside and molested members when they were going home. Two Policemen had to meet me on the top of the stairs and escort me to my car. That was the treatment meted out to hon. members who were doing their duty on the floor of this House.
6.25 p.m.

That was the treatment meted out to hon. members who were doing their duty on the floor of this House, and

the Government knew all that was happening. The loud speakers were playing in the yard, but the people in the rural areas did not have the opportunity of hearing one word over Radio Barbados for which they are paying. Now, Sir, we are not talking about independence, because the Resolution has been passed; we are talking about the Constitution. Now the hon. senior member for St. Peter knows as well as I do, although he may not say it now, but he will at some time to come, that all that would have been done with that Constitution is that the Hon. Introducer would have introduced it, said whatever he likes and walked out of this Hon. Chamber without waiting to hear anything from any side, and as soon as they were ready to pass it, they would have got on the telephone and told him to come, and he would have come and finished lambasting and then it would go to the vote and be passed. He was not going to listen to any of us over here, and we have proved that more than once. What were we to do? Were we to come in here and be ill-treated, stand for a lot of abuse in here by the Introducer and then be molested outside?

Since the British Government cannot tell us anything and we are our own people, why spend \$53,000 to go up there? We should stay here and declare independence. If the two delegates from the Barbados Labour Party do not go, the Government would still have to go. Now the hon. member referred to free rides, but I do not want any free ride. I have something to keep me from getting free rides. I work hard and my shirt neck gets dirty; I do not pimp. I cannot even gamble; I do not know a pair of bone dice. If the hon. member is saying that if the British Government wants four they would have to pay for the other two, why are these boys going up? For free rides? Are they going for free rides?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I never said that the members were going up for a free ride. I said that the same way the hon. member is objecting to participating in the discussions, they should not want to go to London. I said that they are going for a free ride. I did not say that the Government members are going for a free ride, because the hon. member must remember that I said if I had my way, the Secretary of State would have to come here and discuss it with me.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member asked why we are going up since we did not participate. They participated; so why are they going up? He referred to Rhodesia and Ian Smith, but I am saying that Ian Smith is the only foolish Smith I know; so why not stay down here and declare independence? The Hon. Premier said they would have to come down here, as he was not going up. I saw that in a newspaper report. He said he had other things to do and they would have to come down here.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member is not quoting the Hon. Premier accurately. He never said he had so much to do and they must come down. The point at issue was that the Government of the United Kingdom had suggested a date which was unacceptable to this Government, because we had the conference which is coming on next week coming on, and therefore the Hon. Premier said we had work to do, and the date which they suggested was unacceptable. That was all.

Mr. SMITH: And they could come down.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Indeed not, never.

Mr. SMITH: I saw it in the newspaper.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: If the hon. member had heard the Hon. Premier say it, he would be entitled to repeat it, but he cannot say he read it in a newspaper, Mr. Chairman, and quote it as having been said.

Mr. SMITH: It was in the newspaper and the Hon. Premier did not deny it, because the quickest thing they can do is to run in here as soon as something is written in the newspaper and bring it to the attention of the Speaker.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member did not see it in a newspaper. What he saw

was a comment made by the Premier to the effect that the date first suggested by the Secretary of State was not acceptable to this Government, because we gave the Canada/West Indies exercise more urgent priority.

Mr. SMITH: I saw that, Sir, and I also saw that the Premier said that they could come down to him. It was in the newspaper and he did not deny it, because the quickest thing the members on that side can do is to run to the Speaker as soon as a few words appear in the newspaper, and there is a lot of hullabaloo and you have to bring the newspaper man and ask him to apologise, and he has to take off his hat and form fours and such things. I am going to be decent enough to bring the paper, and I will go to the office of the Hon. Minister of Education on appointment and show him. I hope he will admit me when I get there.

Sir, our reasons for not participating in the debate on the Constitution was because we knew the treatment that would be meted out to us. We could talk until we turned blue, the Premier would not even be here to hear anything, but as soon as we were finished, the Premier would be called and he would get up and lambast us, and then it would have been passed. He was not going to listen to us for one moment; so what were we to do, especially with the treatment of their supporters outside? Do you think that I was not humiliated when two Policemen had to escort me to my car? As big as I was, I was small. It was just like when Policemen had to guard some of our homes. (A VOICE: You were given royal treatment!) I was treated like royalty, but I did not like that kind. I drew that type of behaviour to the attention of the Minister of Education the next day, 6.35 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Peter would say that we had nothing to contribute to the Constitution, and therefore we should not go up to England at all. If we do not deserve your paying for our two observers, then do not pay for them. Use the money to increase your delegation. The stronger it is, the better. I saw a film at the theatre - I think it was called "Samson and Delilah". Samson was a very strong man, and no matter how hard they tried, they could not bring him down, but the time came when he was a very weak man. As strong as we are today, we can be just as weak tomorrow. Do not brag on your strength.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Government what their intention is, but the Government is now shielding behind the hon. member for St. Peter. He is their spokesman. He said that we were all junior members. What is the difference between a senior member and a junior member in the House of Assembly? As far as I know, there is no difference. You must have a senior member and a junior member; so there is nothing wrong in being a junior member.

He is trying to make out a case for the Government, and if he were the Premier, he would send none of us. Well, if he would not send up any, nobody would shed tears. I am not going to shed any because I am not going as a member of the delegation. If I were even called upon to go I would not be going. I have my reasons. I am no pimp. That is why I would not be going. If I went, when I came back I might lose my job.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: I thought you were working at yourself.

Mr. SMITH: That is the reply to all who wish to know why. I still maintain that the Government feels that the Barbados Labour Party has the right to an opinion, and they are not dead. They do not rob the country, or sell it out, or fool the people. They do not make promises and then bluntly refuse to carry them out, and then say that something will happen. They remind me of a man who killed another man, and when he went to the Police Station he told the Sergeant that something will happen.

6. 45 p. m.

Do not think that because you are in the Government now and you can put a standpipe in every alley and a little road in your constituency and know your rights that that will save you. You have to do it all over (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, you will not protect me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am listening to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SMITH: I can see, Sir, that you would like to name me. But this is a Committee, and I can get up and sit down and get up again. That is our democratic right. Although I am the junior member, I have the same right as the senior member.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it was inevitable that we should be treated to this exercise in nonsense by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. Of course, we all know that the Barbados Labour Party has a grievance but it is not one which we on this side have occasioned. It is the consequence of their own folly. Because they do not know how to get out of the predicament they are in, every little issue that comes before the House they try to turn into an area of disagreement.

I can answer the question succinctly. The Government will not ask this Legislature to provide any funds for the two legal advisers which the Secretary of State for the Colonies has said that the Barbados Labour Party can have. We are not prepared to ask the Secretary to provide those funds because if the Secretary of State for the Colonies can find it possible to invite them he should know where the funds will come from to defray the expenses.

Our own policy has been set out by me acting on the instructions of the Cabinet in correspondence indicated to the leaders of the two Opposition Parties, and the principle which we have adopted is clear and easy to follow. While it is true that this Party supports the idea of the two Party system, and to that extent should only have been concerned with accommodating the Official Opposition, it is also true that we took into account the political realities as they exist at present in this Legislature and extended proportionate courtesy to the Minority Party.

It is not that this Government wishes to perpetuate a three Party system. We think that a two Party system is eminently practical; but because there are now three Parties represented in this Assembly, Government in arriving at its policy as regards the Barbados Delegation to the Independence talks have accommodated the Minority Opposition Party as well. To that end, and on my own recommendation, the Cabinet agreed that so far as the Official Opposition is concerned we would recommend that funds be provided for one delegate and one adviser as long as both were members of the Legislature.

That is what we have done, what we have taken into account and what we shall honour. We went further. The record should be kept straight. We said that naturally the adviser attached to the Barbados delegation would not be considered by us as advisers only to the Government's side of the delegation, but advisers to the entire delegation. In other words the Cabinet Secretary or legal advisers or whoever they were would not only be entitled to put themselves at the disposal of the Ministers of the Ministerial side of the delegation, but would serve the whole delegation, and therefore their services would have been available to the Opposition delegates as well.

The Barbados Labour Party not only refused this offer but refused it in the most ungracious and scurrilous manner, because in their refusal they suggested that it would be somehow dishonest on the part of Civil Servants to advise other members of the Barbados delegation other than the Government side; and Sir Grantley Adams went even further and imputed the integrity of the Public Service of this island by suggesting that the offer was unacceptable to the Barbados Labour Party because he had known - it is amazing how people spell out portions of their autobiography - because he had known of lawyers taking money from two different clients at the same time.

I think that people should speak for themselves. When you are speaking from your own experience, one can contradict; but when you realise that senior civil Servants by their traditions of the Public Service must give impartial service to the community, you can see why senior Civil

Servants will not only be at the disposal of the Government side, but will have the positive duty to put their services at the disposal of the non-Government delegations. When some one said that this would be dishonest, he is imputing dishonest actions on the part of the senior members of the Civil Service.

I think that anyone should be ashamed in this day and age to make such an attack on members of the Public Service. We did not do this because it was a pretty gesture, but because we knew that in Conferences of this nature, advisers, whether advising the Secretary of State for the Colonies or either delegation are there at the disposal of the entire conference, and we did tell the Secretary of State for the Colonies that we saw no reason why the forthcoming Conference could not be conducted in such an atmosphere that the advisers would be at our own or at the disposal of others as the circumstances warranted.

That is not the atmosphere in which the Barbados Labour Party wants this Conference conducted. I say nothing about the Barbados National Party in this particular exercise because it is on record that if they wanted extra advisers in addition to what was being officially paid for, they would provide them out of their own expenses; and therefore we have not heard any complaints from the Barbados National Party or any request from them asking that the two legal advisers whom the Secretary of State for the Colonies has told them they can bring should be paid for from Government funds.
6.55 p.m.

They have made no such request, and I do not anticipate they will make that request, because the hon. senior member for Bridgetown not only in discussion with me but in correspondence has made it quite clear that if that concession were granted to them, they well understood that the expenses of the extra advisers would be met from their own resources. I do not see, therefore, why at this late stage, with the Conference not more than two weeks off, we should be engaged in this exercise. But I want to emphasise this: the Barbados Labour Party ought to be the last political organisation in any part of the world to upbraid any Government for not doing this or for doing that wrong. They have the worst record for treatment of the Official Opposition that any Colonial territory could have. When the hon. member, therefore, speaks on these matters, he ought to reflect that there are some of us in this Chamber who have sat in this House in Opposition to the Barbados Labour Party. When did any member of the Opposition except in one peculiar instance ever accompany them anywhere by invitation to any overseas Conference? Did not Sir Grantley Adams get up in this House in 1956 when we were all preparing for the most important precursor of Federation - the last and final conference which the hon. senior member for Christ Church who was then a Minister of Government attended, and when we pressed for inclusion of the Opposition, do you know what the argument was? "Why take the Opposition? The Opposition is not opposed to Federation". That was the argument in 1956.

Now you have an Opposition that tried to divide this country on the issue of Independence, and therefore was, in principle and in fact, opposed to Independence - because if they are saying that they were never opposed to Independence, they are wasting theirs and other people's time in the long and vicious campaign which they carried out against this Government in the last six months of the last year. They have not only done that. Not only were they opposed to Opposition participation, but the most spiteful and petty-minded things were done against the Opposition Party in this House by them when they were in power. A case that readily springs to my mind is that: since we have been in power, whenever we have official entertainment to do, particularly if the entertainment to be given is of so important a character that it requires the official visitor, whoever he or she is, to be entertained at Government House to a formal dinner, we not only see that the Official Leader of the Opposition is invited; we also see that the Leader of the Minority Opposition Party is invited. This was never so with them. They excluded in 1957 the Leader of the Opposition who is now the Speaker of this House, the

present hon. senior member for St. Lucy, from the State Banquet at Government House in honour of the Princess Royal, and they gave as the excuse that they did not have enough chairs to get around the table. This is the nastiness that they have done and that we have swallowed as an Opposition in this country. I would not waste the House's time with a recital in this country. I would not waste the House's time with a recital of all the things I remember. They excluded the hon. senior member for St. Lucy who was then Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition in this Chamber from the State Banquet in 1957 held in honour of the Princess Royal and gave as the excuse that they could not get an extra chair around the table; and we now not only put an extra chair for the Leader of the Opposition, we put an extra chair around the Governor's table for the Leader of the Minority Party as well.

Mr. Chairman, they should be the last to talk; and when they talk about the interest they have in the people, that they must now represent the down-trodden masses as they would like to think, the last thing that Party did - the very last bit of legislation that they put on the Statute Book in 1961 was a Bill, Mr. Chairman, to create more prisons in this Island. You see them sitting down over there! This is why I contend, Mr. Chairman, that they would be glad if we could forget half of these things. All the freedoms now which are threatened, they did not remember then that people were going to get locked up; but there is on the Statute Book of this Island brought in by them as the last bit of legislation passed and fought bitterly by us when we were in Opposition a law giving the Governor power to commandeer any dwellinghouse in this Island and turn it into a prison. (VOICES: Shame!) That is their record. Far from doing any of the things they predicted we were likely to do, this Government has been enlarging the area of freedom in this Island. Take even the whole question of political broadcasting. I stood up, where the hon. junior member for Bridgetown now is, in February 1958 and tabled a Resolution asking them to give the political Parties air time to acquaint the people with the basic issues of Federation; and before I could take my seat having tabled the Resolution, Sir Grantley Adams who used to sit in the seat to the right of where the hon. junior member for Bridgetown now sits, rose to his feet and said: "Let him don't bother with this, because even if it passed, we are not going to do it." Yet it has taken eight years for a Government to be in power to give Opposition Parties the freedom which they denied us. Nobody has prompted us to do it. All these things we have done because we know what we suffered under them, and we are determined that no Opposition Party, no matter how provocative it may be, should endure the humiliations which they made us endure.

For every extension of freedom we have given in this country, they have tried to make the people of this Island believe that somehow or other this Government in power now is a Government intent and bent upon robbing people of their freedom. Therefore I say it is hypocritical of them even to ask that two advisers which they asked the Secretary of State to let them have, should be paid for by us. Do you know what they have done? Do you know the shame and infamy which they have heaped on this country as a Party? For long years, for almost the entire length of the history of this Island, we have managed to keep interference from the British Government at arms length. We have not allowed the United Kingdom Government or United Kingdom politicians to interfere in the internal affairs of this Island, and this is not a policy power in this initiating. The planters and merchants held political power in this Island long before people like us did secure the independence of this Island against the encroachments of the Colonial Office. Men like Sir Conrad Reeves whose statue stands at the head of the stairs here fought against the influence of the Colonial Office, and until now no political Party in Barbados until the Barbados Labour Party came on the scene in these last days, has ever sought to cause the British Government to intervene in our local political quarrels. But I want to tell hon. members this: they do not know the mood of great determination with which this Government is approaching this Independence Conference. The Secretary of State may invite whom he likes to the Conference. This

is not to say he can tell us with whom to discuss, for our whole conception of this Conference is different from theirs. They are using this opportunity, as they think, to carry the internal political fight away from the local scene into Marlborough House. We do not propose to allow that; and that is why I said three weeks ago, and I wish to repeat now, that the agenda to be discussed at the Independence Conference will be the agenda decided on by the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Barbados, and by no other persons.
7.05 p.m.

And this has to be emphasised, because I hear tell, I understand that there will be two other Draft Constitutions which have been hurriedly prepared to be put before the Secretary of State, and they may do that if they choose.

That is why they want advisers. They can bring six, but the Draft Constitution which the Government of Barbados will discuss with the Secretary of State is the Draft Constitution which has been laid on the Table in the Legislature of Barbados. They do not affect our principles and our standards. All we are saying is, that since we will be engaged in negotiating Independence for the people of Barbados, we will only discuss with the Secretary of State, and with members of our own Legislature, and with nobody else, all matters affecting the Independence for Barbados.

It makes no difference when it comes to discussing; the basic issues will be on the Agenda agreed by yourselves and us, and no extraneous matter from unqualified and from unwise sources will be acceptable to us as the basis for any discussion. So this, Mr. Chairman, has to be made abundantly clear, because the Barbados Labour Party cannot bear examination of this matter here. You have a political Party which claims that it has more support than the Party which is in power. Suppose this were true, for argument's sake. Why should such a political Party find it difficult to get the very people who support it to give it money for a purpose which it considers to be worth it?

Either the Barbados Labour Party is trusting its place in the confidence of the people of this island, in which case it might well succeed in getting money from the people to carry its advisers to England. But you cannot have it both ways; you cannot walk out all around this island from night to night, and at the same time come in here and ask for the taxpayers' money to be used for the same purpose. You will be collecting money from the two sources. But if you think that it has the support which it claims, they ought to have no hesitation in asking the people to make any sacrifices which they feel like calling upon them to make. The people themselves will know whether it is a cause which they can support, but you cannot have it both ways.

The damage they have done in this country by making it appear that there is a Government in power which is so bent on dictatorship, that they have to take refuge under the Secretary of State - and this comes from a Party that has left havoc of the constitutional position of this island. Sir Grantley had enjoyed more power in this island than President Nkrumah enjoyed at a certain period.

As I said, this Island has had a proper history of Independence. If all British Colonies were like this one, a proper and perhaps better chapter would have been written on British Imperialism.

All Barbadians, no matter what their race, religion, or otherwise, so long they have held responsible positions in this island, they fought and fought successfully to keep this island free of interference from the British Government's onslaught. The Barbados Labour Party has now caught up the idea that what has not happened for 300 years, they should now cause to happen on the eve of Independence. When within a few months we would be paddling our own canoe, it is at this point that they want to drive us back into the alleys of colonialism by appealing to the Secretary of State to intervene on just an internal political dispute, which exists between us and them; and this is a cleavage which cannot be approached, because we stand on it and it sets out our principles here.

As I said, I am certain that the accommodation - and when I say accommodation, I mean the arrangements which we have worked out for representation of delegations - are reasonable, and we do not worry that the Secretary of State have allowed the extra advisers.
7.15 p.m.

We do not quarrel with the Secretary of State for the Colonies for allowing extra advisers. If he does not think that any payment for whatever extra advisers anyone may think fit to carry to be paid for should come out of the Barbados taxpayers' money, that is another matter; but I do not see how he can sit in London and cause expenditure to be defrayed by the Barbadian taxpayers.

We want to show everyone not only in this Island but else-where that the *bona fides* of this Government can be trusted, that we have nothing to hide and that we are trusted, that we have nothing to hide and that we are open and above board in all our dealings in this matter. Despite all the slander, scurrility and mendacious propaganda put out all over the world, we have not acted in any spiteful way. You would be surprised to know, Mr. Chairman, the trouble which the Premier himself and other Ministers have had to clear up the image of Barbados which has been besmirched.

They have used foreign newspapers. The other day in Canada I was astonished when a man said to me: "I understand that in Barbados you have almost no statute law, and that is why the Opposition has to make sure that they have a water-tight Constitution." Imagine, Mr. Chairman, that after a country has for three hundred years enjoyed fully the richness of the British Commonwealth there is still a man in Canada, presumably an educated man, saying this. Do you think that that is easy to forgive? That is what they have done.

One day we have to go out of power. I am hoping that whatever Government succeeds us would be careful in maintaining the image of this country, and that we could exist in peace even if we disagree, as we must from time to time. When, Sir, Sir Grantley Adams was Premier - I have to say these things - I do not think that any two members had bitterer clashes than he and I. But never have I spread any propaganda or made any attacks on him which would lead people to believe that the leadership of Barbados was criminal.

I realised that however much I might disagree with him personally, as long as he was Premier of Barbados of my own island. It is not so with the members of the Barbados Labour Party present. They can scarcely contain themselves. Let anything come before the House for Culloden Farm and hear all the scurrility coming up. They do not want so much for one month, and yet they know that the Chief Minister of Montserrat has an official residence. I admit that the Premier is a difficult person to get on with; but I would not swap him for anyone on the political horizon of Barbados today. I can afford to go to sleep tonight and find myself in the same place tomorrow, sure that no one will sell the island out. When you have a Leader who is honest and upright you can put up with his nonsense now and then. I cannot say so for any other Leader on the political horizon.

None of us allowed our dislike for Sir Grantley Adams - if there was a personal dislike - to reach the point where we would be prepared to drag the whole country down in order to destroy him. We fought a campaign in this island on the last elections as honest and above board as you could want. (ASIDE: A what?) He is short of memory. He talks about the fact that our supporters made him and his supporters feel uncomfortable. He does not remember when it was difficult for us in the D.L.P. to open our voices in more about three or four places in this country, and that was the time when we had to resort to monthly meetings in the Lower Green in order to make our voices heard - sometimes to make our voices heard to only 100 people at a time. We had to show that we had a superior grasp of public matters.

It is alright to talk about personal dislike for the Premier; but if they allow their dislike for the Premier to make them destroy the image of Barbados, the time will come when neither he nor they nor anyone else will be able to live in this country. We are determined when we hand over this country to our successors, if it so pleases the people, we will hand it over with even better standards. We will not allow them to turn us aside from the course we have set ourselves.

They are forecasting that this Conference will last until August. When you are dealing with an Island that has governed itself for nearly three hundred years and is only one fraction of an inch away from Independence, the Opposition Party is forecasting that the Conference will last two months! Do they want to go up there and reopen the political battles which they have lost here? Why should it last more than two days?

This Island has never wanted one cent from the British Government to balance our budget. In the lean years of the 17th Century, there was never any question of the British Government having to come to our rescue. In the last 10 years when an infrastructure has been created bringing us to a level of development higher than that of many other countries, the Barbados Labour Party believes that the Independence Conference will last until August. They want it to last three months because they have issued to fight out with us in front of the Secretary of State for the Colonies and which they cannot fight out here.

If the Secretary of State for the Colonies wishes to entertain them until August, he may do so. We have provided funds for them until closing time. We have from the 20th June until the 6th July as the final time. Beyond that time the Secretary of State for the Colonies may talk with them on any matters which they may find mutually interesting.
7.25 p.m.

I want to say again that they are hiding under the issue of wanting an election before Independence. If they wish, they may raise this matter with the Secretary of State. If he wishes, he may discuss it with them, but he will not be discussing the question of elections with us, because we have already pointed out that this country is a full internally self-governing country, and that never before has the question of elections ever been raised with the Barbados Government by the Secretary of State, and we should wonder why it should be raised at this point. So as long as everybody knows where everybody stands, there ought to be no conflict at all.

The last point I want to make is this; the Barbados Labour Party and to some extent the Barbados National Party have both treated this Independence exercise as if it were a Conference of several Parties participating. It is not a multi-lateral Conference; it is a bi-lateral Conference between the Government of the United Kingdom and a delegation from Barbados. If they had understood this, they would have been able to make a more massive contribution to this exercise. And as for saying that the reason why they did not take part in the debate on the Constitution was because they remembered what our supporters have allegedly done to them in the Independence debate, they ought to be ashamed to say this, because if you are a Party which has more support, as you claim, than the Government party, you should have four times as many supporters there booing us. Where are the 40,000 people you claim you have, the overwhelming support which is ready at a moment's notice to sweep this Government out of power? Is it that you have no influence over the masses of this country, and you have so misled them in the past, so alienated their support, that there is not a sizable body of public opinion in this Island which would stand up in front of the Barbados Labour Party and say "We are with you"?

Mr. Chairman, their whole approach is negative. They could not do their Parliamentary duty because of our alleged support, and were not in a position to trump up support for themselves, although they claim they have more support in this Island than we have. I do not fear Party

strife, Mr. Chairman, I think in a democracy political Parties ought to disagree with one another and ought to be bitterly opposed to one another. On an issue like Independence, it would not occur to me to expect that three separate Barbados delegations would be approaching the Secretary of State. As we see it, it is a Barbados delegation made up of the Government Party, the Official Opposition Party, and the Minority Opposition Party and their advisers - a single delegation, and we have not said that we are going up there to quarrel with them. As a matter of fact, so certain are we that we wish to preserve unity and not to give a deplorable image of Barbadian thinking in the 20th century, that I have said on behalf of this Government that there are certain issues we would not discuss for fear that people would think that we are divided. So here you have the Government side of the delegation confidently predicting that what they have to discuss will take eight weeks. It is a matter for the Secretary of State. I dare say the United Kingdom Government can find money to keep them there for eight weeks. If it wishes to, it is all well with us, but for what we have to put we do not see that at the outside more than 19 or 20 days should be required.

Another thing I want to say before I sit down; I want to make it clear that in this exercise I have obeyed the Cabinet's instructions in making contact with Parliamentary representatives, and I do not appreciate, and I am wondering what sort of self-respect the Parliamentary leaders of the Barbados Labour Party have that when they are engaged on matters between themselves and me or between themselves and members of the Government, some person, though not a member of the House or the Senate, rushes in to get between and writes off correspondence. I have said that I am not prepared to answer any correspondence from the Barbados Labour Party if it is signed by Mr. Tom Adams, because I do not recognise him as a fit and proper person to negotiate on matters affecting the welfare and dignity of the people of this island. I will certainly extend every courtesy to the hon. junior member for St. George and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown because I recognise them as being Leaders of Political Parties; but I will not be entering into correspondence with anybody who is not a member of the Legislature in this exercise, and I want that to be perfectly well known. I would hope that the hon. junior member for St. George would re-assert his own dignity as the Leader of a Party and keep in his own hands quite firmly those matters which involve correspondence between himself and Government, and answer letters himself, and do not allow other persons who have no status in this community except that of irresponsible trouble-makers to intervene in matters which concern political Parties or concern a political Party and Government.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to detain the House. The original matter of making supplementary provision for Conferences and Delegations is, as I have said, an easy matter to understand because of the cost of the London Conference as well as the cost of the Heads of Government Conference of which we are to be the host. The debate became prolonged because the hon. junior member for St. Joseph raised the question of advisers allowed the Opposition delegation by the Secretary of State, and asked whether we proposed to pay for them. Again we say the answer is "no", because there is no principle on which we could be fairly asked to do this. If the Secretary of State has invited them, he ought to know where the money is going to come from to pay for them.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member to let me know the number of persons that would be taking part in this Conference. I cannot make him answer. As I said, I do not want to know the names, but the number the delegation will comprise. He has not replied to that, but he has replied to a lot of things I did not want to hear. Since he has said that they will not be paying for more than two delegates from the Barbados Labour Party, I am saying now that \$53,000 sounds too high to me. If, as the hon. member said, they are not going to take part in this or in that at the Conference, it should not last more than three days, and the amount of \$53,000 is too much money to spend if they are not prepared to pay for all the delegates. No matter which is not on the agenda will be discussed, and I am bound to

feel unhappy over the expenditure of \$53,000. The Minister said in reply to a question raised in here some time ago about the entertainment vote when it was increased that some of them got \$100, and the Premier, I think, got \$400 a month; yet the Minister is telling me that the only person he sees in Barbados that he can support to be Leader of a Government is the present Premier, because you can go to sleep and leave him one place, and when you awake you can find him the same place. He is honest, he is this, that and the other.
7.35 p.m.

The only person that he sees in Barbados that he could support to be the Leader of Government would be the present one, because he could go to sleep and when he wakes up he would find him in the same place. That was revealed inside here.

We are only asking for an increase of, I think, \$12,000.00. But yet, the Minister said that he would leave out himself. If he had said that the only two he would support to lead this Government would be either himself or the present Leader, it would have been alright, but he did not mention himself.

Now, Sir, he mentioned that the last Government passed a Bill in here about private homes. What has that got to do with this? Again, he mentioned that the last Government failed to invite the Speaker to a State Banquet.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I never said that the last Government failed to invite the Speaker to a banquet. I said they failed to invite the then Leader of the Opposition, now the Honourable Speaker of this House, to a banquet in honour of the Princess Royal, and they gave as their excuse that they could not get an extra chair around the table; and I further said that we have not only got an extra chair for the Leader of the House, but

Mr. SMITH: Do you mean I should call him the Leader of the Opposition? That is food. Belly full and head full.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sit down, you are talking foolishness.

Mr. SMITH: That is not foolishness. Now, the honourable Minister spoke about radio time and political broadcasts. At that time I do not think that the Government had its own broadcasting station; it would have had to be done at Rediffusion, and the Government would have to pay for it.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: No it would not.

Mr. SMITH: At the time the honourable member is speaking about, we didn't have CBC. The only broadcasting station we had at the time was Rediffusion. He said already that the last Premier spoke about it, but what has happened now that they have put up one at the taxpayers' expense. They put up one at the taxpayers' expense to appeal to the people, and what happened to their broadcast? They allowed the first set of broadcasts - on the Federation Speech, and since then they had another one. Naturally only three members spoke on the Budget, the Honourable Premier, the Honourable senior member for Christ Church and myself. They allowed the Premier's speech to come over, and they allowed the Honourable Senior Member for Christ Church to come over, but they banned mine.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Because you used too many wrong words.

Mr. SMITH: That is the fairness he is talking about. The next meeting the Premier said that he was not allowing it to come over. Then the Government is talking about damage the Labour Party has done, and the People were able to read in the newspapers that the Leader of the Government threatened to kick a member of the House of Assembly to the moon, and to give him a cuff in his mouth, and throw him through the window. Would that not be damaging the image of the Government too? It may appear to damage my image, not the image of the Government.

I wonder if the honourable Minister knows about these things. A leader of a country, a Leader of the Government threatened an honourable member who, like himself, has the same qualifications to get him in here. What would any one of the big countries think about the Leader of the Government, if they heard about this? Yet he is saying that somebody else is damaging the image of the Government.

Now to get back to the Constitution, I read in the newspaper that the Leader of the Opposition wrote to the Honourable Minister of Education telling him that they would agree to the discussion of the Constitution as a basis for discussion in London.
7.45 p.m.

I do not know if he has replied to him yet, but I read that the senior member for Bridgetown took it up with the hon. Minister and let him know that they would agree to discussion on the Constitution as a basis for discussion in London. He turned it down; but now he is saying something else. Why turn it down? He has his reasons for turning it down. He is saying that the Barbados Labour Party wants the Conference to run until August. He said that the Civil Servants are being accused of dishonesty by Sir Grantley Adams. I wonder if he has ever heard the Premier accusing them of anything. I wonder if he has ever heard of a particular Party. Still he is going to get up and say that their advisers can advise the Opposition delegations.

When you get these learned people saying that their objection to a Judge trying a case is because he has a leaning to the Barbados Labour Party, can we trust them? Speaking under correction, I think that this same particular chap will be one of the advisers in London. If he is going to cut off a Judge's head for thinking that he has a little leaning to the Barbados Labour Party how can he advise the delegation of the Barbados Labour Party? We would be only idiots going out there listening to them.

I can remember on the floor of this House, when we were getting ready to vote, the Premier threatened his members either to vote or leave the Party. Now, he will have to say to sack these advisers when they come back down here.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is really tiresome having to do these things, but since I have been a member of this Government I know of no occasion when the hon. senior member for St. John has ever threatened anyone on this side of the Table that if they voted or did not vote on any particular measure they would have to leave the Party. It is completely untrue unless it happened on an occasion when I was not present. Other people can speak for themselves.

Mr. SMITH: I do not remember what the occasion was, but the Premier said: "Vote or out you go!" If he is going to threaten people so -

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: On a point of order, I know that the hon. member likes to denigrate the Premier in his absence. Lest it may be thought that he is not defended in his absence, I want to make it clear that I challenge the hon. member to produce evidence of his statement that on an occasion in this House the Premier has challenged a member of the Government that he would have to leave the Party if he voted or did not vote. I say now to my colleagues that if they know of it and have to remain silent, I do not have to remain silent. It has never happened on any occasion when I was a member of this House, and the hon. member has no right to say it in the Premier's absence.

Mr. SMITH: If the Premier is not here would I have to wait until he comes? When last has he been here? Did he not threaten to take away the Hon. member's portfolio?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would not permit any more discussion except on the Resolution. This is becoming intolerable.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: He thinks that he can frighten me or make me lose my equilibrium. The answer to the question that he is asking is "no".

Mr. SMITH: I would not go so far as to say what the Premier said to the Hon. Minister. I would not be so indecent. I do not want him to cry again. I would be decent all the days of my life. He can remember he is always getting up and defending the Premier. Defending what? If you go outside I would remind you of what he said under the tree for the public to hear. (ASIDE: Categorically no.) The Hon. Minister has said that they considered two Opposition Parties, but the Hon. Premier has said that he only recognises one Party in this country.
7.55 p.m.

When the hon. member says that we have made an appeal to the Secretary of State and have carried the business of the Government of Barbados to the Secretary of State, I do not know anything about that. Now even if we did that, when one heard, I think, the same Minister of Education say that he is not going to sit in with any other delegates, if these advisers go up, the Government would not be sitting in; so we may not have a Conference. They make utterances and forget. If the Government said that they are not sitting in at the London Conference with members other than those of the Legislature, they would have to appeal to the Secretary of State if they wanted advisers.

As far as I am concerned, I am not speaking for my Party; I am speaking for myself, and I am not going anywhere. The same way that they have passed the Constitution down here by themselves, they can stay here and declare Independence. They have told us that the British Government is this and is that, and they can do ever so much. I am not going to talk too plainly now, but the Hon. Minister would be surprised to know that I know that at some Conference in London that they told the British people that they could give them back the money given us under C.D.C. He was not there, but he will get up and deny it now.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I will, because we have never got any money under C.D.C.

Mr. SMITH: I did not say C.B.C. They said they would give back the money given to Barbados.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This Government has never received any money from C.D.C. They do not give money anyhow.

Mr. SMITH: This Government receives money from Colonial Development and Welfare.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: That is C.D. & W.

Mr. SMITH: I still know what I am saying, but the hon. member is going to catch up. The hon. member knows what I mean, and he can deny it now.

Mr. Chairman, the Government had to come back and make amendments to the Constitution which they themselves drafted, which means that they left out something. They drafted it, read and re-read it and have accepted amendments; so every thing is not right with it, and there are still more things in it which need amending. This is something for the country which is liable to affect any of the members on that side if they are out of the Government at any time. They were only in the Government for three or four years, but they were ordinary men before, and these things will catch up with them. If they cannot see something and somebody else does, they should listen and do everything possible to get this matter working smoothly. But they are in power and have the numbers; so they can go on their way. It will catch up with them someday.

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

On the motion of Hon. J. C. TUDOR, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that the hon. senior member for St. George is now in his place, and earlier during Question Time that hon. member was not in his seat when the Oral Reply was given to his question.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I wonder if we could dispose of Government's Business first.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the Hon. Leader of the House for suggesting that Government Business be first completed.

There has just been handed to me by the Chief Clerk at the Table a document from the Senate to the Honourable the House of Assembly wherein is stated that "the Senate has the honour to return to the Honourable the House of Assembly the Resolution that the Draft Constitution of Barbados be approved." The Resolution which was passed by this Chamber on the 26th April, 1966, and signed by the Speaker, bears the signature of the President of the Senate dated 26th May, 1966. Immediately above the signature of the Hon. President of the Senate, there appear the words: "Approved with amendments by the Senate the 26th day of May, 1966."

It has been drawn to my attention, and I entirely agree with what has been pointed out to me, that there is no amendment whatsoever to the Resolution which passed this Honourable Chamber on the 26th April, 1966, and I therefore do not, as at present advised, hold that there is any action which this Chamber may take on this Resolution which, as submitted to me, is worded exactly the same as that which passed this Chamber on the 26th April 1966, and as signed by me as Speaker.
8.05 p.m.

It may well be that this matter has been submitted to me by the Honourable Senate in order that this Chamber be made aware that certain amendments were made by the Upper Chamber, and that we might take cognisance and be seised of that fact; but apart from that, the Resolution which passed this Chamber and which has been submitted to me as having passed the other place is entirely without amendment.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I bow, of course, to Your Honour's Ruling, but there is still something to be clarified. When the honourable House passed a Resolution approving the Draft Constitution, the House itself accepted amendments to the Draft; yet it passed the Resolution as the Resolution was introduced, but did not say that it accepted the Resolution with amendments. It sent on the Resolution to the Senate with the Draft Constitution as amended. As I understand it, what the Other Place has done is really to have sent back the Draft Constitution to us with its own amendments and of course with the insertion of the Preamble, and merely seeks from us, or rather with the hope that we would accept the amendments to the Draft without in any way troubling the original Resolution. This is how I see it, and I cannot think that any harm would be done in dealing with the amendments to the Draft, even although, the former Resolution remains as it does.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House in respect of the Resolution which passed this Chamber and which subsequently was as I understand, considered by the Other Place that for this Chamber to have any justification for reconsidering it, there should at least have been another Clause added to the Resolution which passed this Chamber, which Clause might have stated, after the first Clause "Whereas on the 8th day of January, 1966..."

secondly "And Whereas on the 24th day of January 1966..."; thirdly "And Whereas Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State..."; and fourthly "And Whereas it is deemed necessary....", and immediately before "Be it Therefore Resolved", there should have been inserted an additional Clause by the Other Place stating "And Whereas certain amendments have been made by this Chamber, and so on..."

No such Clause appears there. It may well be an oversight by the Other Place, but what has been returned to us is exactly the same Resolution which we passed, and which bears my signature.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering then whether it would not be better for the Senate to be made aware of this technicality and for them to have an opportunity to put it right on Thursday when they meet next.

In view of that, I would like to suggest that we take our adjournment until the Friday afternoon of this week at 2.30 p.m., and I so move.

Mr. SPEAKER: That would be entirely a matter for the Other Place to what date they adjourn, and which we in this Chamber obviously cannot determine; but if there is a motion of the Hon. Leader of the House that this Chamber do now adjourn until whatever date and time he moves, provided such motion is carried, obviously we meet here again at that date and time. If between now and then the Other Place rectifies the position, as it seems to me it requires rectification, well that would be entirely a matter for the upper Chamber so to act.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this is by way of clarification. As I understand it, you have said that provided there was a recital incorporated in this Resolution setting out that amendments were made to the Draft Constitution which was sent to the Other Place, then we could consider the proposed amendments in the Draft Constitution. But in the absence of a recital to that effect which incorporated the proposed amendments, we would not be in place in considering the proposed amendments moved by the Other Place.

Mr. SPEAKER: Because what is submitted to me now is exactly the same as that which has already been passed by this Chamber, and signed by me.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is only that intimation has been made in the last Clause where the signature of the President of the Other Place appears - it is signed clearly that there are amendments. It says "with amendments". So that in itself notifies us that there are amendments which are to be incorporated. It is simply that the Resolution is not in its final form in that it is not properly drafted, and there has been a grave omission.

Mr. SPEAKER: I entirely agree with the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

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

The question that this House do now stand adjourned until Friday, 3rd June, 1966, at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.18 p.m.