

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday, 5th November, 1951

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. to-day.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*).
Messrs. J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., J. E. T. BRANCKER,
His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*),
Messrs. M. E. COX, L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*),
F. L. WALCOTT, R. G. MAPP and F. E. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

Dr. CUMMINS and Mr. ADAMS entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings which were held on the 16th and the 23rd October, 1951, respectively, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council as follows:

*The Legislative Council
To*

The Honourable The House of Assembly

The Legislative Council have the honour to refer to the Message from the Honourable House of Assembly dated the 30th October, 1951, regarding the Bill intituled "An Act to make provision for the protection of wages of workers," and to inform the Honourable House in reply that the Legislative Council have agreed to waive the amendments made by them to Clause 2 of the Bill, but do not withdraw the other amendments they have made to the Bill.

The Bill is accordingly returned herewith to the Honourable House of Assembly.

J. D. CHANDLER,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
1st November, 1951.

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have also received from the Honourable the Legislative Council a Message returning the Bill intituled "An Act to make provision for the control and use of the underground water supply in the Island and other matters connected therewith" with the amendments noted on the Bill.

PAPERS LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am commanded to lay the following Papers —

The Quarries (Miscellaneous Forms) Regulations, 1951.

Quarterly Return of Transactions in Rum to 30th September, 1951.

Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 30th September, 1951.

NOTICE

A Government Notice was given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$4,420 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 35, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: This Resolution is to provide a cost of living allowance for the servants of the Legislature and I expect that hon. members will deal with it today, as it will be impossible to deal with it on any other occasion. I am therefore giving notice that in due course it is my intention to ask for leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with this Resolution to-day.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 and 89

Mr. ADAMS: In accordance with the notice which I have just given, I am asking leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with the Resolution for \$4,420.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 4 as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee when the House is in Committee, to deal with the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier to-day.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES *re* LEGISLATURE AND PENSIONS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—This is a Resolution for \$4,420 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose as set out in the Schedule to the Resolution. Honourable members will remember that we have passed an Address to the Governor asking that legislation be sent down to cover the cost of reporting and printing the debates of the Legislature, to provide for the payment of a gratuity to the widow of the late Mr. E. A. Maynard, late Official Reporter of this House—I apologize for saying in the House that this Resolution is to provide a cost of living allowance for the servants of the House; I forgot for the time being that no Resolution has to be sent down to the House for that purpose, because the House passes its own Address and it is sufficient to pass a Resolution for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to make provision for paying that cost of living allowance. This Resolution is to cover the cost of reporting and printing debates of the Legislature, to provide for the payment of an *Ex-gratia* gratuity to the widow of the late Official Reporter of the House and to provide a cost of living allowance for the Official Reporters of the Legislature. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman—In supporting the passing of this Resolution, I would like to take the opportunity, since I was out of the island at the time, to express my appreciation of the services of the late Mr. Maynard, late Official Reporter of this House. Mr. Maynard had been with us for many years, and before he was taken ill—unfortunately he was ill for a long time—he was, in my opinion, the most efficient Reporter which we have had in this House. As I said, I was not here when Mr. Maynard passed away, and I take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of his services and my sympathy with his wife and relatives.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. DOWDING entered the House and took his seat.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE PREVENTION OF FLOODS BILL, 1951

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take Order No. 10 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Prevention of Floods Bill, 1951.

Mr. ADAMS: I have no doubt that honourable members have read carefully and digested the proposed amendments of the Other Place to this Bill, and therefore I should not spend much time in saying what the amendments amount to, Clause 12, as passed by this House, reads as follows:—

12. Any question or dispute which is required by any provision of this Act to be determined by arbitration shall be referred to the determination of two arbitrators, one to be appointed by each party to the dispute, or an umpire in case such arbitrators fail to agree, such umpire to be chosen by the arbitrators before entering upon the matters submitted to them and the decision of such arbitrators, or the umpire shall be final and binding on the parties in difference, and every such reference shall be deemed to be an arbitration within the Common Pleas Act, 1911, and be subject to the provisions relating to arbitration contained in that Act.

That Clause has been extended into two Sub-clauses which read as follows:—

12. (1) Any question in dispute which is required by any provision of this Act to be settled by arbitration shall be referred to the determination of two arbitrators one to be appointed by each party to the dispute or to an umpire in case such arbitrators fail to agree, such umpire to be chosen by the arbitrators before entering upon the matters submitted to them; and if for the space of fourteen days after such dispute shall have been arisen and after a request in writing (in which shall be stated the matter so required to be referred to arbitration) shall have been served by the one party on the other party to appoint an arbitrator such last mentioned party fail to appoint such arbitrator then upon such failure the party making such request, and having himself appointed an arbitrator, may appoint such arbitrator to act on behalf of both parties, and such arbitrator may proceed to hear and determine the matter which shall be in dispute.

(2) The award or determination of the question in dispute by a single arbitrator, the arbitrators or the umpire, as the case may be, shall be final and binding on the parties in difference and every submission to arbitration under this section shall be deemed to be an arbitration within the Common Pleas Act, 1911, and be subject to the provisions relating to arbitration contained in that Act.

The effect of these Sub-clauses is to extend what this House has passed. As this Clause left this House, the arbitration and the result of the arbitration were to be treated in the same way as the arbitration Clause of the Common Pleas Act treats the result of an arbitration. The Other Place, however, as hon. members will see from the amendments, have made a slight alteration which does not interfere with the

principle, and I suggest that the House may well agree to these amendments rather than throw them out and lose the Bill altogether. This is not one of those things about which the Government finds it necessary from time to time to criticize the Other Place for their interference, if I may say so without offence. In effect, all this amendment does is to fix a time within which one side or the other has to make application for the appointment of an arbitrator. There is really only one amendment; in this Clause we only said that there should be arbitration as the law provides in the Common Pleas Act. I have not looked up the Act to see whether the time agrees, but the Other Place has put in a time limit of 14 days. As far as I can see, that is the only difference between what left this House and what the Other Place has purported to amend. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE PROTECTION OF WAGES BILL, 1951

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to take as the next Order of the Day, the consideration of the amendments of the Other Place to the Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the protection of wages of workers, and the amendments of the Other Place to the Underground Water Control Bill. With regard to the former amendments, I know that amendments have come from the House of Lords down to the House of Commons, and if the House of Commons disagrees with them, a Message is sent to the House of Lords who may insist on the amendments, or they may back down from them. I presume that that procedure has been followed here. The position now is that the amendments which came down from the Other Place were not agreed to. I gather that the Other Place got a Message from this House to the effect that we disagreed to the amendments and the Other Place have now withdrawn the particular amendment in respect of which this House differed from them—the one in which a watchman was to be counted as a labourer for the purpose of not having more than a certain amount of his wages stopped in any one week—but they insist on their other amendments which, I am told, are merely verbal amendments or perhaps typographical. The attitude of the Government is that if the Other Place do not insist on their amendments with respect to the status of a watchman, the Government is prepared to accept the other amendments inasmuch as they are trivial, verbal amendments.

Mr. LEWIS: In this matter which is now before us, I think it is necessary to move for the suspension of Rules 86 and 87, otherwise we will be saying "Yes" and "No" to the same question within the space of seven days or less than that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member read the Rules?

Mr. LEWIS: Rule 86 says: "No question or amendment may be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

Rule 87 says: "Any Bill, motion or petition presented or made in the House and rejected, shall not be again presented or made for the space of three months, nor even then without some material alteration or amendment."

Mr. ADAMS: I was not present when the amendments were considered in this House, but I can hardly imagine that the House was so nit-witish as to object to an amendment such as chang-

ing the word "of" and thereby improving the English: or, in respect of the meticulous criticism of the Other Place, to object to the insertion of the words "not exceeding" in connection with the fine of \$48. What we objected to was the keeping of watchmen out of the category of manual workers; but the Other Place have backed down on that amendment and they are insisting on the other amendments which are merely grammatical corrections. I take it that the House only objected to the exclusion of watchmen from the definition. I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable member that he move for the suspension of Rules 86 and 87. There is a little technicality in the matter, and I suggest to the honourable member to adopt that procedure.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. It is my information that—

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 87 says: "Any Bill, motion or petition presented or made in the House and rejected, shall not be again presented or made for the space of three months, nor even then without some material alteration or amendment."

It has been pointed out to me by the honourable junior member for the City that there is some technicality involved in this matter if we were to pass these amendments today without the suspension of the Rules, inasmuch as this House has already rejected the amendments. The amendments have now been returned to the House and, actually, if we accept them now, we would be accepting something which we have already rejected, and something which the Other Place have subsequently accepted. I suggest that there is a little technicality and that a motion be made for the suspension of Rule 87.

Mr. ADAMS: Out of deference to Your Honour's appeal I shall make this motion; but I say this; the Government's attitude is that we object to leaving out watchmen from this Clause. If the Other Place have also made verbal amendments, how can we say we object to them? If the honourable junior member for the City persists in this sort of thing, how can we ever get any work done? I beg to move that Rules 86 and 87 be now suspended.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Protection of Wages Bill, 1951.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE UNDERGROUND WATER CONTROL BILL, 1951.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the control and use of the underground sources of water supply in the Island and other matters connected therewith.

Mr. ADAMS: The Other Place have amended Clause 4 of the Bill, dealing with the constitution of the Water Board, by the addition of a Sub-clause which reads as follows:

"It shall be lawful for a member of the Executive Committee to be a member of the Board."

With great respect to the Other Place, that amendment seems to be quite unnecessary; it seems to me to be rather insulting to the Head of the Executive to put in that amendment. The Executive Committee is a Court of Appeal from the Water Board and the point was taken by a member of the Other Place that a member of the Executive Committee should not be a member of the Board, if an appeal from him has to come back to him. It seems to be a reflection on any possible Governor to put into the Act that he cannot appoint a member of the Executive Committee to the Board, because no Governor could be so stupid as to put as a member of an original Court, one who is already a member of the Appeal Court, to use legal language. However, out of an abundance of caution, I take it, the members of the Other Place seem to think it necessary to make that amendment: it cannot do any harm except in respect of suggesting that a Governor has to be warned beforehand.

There is another amendment similar to one which we have just passed; again it is one which has been made out of an abundance of caution, but which is absolutely and totally unnecessary. In the Clause dealing with offences where we have said that a person who is guilty of an offence shall be liable on conviction to a fine of \$500, the Other Place have inserted the words "not exceeding" before the amount of the fine. That seems to me pretty ridiculous when the Acting Attorney General is a member of the Other Place and he drew to the attention of this House that the Interpretation Act covered that particular point. According to that Act, the sum mentioned by way of a fine is the maximum, and a Police Magistrate is entitled to fine a person a sum below the maximum. As I have said, this amendment is totally unnecessary, but the Other Place have seen fit to insert those words. Inasmuch as this is not a matter affecting the principle of the Bill, I suggest that we also agree to this amendment in order to get the Bill on the Statute Book. I therefore beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

DR. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the amendments were read a second time and agreed to.

ADDRESS *RE* ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR THE BRITISH WEST INDIES

Mr. ADAMS: I asked leave to revert to Order No. 1 on the Order Paper.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order therefore is to resume debate on the consideration of the Interim Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 16/1950 *re* the Reports of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee and of the Commission on the Unification of the Public Services in the British Caribbean Area.

On the last occasion the postponement of the further consideration of the Report was moved by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas and seconded by the honourable senior member for St. Michael. The honourable junior member for St. Thomas is entitled to speak now.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker—I am taking this opportunity to continue my remarks on this subject

and I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph who was not present on the last occasion, some points as to his peculiar position in so far as this Report is concerned. The honourable member was a member of the Select Committee which drew up this Report, and, of course, he will have much say in the future discussion of the federation of the British Caribbean territories. Last week I compared the proposals in this Report with the constitution of Australia, and drew to the attention of this Assembly that the Australian States have reached the same constitutional level. They are all self-governing States whereas in the Caribbean area as it is at present, there are islands which are still very backward and have the Crown Colony constitution. Certain colonies are still Crown Colonies and it is necessary for His Majesty's Government to have various safeguards in a federal system. There is the question as to whether the Senate should be elected or nominated; I think that electing the Senate is merely a duplication of the House of Assembly, that is, you will have two elected bodies and it is not clear which Body could probably be said to be representing the will of the people. If you have one Body elected, it is clearly understood that that part of the Legislature represents the will of the people, whereas the other part of the Legislature which is nominated should be subject to a limitation of their powers; therefore that part of the Legislature does not represent the will of the people. It should be a principle laid down that the will of the people in all democratic countries shall prevail; I think that those are safeguards which are quite necessary if you want to draw up really democratic federal legislation. I think a nominated Senate should find favour with this Assembly, because we will not have any duplication of the House of Assembly, and we will have one part of the Legislature which is really representative of the people's will and having the final say in all matters of legislation. I do not feel that we will have any quarrel about that. What I do say is this; while senators are elected in Australia to what is the equivalent of, and what is proposed to be, the Council of State as recommended in this Report—while those senators can speak for the people, I cannot see in these proposals any member of the Senate being able to speak for the people, because he is nominated by the Governor-General. I think that we should be quite definite in stating our objection in this matter; I feel that with our long years of representative government, we have reached the stage where we can tell the British Government that we have elected representatives who can carry on the Government in the West Indies. We form the Government in this Assembly today and the people of the West Indies should be quite willing to do that at all times; if we have not reached that level, we are admitting that we are still in the state where we cannot govern ourselves federally. If it is proposed to have a Council of State, if it is necessary to have people's elected representatives on the Council of State, let there be one nominated member who may be expected to conduct Government Business in the nominated Chamber, and one official may be the Attorney General who could advise the Council of State on legal matters; but do not let us depart from the principle of having on a policy-making Body such as a Council of State, elected representatives of the people responsible to the Prime Minister, responsible to the electorate, who can develop policy and there will not be any confusion of thought or ideas on the Council of State. I feel that this Assembly should object to the proposed number of officials on the Council of State.

If this Federation is to go on in the quickest possible time to Dominion Status, it is well that we ask; why do you require the Governor-General and probably the Colonial Secretary and other officials on the Council of State? I think we should all agree, having reached the stage where we are claiming that we are capable of carrying on our Government, that this proposal is a very wicked one indeed. If we admit that in Barbados we are quite capable of carrying on our Government, I think we will admit that in the West Indies there are people who are similarly capable; we have people who can run the Council of State without having all these officials on it.

There is another warning which I would like to throw out. It is that I feel Barbadians would be well advised in their own interest, not to quarrel about the number of seats which we should have in this Federation until we have settled the greater issue as to what kind of Federation we will have, and how far this Report will be adopted and modified. As compared with this greater issue, this matter of the number of seats we should have, is very small indeed and it is rather insignificant. Let us, by all means, quarrel with this Federation Report; let us oppose some of the suggestions contained in it; let us put forward our views strongly; let us say where we differ from the Committee's recommendations and where we agree to them. Until we have done all that, let us avoid saying that Barbados should have three, five or six seats. We have tried to build up a Party here, we have tried to carry out our responsibility, we are asking for Ministerial Status and that sort of thing: if we have Ministerial Status in the very near future, that will throw even greater responsibility on the Party in attempting to run this country. We have men who have taken part in the affairs of Government, men who are expected to bear the responsibility of Government in the near future, men whom it will not be easy to replace in an island of 200,000 people; if it is expected that we will lose the services of these men for a Government which is weak or cannot plan as well as the past Government has planned, then Barbados is heading for the worse by agreeing to a Federal Body such as this. I say that we should not agree to having four seats in the Federal Assembly; let us carry on here and make sure that we retain those people who have helped us to attain the position which we have attained today. If in the Federal Assembly our representatives have less opportunities to plan effectively for the people of Barbados than what they have today, I feel that instead of sending four representatives to the Federal Assembly we should only send two representatives.

In this Report, in respect of the powers of legislation, we have the Exclusive Legislative List and the Concurrent Legislative List, and a number of items are set out in each List. One of the items to be retained by the Governments is Agriculture; that item is not mentioned in either the Exclusive Legislative list or the Concurrent Legislative List, but we know that agriculture is the backbone of Barbados. We know that this Federal Government is based on the Australian Federation, a loose kind of federation and it does not have any power of raising income tax; it depends on customs duties. The Chambers of Commerce of the different islands have sent in reports and suggestions in connection with the recommendations in this Report, and among the suggestions is one of far more increasing the power of that type of Government that would even limit the amount which the Federal Government could draw from customs to less than what is recommended by this Committee; representatives at various Cham-

bers of Commerce like the idea of having a weak federal structure. Their idea is that you can only draw customs duties; you cannot tax them. Obviously, if you add more services you will have to get more finance to run those services. I am afraid that if Barbados were to ask for bigger representation in the federal structure, that would work to the detriment of this colony; when we send five or six representatives from this colony to the Federal House of Assembly, it means that we are denied their services at home. I think we should first settle the question as to the type of Federation we should have, and then press for greater representation. I am not saying that Barbados should not strive to have more seats later on, but I say this; let us, at this time, devote all our efforts and attention to the type of federation that should be set up. Let us agitate for a different or better Constitution for this Federation, and then let us talk about the number of seats we should have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will notice in the proposals for a Council of State it is recommended that the Prime Minister should be elected by the House of Assembly. At paragraph 86 of the Report this is what is stated:

"It will be noted that we do not recommend that each and every member of the 'Cabinet' group should be elected by the Assembly, but only the Prime Minister. The omission is deliberate. We believe that our proposal effects a necessary concentration of authority in the hands of the Prime Minister. By this means, the Prime Minister owes his position to the Assembly; other State Councillors appointed on his nomination owe their position to the Prime Minister. It is of course possible that the Prime Minister may make choices which do not commend themselves to the Assembly."

We have this position; the Prime Minister is to be elected by the Assembly and he will be responsible to the Assembly, but the members whom he chooses will be responsible to him and not to the Assembly. That is a mixed state of affairs. As far as Trinidad is concerned, I cannot say that I am enamoured with the way in which things are working there: it seems to me that there is as much confusion in Trinidad as you get in any fish market. I feel that if the Prime Minister has to elect or recommend the elected members to serve with him on the Council of State, the Governor-General should send for the person whom he thinks can command a majority in the House of Assembly or the House of Representatives. If you leave the election of the Prime Minister in the hands of the Assembly, you will get a lot of lobbying; you will get to things which we have not yet reached in Barbados. I think we should stick to the principle which we have here; the Governor sends for the person whom he thinks can command a majority in the Lower House, and that person is the Leader of the House, who recommends to the Governor the persons whom he wants to serve with him on the Executive Committee. As I have said, I feel that that principle should be stuck to in this Federation instead of having a mixture of the Barbados way of appointing the policy-makers today and the Trinidad way of doing these things. If the Governor sends for the person whom he thinks can command a majority in the House of Assembly, that makes for Party politics, greater discipline, stronger Government and the better running of the affairs in any Constitution of which you can think. By all means, let the Prime Minister name the members who will serve with him; but let the Prime Min-

ister be the person who the Governor-General thinks can command an effective majority in the lower House, otherwise you will get a lot of things which do not make for the good running of the country.

I think you will agree with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are some desperate features in the Trinidad Legislative Council; the Legislative Council in Trinidad is in utter confusion and I feel that one of the reasons for that state of affairs is the very system of representation. The system of Government in Trinidad denies them any proper discipline in the Legislative Council; they cannot work any Party system because there is no Prime Minister. The Ministers are elected by the Assembly and you get people looking around for their friends; no man is able to speak with authority, he has to look to the people of the elected Chamber. I feel that it would be a very despicable thing in a Federal Constitution to allow that state of affairs to go on.

I am not going to say much more in connection with this matter; I think I covered many points last Tuesday. I just wanted to add the particular point as to how the Prime Minister should be selected, because I think we should get away from the ugly features that obtain at present in Trinidad. I feel that the best thing we can do at present would be to approve of this Address in principle, but let us get together, as hon. members have said, and formulate our opinions, put forward our proposals and be united in the type of Federation we want before we have a West Indian meeting on this matter. It is for us to present a united front in this matter because this is a matter which affects our people far more than many of us think today. Great matters come about at times in a way which you do not expect, and then after a time you feel that you have not played the part which you should have played in these matters. In this particular matter, if we play our part in saying what we think the West Indies should be, we will be doing our duty to the people of this colony; we can only do so by saying whether, in our opinion, this Report is right or wrong. I feel that this Chamber should record what type of Federation the West Indies should have and what part Barbados will have played in the matter. I think that Barbados can play a part in what the West Indies desire.

Mr. WILKINSON: This question of Federation is a very big, full and wide one. A few months ago I had the honour to read the very able Report which was put before us, and then I was of the opinion that the principle of Federation would be the right thing for the West Indies. However, at the same time, I feel that Closer Union should definitely come first. We, in Barbados, are very fortunate inasmuch as we have a very good Constitution, and we look after our own affairs very much more than is the case with other colonies in the British West Indies; therefore we must be careful to see that we do not give up some of the authority and the right which we have now. We represent a small unit in this Federation. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the House will die tomorrow and it is somewhat strange to me that we should pledge ourselves at this hour to any future policy on this very wide question. As a matter of fact, I do not think it would be worth while to do so. I have heard some of the remarks of honourable members on the other side of the Table, but this question is one to which we must give a great deal of consideration. I am not prepared to pledge myself to any future policy as regards this question of Federation until I am satisfied that we will not be in any worse position as a result than that in which we are to-day.

There will be a very large expenditure in respect of this federation and we must bear in mind that we will have to bear our percentage of that expenditure and what are we going to get for it? I am not satisfied that we are ready in this colony of Barbados of which we are so proud, for federation as laid down in the Report of this Committee which sat under the chairmanship of Sir Hubert Rance.

There is the question of Closer Union and I think that almost every honourable member present will agree that we should encourage Closer Union as a step towards Federation. Therefore, let Closer Union come first and give us an opportunity of going into more details and understanding as to what we are pledging ourselves to do. It must be remembered that there has been a change in the Government in England since this proposal was put forward, and we do not know what idea the present Government will put forward now; I am sure that they are too busy at the moment to deal with this matter. As a House we will all die to-morrow and I think it would be just as well to let His Excellency the Governor know that although we view with favour the principle of Federation, we definitely are not going to pledge ourselves to agree to the suggestions made in this Report by the Committee which sat under the Chairmanship of Sir Hubert Rance.

MESSRS. GILL, GODDARD, MOTTLEY and REECE entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. LEWIS: I did not intend to contribute to this debate today, but I am very glad for the opportunity of putting forward a point of view which I have not heard put forward as yet. That point of view is that while we all desire federation because we believe that unity is strength, there is not one of us who has any clear-cut view as to what type of federation we want and exactly what constitution will serve our needs best. It is regrettable that the people of these colonies who desire federation know so little about it. I believe that as the forerunner of federation we should have a shipping system subsidised by the West Indian Governments so that people will be able to get to know each other, and school children should be sent around in great numbers at holiday times so that they will be able to get to know the people of the various colonies. Perhaps it would be a good thing for us to have a British West Indian Steamship Service. This question of not knowing each other personally will militate to a great extent against a workable federal structure: we all know that a thing of this sort will take some time before it gets running smoothly, and it is my considered opinion that these colonies will find it very difficult to give up an insularity which they have practised and which has become second nature to them. They will find it very difficult to give up any of their rights to the strengthening of a federal structure. I feel that Barbados has a better constitution than any of these colonies; we have a higher standard of education, our people are more politically awakened and we are going to have a hard time in entering into this federal scheme. If we are going to have a federal structure we have to make it strong; whether it develops like an infant and becomes stronger or whether it has not got all the power for making it stronger, I am not prepared to say. There are two colonies in the proposed federal area which are unable to make up their minds even for us to consider them in expressing an opinion; those are the colonies which offer assistance to the very pressing problem of over-population in the area. One of these colonies seems to think that we have a continental destiny forgetting that this destiny will swamp it out entirely out of existence, and the other colony

is now becoming aware of the result of our having that destiny. For the purpose of utilising the broad open spaces of British Honduras and British Guiana we will undoubtedly have either to get a free gift or embark on a loan. It is well known by the people of these two colonies that if we can develop those areas within the federal structure the inhabitants of the small area at present occupied will stand to benefit, yet the people of those two colonies are still chary about joining in federation. I think at times that it is unfortunate that people from whom we have not had an official word that they will be joining in federation, should enjoy with us some of the sweets from the united body in so far as currency is concerned; my method of dealing with them would be to leave them out. These colonies are hoping to form a Customs Union, but I personally, wonder how it will be possible to work a Customs Union with people who are outside the Federation; I am willing to have explained to me how that will happen. I sincerely hope that what I regard as a mistake in having included those two colonies in anything at all, will induce them to come in the Federation. If they are legally entitled to some of the sweets of these things, that might be a very good reason for their holding out and not coming into the Federation.

In connection with the Federal Legislature, I cannot say whether I regard it as a good thing or a bad one that this Legislature should be bi-cameral. However, there is one thing with which I do not think the people of these colonies are going to be satisfied, and that is having a nominated Chamber deciding issues in which the fate of the people is involved. As to whether we can finalise arrangements on this point, it seems to me that arrangements will have to be made for a meeting together of West Indians to take place, and the proper place for a preliminary meeting is in the area. If I have the favour of any say as to where that meeting should take place, I will give my vote for the West Indies. I do not think that West Indians should go to London to decide anything about Federation until they meet in this area and decide for what they are going to ask. We are all divided as to what we want, and as regards this Report, our representative, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, has said, that he disagrees with many things in it. It was as a basis for discussion that this Report has been unanimously signed.

In so far as this Report itself is concerned, I feel that we should have nothing to do with it all; let West Indians get together now. We had for 300 years a representative form of government, but whom did it represent? It did not represent the people of this colony; it could not represent the people of this colony where we had a certain number of people on the electoral roll. Now that we have adult suffrage, these are the people who should say whether they want federation or not. They should know exactly for what they are letting themselves in and they should be prepared to consider what they are giving up in the way of their rights, so that they can start to walk on the road first and then run with ease. I have seen it hinted that if you want to federate and eventually reach Dominion Status you will have to stand on your own bottom, as it has been described; you cannot want to rule yourself, have a say in your own affairs and be a pauper at the same time, asking somebody else to balance your budget. The people who have been helped are the same people who are now telling you that you should stand on your own bottom and finance your own affairs. In other words, we are today back where we were thousands of years ago — glorifying money rather than persons. Of course the Head of the State Church who said that it is the people that matter is no longer here, and we ignore

that advice. I feel that the people who tell us these things should be in a position to prove that they themselves are doing likewise. I think we should be assisted with a grant in order to put this matter of federation on a proper basis. In respect of this experiment on which we are expressing an opinion, there are numerous little units separated, in some instances, by hundreds of miles of water, coming together to form a federal unit; I do not know that a thing like this has any parallel in the world, and we need all the assistance we can get both in the form of advice and in the form of money. Of course we are only agreeing in principle to this Federation; we are saying that this is an interim report and we are leaving the matter open so that we may express a further opinion on the matter. We will have a final say when the legislation for the setting up of the federal structure is placed before us. Mr. Speaker, at this point I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. MILLER seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:—

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — I have a few remarks to make on this Report relative to Federation. I suppose it is accepted in principle, and I am somewhat disappointed that after almost 100 years of clamouring for Federation this debate does not contain the required tempo which could be regarded as enthusiasm. I say that—, Sir, because I hoped for many years that Federation of the West Indies would have been regarded as something very important, and that honourable members would have found it convenient to come forward today and say something in favour of this Report. It is true, Sir, that we all agree in principle with this Report. We agree with the Report except as regards a few things which I think will have to be changed. I have always felt that Federation of the West Indies without economic stability would hasten the collapse of the federal structure, for a federated West Indies with no financial stability would soon be reduced to a department of the United Kingdom. I feel, Sir, that we must come together. It is apparent that we can go very little further by just prolonging this talk of independence. Just as an abolition of the system of 11 Vestries, 11 Parochial Treasurers etc. in Barbados would mean a saving in costs, so I feel that if the West Indies came together the Governors who now govern these colonies would be reduced to Lieutenant Governors with a saving in costs. I also feel that unification of the Agricultural Services of these islands, unification of Currency and Customs would be of similar benefit.

I am to some extent disappointed that in this Report Barbados is restricted to only four seats. I will also say that the articles laid down in this Report relative to the formation of the Federal Parliament must have entailed considerable thought. The question that is exercising my mind is whether or not we should have a series of discussions with the various people in the area who are interested in Federation, so that we can get the opinion of the people with whom we want to federate.

With regard to the question of the Speaker, comments have been made that he could be selected from outside of the Assembly. To my way of thinking that is undemocratic because he would be entitled to a casting vote. I think it would be undemocratic to have an elected body forming the Assembly and then to have a Speaker who would be entitled to a casting vote selected from outside that body.

As regards the Federal Capital, I do not want to be selfish, but I feel that it should be in Barbados. I say that because we have got a lot to our credit by way of our constitution and we have been in a position to prove to the rest of the West Indies as well as to the United Kingdom that we have been able to take care of our own affairs. I have always felt that the U.K. can take no credit for whatever greatness we may attribute to the U.S.A. The U.S.A. found it necessary to wage a war to force independence. I cannot say that Canada had to wage a war, but Canada has developed into one of the greatest nations of the world, and again the British Government can claim no credit for Canada's advancement. If the time has come that the U.K. Government realises that it would be stupid to have us segregated in the West Indies, I think it is but natural. I think that if we look at India which has gained independence there is every human reason for us to be anxious to have Federation.

I do not think I can say much more, Sir. I am a bit uncomfortable in mind. I fear that if some tremendous effort is not made, we will find that after waiting 100 years for Federation that we have something that is not really serviceable to the units of this area.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Deputy Speaker.—There seems to be a far cry from 1937 when, as you will recall,—you were not a member of the House then but you have always taken a keen interest in political matters—you will recall the day in 1937 when the question of the closer union of the British West Indian territories was discussed in this Chamber. You may remember, Sir, how in those days, Mr. C. A. Brathwaite who was the junior member for St. Michael, tabled a question, as to whether the Government could see its way to recommend to the Secretary of State for the Colonies the preparation of a proper scheme for the federation of British Guiana and the West Indies, to which question the present honourable senior member for St. James replied that the Government is prepared to forward to the Secretary of State for the Colonies any representation on the subject which the House of Assembly might desire to make. And, Sir, of the honourable members who were present on that 12th day of October, 1937, in this chamber there remains today only one who was present on that occasion; and only four of us saw fit to intervene in the debate on so fundamentally important a question as Federation—Mr. Brathwaite himself, the present Mr. Justice Vaughan, the late, lamented Mr. C. L. Elder who was the local Gladstone in those days and myself. Of those who were members of this Chamber then we have only the present Solicitor General, the honourable and learned member for Christ Church, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the honourable senior member for St. James and myself. Well, Sir, it seems to me that Federation has taken a great step forward since those days, although I must confess that I do not yet see it around the corner. I hope I am wrong.

Now, Sir, we have before us for consideration this Address which deals with the Report of 1948—49 of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee, and we are asked to consider now whether we shall, or shall not, with or without amendments, pass this Address to His Excellency the Governor. Now, Sir, I would suggest that the first paragraph should occasion us little worry. In deciding to pass it we are simply repeating our acceptance of the principle of establishing a Federal Government of

the British West Indies, and that we regard the proposals of the Standing Closer Association Committee's Report as the basis for discussion of the form which the constitution of this Government should take. Obviously no one could take up a document of the size of this one and say that he agrees *in toto* with everything that it contains. But it is a useful thing as a basis for discussion. So in paragraph 1 of this Address we are merely saying that we are still of the same mind as before in that we accept the principle of establishing a Federal Government.

Of course, Sir, I have supported the principle of Federation from the very earliest times; not only in 1937, but before. Because it is obvious that the numerous islands of the Caribbean which form this archipelago could never hope to achieve dominion status as individual colonies; and without dominion status we can never arrive at political manhood which must be our aim. I will not use the phrase "ultimate aim" because it is not something which I would envisage for the distant future.

In Paragraph 2 we are observing that the House does not accept in its entirety the detailed proposals in the Report, and will in due course forward its proposals and suggestions for the amendment of some of these proposals. Therefore we are saying in respect of the Report which we are regarding as a basis for discussion that those things which we do not accept we will give our further consideration. Again, I do not see anything unacceptable in that proposal, or why it should cause anyone to oppose the passing of this Address:

Paragraph 3 sets out that the House is convinced of the advantages to be gained from the unification of the Public Services of the British Caribbean Area, and therefore agree generally to the whole of the Report on this subject. There again I find it difficult to understand how anyone could reasonably take exception to that. Accordingly I find it hard to understand why there should be any serious objection to the interim Report of this Committee. I think, Sir, that it is our duty as a Legislature to give the impression that we regard this question of Federation not only as a matter of great importance, but as a matter of great urgency. Of course, as Barbadians, we feel quite naturally that the proposed four seats for this very important island is infinitesimal, or negligible, compared with the 16 which it is proposed for Jamaica. We feel the same as regards our proposed four seats compared with six for British Guiana and nine for Trinidad. I suggest that that is a matter for detail, although it is a very important matter. Then there are many divergent views as to whether the most suitable seat of the Federal Government would be in Trinidad, and not perhaps Grenada, Antigua or one of the small islands. That again is a matter of detail, although it is a very important detail.

Leaving aside for the moment these questions of detail, I counsel the House to pass this Address so that we will not give the other West Indian Colonies, and Legislatures as a whole the impression that we are not unanimous in seeking Federation, and that we are allowing insular jealousies and prejudices to blind us to the greater consideration that Federation is the first step towards self-government and Dominion Status. After all, Sir, we should start now looking forward in the near future—I would like to think within the next five years—to a federated West Indies nominating its choice of Governor-General, who will be of course a West Indian, to His Majesty the King for his approval. In these colonies we have to be satisfied every

now and again with some official from the U.K. Now India in World War I got the promise of self-Government. But it took the interval between World War I and World War II and then World War II itself for India to get it. So it is necessary for us to emphasise that with Federation we are insisting upon Dominion Status, either simultaneously with it, or within a definite period of years after the start of Federation.

I feel, Sir, from the Legislative standpoint that we have gone far in 14 years. We have gone so far that we find nearly every member of this Chamber expressing his views on it instead of just five as in 1937. For as I have said, in 1937 only five of the 24 members of the House thought the matter important enough to speak on, while the others were in the lobby smoking cigarettes or partaking of the things which we do not get now. I commend this Address, and I suggest to honourable members that there is no reason why anyone should object to anything that is contained in it.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am sorry that I have to sound this note at this present time, but I think it is unfair for us to discuss this Federation issue now. I have noticed the lethargy of most of the honourable members on this issue. I feel that it is something of the utmost importance to the West Indies, and any mistake made in this Agreement might take generations before it is remedied. I know that the Report was in the hands of honourable members for six months. I read it when I first got it; but I did not expect that it would have been brought up for discussion at so late a date as last Tuesday. I feel that in fairness to honourable members it should be realised that most of them are at present thinking about their campaigns and their brains are tired. It is not fair, therefore, to ask us to make so important a decision as the one we will have to make on this issue.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the interim Report. I think that the proper time to have objected to bringing it up at this stage in the session was when the Order Paper was being fixed.

Mr. ALLDER: Unless there is some special reason for our arriving at a decision now, I do not think that postponing such a discussion until next session would do any great harm as far as Barbados is concerned. Early in the next session honourable members would be fresh and would be able to do greater justice to a decision of this nature. I did have a few points on this issue which I wanted to stress, but I must admit that I have not been able to gather all from the Report that I would have liked. No honourable member can read such a Report any one time and gather from it what he wants to gather.

As far as I see it, Sir, those colonies in the West Indies which have greater natural resources than, say Barbados, and which would have much say in any federal set up do not seem as if they are ready to enter it. I have always felt that we have allowed ourselves to be slow in formulating any programme and expressing our opinion at the appropriate time, and therefore many things which we would have benefited from in a federal set up we have allowed to pass us. When I say that, I am thinking more in terms of the economic set up of a federal state than the political set up. What I mean is that becoming a unit of a federal state does not mean that the economic stability of your colony is going to be any better. As a matter of fact there is a greater possibility of its being worse than it is now. I am awe-struck with the feeling that most of our revenue will be

taken from us and carried across to the Federal Government. When I look at our Customs Revenue, the greatest source of our income, and think that it is going to be utilised for the purpose of running the Federal Government it gives me some apprehension. What is more, Sir, as regards the regional planning of industries, I am of the feeling that we are in a bad position, inasmuch as all the heavy industries which would help the colonies have already been started in the larger colonies. If you are going to have a federal state, before one colony gets ahead of the others and tries to out do them, you should go into the resources and potentialities of all the colonies, and see what industries suit one or the other most.

To-day, Sir, when I hear all this talk about Federation of the West Indies, I start to feel that Barbados will be sinking its individuality into that of other West Indies colonies whose political standards are far below ours; and therefore we may be called upon to tax our population too heavily so as to be able to bear the added burden contributed by people of the other West Indian colonies. In other words, I feel that if you are to have a federated West Indies, Barbados, because of the adaptability of the people, because of its limited land area and one crop economy should be given the opportunity to industrialise as far as possible, and not allow Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana to get ahead of us as far as industries are concerned, which might only reduce us to the state of a consuming public without employment for our population. Take Hong Kong, for instance. That is a small colony compared with other countries in its area; but it is more industrialised than Singapore, Malaya, the mainland of China and such other places. The only way in which I feel that Barbados can benefit from federation is if we can have the opportunity of having industries concentrated in this island as a result of which we would get employment for our abundant population, and have these countries like British Guiana, British Honduras and Jamaica with greater land area concentrating on agriculture. These colonies could then become the bread baskets of the West Indies, while the heavy industries like the Cement Industry, the Glass Industry, Textiles etc. could be concentrated in Barbados within the federal set up. But with these industries already set up in other colonies, and with Barbados lagging behind, I feel that there is no benefit for Barbados in federation.

I do not believe in going into anything unless it will bring a higher standard of living. What will you get from Federation? You will probably get an amalgamation of government offices. There is an amalgamation of the Police Forces of the colonies. The Chambers of Commerce are already amalgamated. It seems to me that the only thing left for us to amalgamate now is the administrations of these islands; and this colony which does not now contribute economically to either of the colonies will have to give up a certain amount of its revenue to pay for this federal administration, which might be another burden saddled upon us. Therefore, Sir, my view is that we need not hasten ourselves to give any decision on this issue right now, and I am of the opinion, from what I have seen, that honourable members are not in a position to do justice now to an important matter such as this. But inasmuch as it is accepted that we should come to some agreement on it, I felt myself obligated to make the few points which I have made.

I will say now, Sir, that the allocation of members of the proposed Federal Assembly does not do justice to Barbados at all. Because when you see Barbados with her high standard of politics, the

stability of the people and their general intelligence, and realise the leadership that Barbados can produce in any federal set up, why should Barbados be given only four seats as compared with six for British Guiana, and 16 for Jamaica. While Jamaica's revenue is greater than that of Barbados, you cannot say that the stability of the people in Jamaica compares in any way with the stability of the people of Barbados, politically and otherwise. I do not think that the allocation of seats in the Assembly should be based on the size of the colony, nor on its revenue; because if you look at the picture carefully of the British Dominions of Canada, India, New Zealand and Australia, you will see that England is several times smaller than any of them, and has stood in fear of them several times. Therefore the question is not whether Canada has a greater land area or a greater revenue than Great Britain.

Whatever decision may be reached on this matter at this time, Sir, it may be taken that we in Barbados do not agree with all of what we have been presented with in this Report. I therefore must conclude with the admission that I have not had the time in the recent past to give this Report the careful study it deserves. That is why, Sir, I suggested that it was a very inappropriate time for us to make up our minds on it.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Like the last honourable member, though possibly not for the same reasons, I regret that it has not been possible for this debate to have taken place earlier this session; and I do not think we can do more on the eve of the dissolution of this House than to speak in general terms as to how we, the present House, feel about the Report in general inasmuch as the composition of the new House will be different to a greater or lesser degree. I do not think, therefore, that inasmuch as our term of office has come to an end, we should go into detail, or make any detailed statements of our views on the different sections of the Report.

It is very incumbent upon me inasmuch as I signed this Report, to make my position clear. I am asking honourable members to agree to this interim Report and to pass an Address to His Excellency the Governor. As honourable members are aware, the Standing Closer Association Committee had several meetings, and the representatives of Barbados, unlike those of every other colony, were not present throughout the whole of these meetings. A sort of rough and ready procedure was laid down, the main thing established being that our proceedings were to be private and confidential; that members of the Committee were not at liberty to say outside what decisions were being arrived at from time to time, chiefly because, of course, those arrived at, at one meeting might be modified at a later meeting, and that would give the public the impression that members were shifting in their views. The committee felt that it was not unreasonable to follow the practice of the founding Fathers of the American Constitution. I think, of course, that it is possible to carry that too far because most historians have regretted that their knowledge of what took place at the foundation meetings that produced the American Constitution eventually was confined to the notes and diaries of two of three of the representatives, inasmuch as their meetings were also held in secret, and their proceedings were burned at the end.

The honourable Mr. Cuke and myself who were not present at the first meeting did endeavour to put our point of view on behalf of Barbados at subsequent meetings; and eventually this Report was pro-

duced. While I subscribed as all the others did, to the views of the committee that our proceedings were to be secret and confidential on the other hand when the Report came up to be signed I made it clear that there were points in it with which I did not agree and that I was going to write a Minority Report. I am saying what I am saying now with a clear conscience. Had I persisted in making that Minority Report I do not think that this Interim Report would have seen the light of day.

I have to be careful in choosing my language. We in Barbados are second to none in the West Indies. Whatever may have been the position in the early 1870's in believing in the principle of Federation in the sense that these colonies, scattered units, could speak more confidently if we spoke with a single voice in political or economic matters, we in Barbados are unique, absolutely unique among the colonies that were represented on the Committee, in the constitution that we have, and the stage of development that we have reached, and I will go further and say in the position which we hold in the minds of other West Indian colonies.

As I said, Sir, we agreed to have this secrecy; but when it came to signing the Report there were some things in it with which I could not agree. I said, however, that if for the sake of getting the Report out, and preventing a breaking up of the committee it was necessary to sign it, I would do so with the reservation which I made clear to the committee that I was not going to be bound by anything with which I disagreed, and to which I knew the members of the Legislature of Barbados would not agree. I have often thought that I made an error in not writing that Minority Report, even if it had led to the breaking up of the committee; but for the sake of preventing that unpopular action, and the postponing of the consideration of Federation for some years, I eventually agreed to the wording of section 7 of Part I. I will remind honourable members of what that wording is. That there shall be criticism I have no doubt.

I repeat that I cannot think of any time in my political life when I have felt so much that I have made an error of judgment as I feel now with regard to signing this Report, in spite of the fact that I made my position clear. I think we all know our Barbados, and we all know—because we have known nothing else—how it feels to have a constitution which so approximates self-government. We know what it means to us to have no restraining influence like the reserve powers of a governor. We know what it means to us to have a governor's powers limited to an inoperative and unused veto. Therefore when we see a proposed constitution which would place us in the position of not being really masters of our destiny we in Barbados would hesitate very much, unless the advantages to be gained by adopting a Federal Constitution are so considerable as to outweigh the loss of power and freedom and the liberty which we have had under our constitution.

As I have said, we are on the eve of the dissolution of the House — I hope that the morticians in this Chamber will pardon me for confusing dissolution with burial — and however strongly we may feel on this Report, speaking purely for myself I do not feel we should spend too much time on its details. I agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think that every single one around this table will agree with Federation as a principle. But we should not assume that West Indians are the wisest people that God ever made, so that 16 or 18 of us would get

together and draft a constitution that will be accepted by every legislator. It is almost inevitable that some of us will say what I propose also to say. Never in the history of this world have people coming from separate states and separate provinces provided a constitution that could be accepted in its entirety by the several states. I say at the risk of being called "insular" that the action of the Trinidad delegates in taking the stand that they did, trying to bulldoze the rest of the West Indies to swallow hook, line and sinker every recommendation in this Report has not done the cause of Federation any good in the West Indies. I do not want to appear insular. Believing in Federation as I do, I do not want to say things which might cause friction or lead to repercussions in other colonies who might feel that Barbados always thinks itself superior to the rest of the West Indies. Is it not remarkable that when the American representatives got together they quarreled like kilkelly cats, and they made a compromise Report, many States repudiating their delegates when they went back home? The same thing is reported to have happened in the case of Australia. Is it not remarkable that every people who have come together to prepare a draft Constitution have found it impossible to please everyone? And yet the colony of Trinidad seems to get annoyed because other colonies say you should not accept this in its entirety. We are not a body of absolute Fascists on the one hand or absolute geniuses on the other that could come together as this Committee came together and draft something that would be accepted by every colony.

What I am saying I am saying deliberately. Those colonies who feel that Barbados will be a stumbling block because we believe that this Report should be considered in a critical way so as to see whether it may be acceptable in its entirety are not doing the cause of Federation any good. Mr. Speaker for three hundred years we have had a representative system, and it may be that being British, we are so blinded by the excellence of the British system that we cannot see the excellence of any other system; but I think we should endeavour to take an impartial view of the matter to ask ourselves if it is not better to have a flexible constitution which we can change than to have a written constitution in which you have to stick to every comma, semicolon and full stop. The American Supreme Court has gone so far as to claim the right to say whether an amendment to the constitution is constitutional in itself. When you have a written constitution you may find yourself for generations, for centuries, unable to change it. Let me repeat, The American Supreme Court has gone so far as to say that they will have to say whether an amendment to that constitution is constitutional. When you reach that stage you have to be extremely careful. Next week in England the Conservative Party may alter the law as regards nationalisation; but you cannot alter a provision in a written constitution which says that the Government has a right to nationalise industries. You are bound by a written constitution. The Honourable junior member for Christ Church can bear me out that there are hundreds of cases which go to the Privy Council from Australia and Canada in which decisions are over-ruled when they are against the written constitution. There are lawyers who practise in the Privy Council and make a lot of money out of these cases which come up from Australia and which came from Canada in the past. So when I am told let us

make a start with this and then we can change it later on, it shows that those who use that expression are plainly ignorant of what we are letting ourselves in for. So again I say that any colony which passes this Report in its entirety without careful and critical consideration is doing the cause of Federation no good.

The British Government, without any attempt to force things down our throats, were anxious a few months ago to know what our attitude would be. I repeat, that I am absolutely sure that they are anxious to see Federation, but they are anxious that it should come from us and that it should not seem that they are pushing us in one direction or another. Another thing too that makes one sound a word of warning as to what our attitude in Barbados should be, and what I have no doubt the attitude of Jamaica will be is the fact that today we have a Conservative Government in Great Britain with a Prime Minister who has let the world know that he is not the King's First Minister to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire. The British Government is willing to give us self-government in a Federation; but it is a crown colony mentality that can be seen in some of the recommendations of this Committee. It is true that we have no money to provide an army or navy. It is true that for some years to come the British or American Navy will be defending us. One can well agree, therefore, that on matters of defence and foreign policy we will have to agree, as some of the present dominions had to agree at the beginning, that those matters were imperial matters, and therefore the imperial Government would legislate for those purposes.

But Mr. Speaker, I say that without any modification of the statement that implicit in this Report is the Crown Colony mentality. The critics of this Report who say that its recommendations look very much like those for a glorified crown colony are not far wrong. I think, Sir, that is due to the fact that with the exception of Barbados, all the others are Crown Colonies, or were Crown Colonies in 1947, 1948 and 1949 when this Report was drawn up. For instance, a suggestion that will need very serious consideration is the one that the Imperial Government will have jurisdiction to legislate on matters concerning the financial stability of the Federation. It means in effect that the Federation will have to do to the Imperial Government what St. Lucia and St. Kitts now have to do with their Estimates—send them to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Imagine telling a Barbadian that. Matters of that sort will make a Barbadian hesitate before he agrees to a constitution of this nature. On the other hand, he must use his commonsense and realise that initially, in the absence of material resources in the Caribbean Area, the U.K. Government will have to make some form of financial contribution, whereby whether by way of a loan or a grant we can start off our Federation; and the man who pays the piper must call the tune. The British Government will tell us that if they have to give us money to start off we must come within such and such conditions. But again I say we have to be careful with a written constitution which we might find it difficult to amend. You have to be careful that you do not give yourself body and soul to the U.K. Treasury. Those are matters which are so fundamentally important in the enactment of a Federal Constitution that we have got to watch them very carefully.

Now lest I give the impression that I am not in favour of political federation, as soon as possible, let me say straightaway that if we can get the two

going at the same time let us do so. But if we are going to be delayed by the consideration which must be given to this Report, if we are going to wait for the modifications and qualifications which will be given to it by us and I have no doubt, by Jamaica also, then I should get on with the Montego Bay recommendations, and the recommendations of the Committees which sat about the same time, such as the Holmes Report, on closer union etc. I know I shall be accused of playing into the hands of those who feel that if you get unified currency the chambers of commerce will not be so keen on political federation, especially with the upsurge of Labour Parties in the British West Indies. I do not subscribe to that; I do not think that we are playing into their hands; but I do feel that if there is anything that we can start off with now we should do so.

I emphatically differ from the view that we should get the Imperial Government to set up a Federation and then set about to get the political machinery. Islands without any training in, say, Bushe Experiments will come together as a federal unit, create Departments of State from scratch and expect Federation to work. If throughout these islands we could put into operation Bushe Experiments, when they federate they will already have had training in the working of Departments of State. I think I heard the honourable senior member for St. James refer to Australia. While the Australians were not on equal status as regards responsible government, they did have, in the main, responsible government and not representative government only. There was a Prime Minister of the Australian States; they had the Colonial Office behind them and they got self-government in its entirety. We are the only place with self-government in the West Indies, Jamaica comes second and Trinidad is almost neck and neck with Jamaica. When it comes to the Leewards and Windwards, they, of course are run by Governors and through the Government by the Colonial Office.

Though you may say that political federation cannot come in a hurry, it does no harm to have this closer union as found in the Holmes Report established. I shall now take an attitude towards the whole question of Federation which I think that members on both sides will agree with. I have already said that we with our advanced constitution will be giving up a lot if for the first time in our lives we come under a constitution by which we have to put a lot of power in the hands of a Governor. But as a Barbadian — I am speaking purely as a Barbadian in one respect and as a West Indian in another respect — the signs of the times even today after the Windward and Leeward Islands elections point to the danger of our going into a Federation and having to fight the old anti-Chamber of Commerce battle all over again. We have to a great extent won it for Barbados. As things are at the present moment, if Trinidad is going to be the capital, it does look, taking the West Indies as a whole, as if we would be run by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the West Indies. I do not care how insular I may be accused of being, I say that we, as West Indians, should avoid that as we avoid poison. What is the whole essence of colonialism but being run by Shipping, Sugar and Oil interests, and ultimately by the Imperial Government? And the whole essence of progressive movements is to get away from that. We have done so in Barbados. Other British colonies are showing signs of getting away from it. For us in Barbados to have to begin all

over again (ger scale the battle against the rule of the Producers' Association and the Chamber of Commerce would be an act not merely of children, but of stupid children.

I know it will be said that that is a narrow way of looking at things; and that it does not matter which Government is in power as long as you have Federation. I cannot subscribe to that because that is equivalent to saying that if you have a Government of the extreme right you should accept it, as long as you have Federation. I cannot accept that, especially in the West Indies with so many mixed races. Honourable members will pardon me for making a personal statement; but I became a Socialist through my brain as well as through my heart. I think we should be convinced that the only hope for the realisation of the dream of a West Indian nation is to have a Socialist Commonwealth of the West Indies, because Socialism, if it preaches nothing else, preaches that class distinctions and colour distinctions are evil, and should be opposed. Therefore, our only hope if we want to avoid ever-recurring strife in the West Indies is to aim to establish Socialist Government in the West Indies. To start off with the dice loaded against the federal West Indies is not to my way of thinking the right way to begin. I say that deliberately as a matter of considered opinion, even though I will be accused of looking at one political faith rather than at the desirability of Federation. I repeat, Sir, if we are going to say let us have Federation no matter what government wins the election I do not agree. I would not be one to go into a political federation unless there was a reasonable chance of building up a West Indian nation, and not merely establishing a state of class, races and interests struggling against each other.

I hope that the House will pardon me for speaking so long; but inasmuch as my name is appended to the Report it is necessary to make my position clear. I hope that we will all see a change throughout the West Indian scene to sane, sober, constitutional left wing governments. Sometimes one is amused to see what the power of propaganda can bring about in the world. In 1944 Russia was a wonderful place. In 1944 the freedom of the individual and the right of every man to share in the good things of earth were axiomatic. Today we are told that the salvation of the world lies only with big business and a Conservative Government. We have entirely forgotten, or very many of us have, the things that we preached seven years ago. I still believe, taking into consideration the mistakes that have been made by previous federal structures, that it is our duty not blindly to follow any federal set-up, but to profit by those mistakes. There has been as you doubtless know a strong movement in Canada recently and in Australia, questioning the wisdom of the constitutions as they exist today; especially on the ground that when you have a written constitution, no matter how you word it, the difficulties of amendment are great. One remembers what the American Supreme Court did with President Roosevelt when he endeavoured to put over a new Bill. One remembers that Roosevelt threatened to take off the judges of the Supreme Court and replace them with judges who would give decisions his way. It was a lamentable thing in one respect for a judge to allow his ideas of the sanctity of big business to outweigh his judgment. But it is the sort of things that happen with a hard and fast constitution.

I repeat, therefore, that it is our bounden duty when this election is over and we come back and