

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30th October, 1951

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs. M. E. COX, L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), F. L. WALCOTT, H. A. DOWDING, R. G. MAPP, T. O. BRYAN and O. T. ALLDER.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 11th October, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

ILLNESS OF THE DEPUTY CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a letter from the Deputy Clerk of the House applying for leave of absence for today on account of indisposition.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Deputy Clerk be granted leave of absence for to-day.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk for today.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following Documents:—

Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month of September, 1951.

Statement of Highways Accounts for the parish of St. Philip for the half year ended the 30th September, 1951.

Statement of Highways Accounts for the parish of St. George for the half year ended the 30th September, 1951.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable the Legislative Council Messages returning (a) The Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the execution of works necessary to prevent and control flooding and inundations caused by excessive rains and by high tides and by reason of the low level of various places, causing inconvenience to persons and injury to health and property and to authorize the Governor-in-Executive Committee to take all reasonable steps in connection therewith with amendments: and (b) The Bill intituled an Act to continue temporarily certain emergency enactments.

PETITION

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Petition from the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of St. James, praying the House to pass a Bill authorising them to increase the salary and travelling allowance of the Inspector of Highways of the said parish.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to approve the allocation of the balance of the stabilisation fund fixed on the 25th of October, 1951, by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Fancy Molasses Control and marketing Board under the provisions of Section 10 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I should like to give notice that it is my intention to deal with this Resolution later in the day. At the proper time I shall ask leave to proceed with it.

Mr. COX: Bill intituled an Act to provide for the importation into this Island free of duty for a period of one year of goods made from Sea Island Cotton.

Mr. COX: I should like to inform the House that it is my intention to deal with this Bill later in the day inasmuch as it is a matter of urgency. It is a continuation of what was done in 1950. Honourable members will be given cyclo-styled copies of this Bill.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill intituled an Act to provide for the importation into this Island free of duty for a period of one year of goods made from Sea Island Cotton, was read a first time.

LEAVE TO TAKE CHARGE OF ORDERS

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take charge of all the Orders standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

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

Mr. WARD entered the House and took his seat.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Dr. CUMMINS: 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 now stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

PURCHASE OF LAND FOR THE ERECTION OF A DISTRICT MARKET

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution with which I should like to deal is the one for \$18,650 which is for the purpose of purchasing a portion of land at Eagle Hall from Honourable Mrs. Hanschell for the purpose of erecting a District Market. The history of this case is quite familiar to members of this Committee. Not so long ago the matter was fully debated in this House and I do not want to go over that long history; I should like to remind honourable members that it was the decision of the Government and of this House to proceed to purchase this land compulsorily, but in view of the fact that other land in the immediate vicinity was sold to a private individual at \$1.40 per square foot, it would serve no useful purpose to proceed to purchase this land compulsorily, which would cost us more money in the long run. The question of legal costs in going before the Court would be involved. Since Honourable Mrs. Hanschell has expressed the desire to treat with the Government rather than go before the Court, it was felt that, in the interest of the colony, the Government should treat with Mrs. Hanschell. Her latest offer is to sell this land at \$1.32 per square foot as compared with \$1.00 per square foot which had been previously asked. It was argued by those who seemed to know that in view of the fact that land opposite this particular portion of land was sold at \$1.40 per square foot, the Court would take that fact into consideration in coming to its decision. In the circumstances the Government has decided, subject to the decision of the Legislature, to treat privately with Mrs. Hanschell and acquire this land for the purpose of erecting a District Market. I will take this opportunity to state that it is proposed that this money will be advanced from the Treasury pending the raising of a loan. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: This Resolution brings afresh to our minds a matter which occupied the attention of this House some months ago. At that time it was proposed to purchase this same piece of land from this lady and it was said then that the price which she asked for it was \$1.00 a square foot. The House decided that, taking into consideration the price of the adjoining land, at least a short time before that land was about to be sold, the price of this particular piece of land at \$1.00 per square foot was too steep, and it was decided to use the power of compulsory acquisition. We agreed to that; we agreed to pass legislation to acquire this land compulsorily, and now this Resolution has come down for the purchase of this land at \$1.32 per square foot. In the addendum to this Resolution, this is stated:

"The Acting King's Solicitor considers that, bearing in mind recent transactions in the same neighbourhood this price is reasonable and this Resolution accordingly seeks the provision of funds for the purchase of the land at this price, together with the stamp duty on the conveyance of the property and the fees of the Acting King's Solicitor."

Personally speaking, I feel that it is asking too much of me to ask me to agree to the purchase of this land at \$1.32 per square foot when a few months ago in company with others, I condemned the price of this land at \$1.00 per square foot as being too high. At \$1.00 a square foot for this land it was decided to use the power of compulsory purchase. I am not aware of anything that is given to the Government in deciding to purchase this land at \$1.32 per square foot. I have heard it stated often in this House that on past occasions we have turned down land at one price and when it came to arbitration we had to pay more for the land. I feel that there should be some ceiling value of land; the value of land should not be allowed to rise from day to day to a really fictitious price. It is my feeling that a Socialist Government should try and keep the price of land so under control that it cannot rise very suddenly and surprisingly and for no obvious reason at all, to any figure which exceeds what you think you should reasonably pay for it. I do not know why that legislation for the compulsory acquisition of this land was not proceeded with in the Other Place; from my point of view that piece of legislation should have been forced through the Other Place. I can only come to the conclusion that that legislation was not forced through the Other Place because Mrs. Hanschell is a member of the Other Place; in this way we are being told that the Other Place has the final authority in matters of legislation. That legislation was not forced through the Other Place but the matter comes to us in another form.

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order. I deliberately pointed out in my introductory remarks that the matter was not proceeded with because of certain conditions which were brought to our attention, and it would be cheaper in the long run to treat privately with Mrs. Hanschell than go through with the compulsory purchase of this land.

Mr. MAPP: I do not mind what considerations forced the point that it would be cheaper to buy this land privately. Only a few months ago we decided that the price of this land at \$1.00 per square foot was too high and it would be better to deal with it by compulsory arbitration. If the Government has come to the conclusion that it is cheaper to buy this land at \$1.32 per square foot instead of going to arbitration, the Government is perfectly entitled to bring down a Resolution like this, although the reasons were not made known to

me. My colleague has said that there was some information which has led the Government to the conclusion that it would be cheaper to treat privately in respect of this land than to acquire it compulsorily, but I could not agree to the purchase of this land at \$1.32 per square foot when the majority of the House opposed the payment of \$1.00 per square foot for it. Unless it is absolutely impossible to find an alternative site, I feel it would be better for the Government to postpone the consideration of this matter, which would mean some delay in the setting up of these District Markets; but the matter has been delayed for a long time already and it could not be delayed for very much longer. The next session of this House will soon be started, we will come back with our minds fresh and we may be willing to consider the purchase of this land at this price; but it is too short a time for me to blot out from my memory the fact that we protested against the purchase of this land at \$1.00 per square foot.

Messrs GILL and E. K. WALCOTT came into the Committee and took their seats.

Mr. LEWIS: Probably I have been a member of this House for longer than the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, and I can tell him that when the Government attempt to buy anything compulsorily, they usually pay a lot more for it than if they bought it otherwise. In the matter of land, they have to get people who know the value of land to do the valuation, and therefore they have to get people who have land to do it. The best way for these people to put up the value of their land is to say that the piece which the Government wants to buy is about ten times the price of theirs. The erection of these District Markets is long overdue. In this case the House accepted the proposition put up by the Government which have now thought otherwise and are asking the House to accept the new decision. I am willing to reverse the previous decision of the House: the only thing is that I do not know how long this matter was dealt with. We are bringing up a matter twice in the same legislative session and I do not know what the position is now. One of the Rules of the House says that if you decide a matter in one way or the other, you cannot bring it back up in the same session. The next point is that we decided how we would buy this land already and we are now deciding to buy it in another way. However, I would like to say that since the Estimates were passed by this House, we have had Resolutions for capital expenditure brought before us, Resolutions which did not tell us whence the money was coming except out of the Treasury. This is not the first piece of land which we are buying; we bought land at Waterford, and now we are buying another piece of land, the money is coming out of the Treasury and the Resolution does not say that the money will be refunded from loan funds. The representatives of the people are not saying how this money is coming out of the Treasury, but we think that that is our sole right. I have no doubt that this money will be refunded from loan funds, but that matter is going to be looked after by the Financial Secretary who is a Government Servant, and the people's representatives have not got the matter before them. My concern is really to preserve the rights of this Assembly. I have no doubt that this matter will be dealt with in the way in which it should be dealt with: I am saying that this land which is for the purpose of erecting a market for the use of people yet unborn, should be bought in such a way that the people who are going to use it should help to pay for it. That

this money will come out of loan funds, I have no doubt, but the Resolution does not say so: and, in my opinion, that is a violation of the Rules of this House and the Executive Committee Act. I am perfectly prepared to allow the purchase of this land to be made privately because if it is done under the Land Acquisition Act, I can fairly say that the Government will find itself going from \$1.32 per square foot to \$1.50 per square foot, in the same manner as it went from \$1.00 per square foot to \$1.32 per square foot.

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

PURCHASE OF SAFE FOR CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT AT SEAWELL AIRPORT

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of \$125 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. 34, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

In view of the fact that a certain amount of revenue is received at Seawell, it is considered necessary to purchase a safe in which this money can be disposed. This sum of \$125 is required for the purchase of this safe. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I congratulate the Government on getting a safe for the safe keeping of money collected at Seawell. I compliment the Government on that, because something might happen up there as it has happened down here, and we were not told about it although a considerable sum of money has been lost. I say it is a good thing that the Government is taking this step; if they do not take such a step probably the officer in charge of this money will be robbed with violence and when you think that anything like that could have been avoided with the expenditure of this \$125 it would be ridiculous for us not to agree to this expenditure.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair, and reported accordingly.

On motions of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee of Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. MOTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE FACTORIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Dr. CUMMINS: I propose that we now proceed from Order No. 10 onwards. I therefore beg to move that Order No. 10 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT 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. Thomas:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council, to the Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1947.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Order deals with the amendments of the Other Place to the Factories (Amendment) Bill, 1951. The first amendment is in Clause 4 which repeals Clauses 3, 4 and 5 of the principal Act and substitutes new Clauses therefor. This is a verbal amendment. As passed by this House. Sub-clause (2) of the new Clause 3 reads as follows:— "The Labour Commissioner may delegate the exercise of all or any of his powers and duties under this Act to any Inspector." The Other Place has changed the word "any" to the word "the". This is really a little more than a verbal amendment; I do not know if they do not envisage that there might be more than one Inspector. The next amendment is in Clause 12 which repeals Clause 19 of the principal Act and substitutes a new Clause therefor. Sub-clause 2 of the new Clause as passed by this House reads as follows:

"All fencing or other safeguards provided pursuance of this section shall be of substantial construction, and constantly maintained and kept in position while the parts required to be fenced or safeguarded are in motion or in use, except when any such parts are necessarily exposed for examination and for any lubrication or adjustment shown by such examination and for any lubrication or adjustment shown by such examination to be immediately necessary and all such conditions as may be prescribed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee are complied with."

The Other Place has inserted the word "in" which was omitted before the word "pursuance" and that does improve the reading. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that these amendments be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I think it is incumbent upon some member of this House to say that Bills are sent back to this House from the Other Place with unfailing regularity, and many of the amendments made by the Other Place represent carelessness on the part of somebody from the time the Bills are drafted until they reach the Other Place. Here we have no fewer than four Bills which have been returned to this House and it seems to me that every important Bill that is dealt with by this House is sent back here with verbal amendments by the Other Place. Whether they are willing to show up anything that is done here or otherwise, I am not in a position to say; but I feel that some step should be taken to see that this situation does not reflect on the credit of this House, or on the way in which we are doing business in this House. We are either getting too hasty or something of the sort, and I hope the situation will be corrected to the advantage of the Legislature as a whole.

The question that these amendments be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the amendments were agreed to.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE ACCIDENTS AND OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES (NOTIFICATION) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:— To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to provide for the notification of Accidents and Occupational Diseases.

Dr. CUMMINS: These are the amendments of the Other Place to the Accidents and Occupational Diseases (Notification) Bill, 1951. The first amendment is in the last line of the proviso to Sub-clause (I) of Clause 6 which deals with the holding of an inquest on the body of any person whose death may have been caused by any accident or disease. As passed by the House that proviso reads: "Provided that the coroner, before the adjournment, may take evidence to identify the body, and may order the internment thereof." The Other Place has quite rightly changed the word "internment" to "interment." Then there are amendments to paragraph (g) of Sub-clause (I) of Clause 7. That paragraph as passed by this House reads as follows— "any person who without reasonable excuse (proof whereof shall lie on him) either fails after having had the detention allowances, travelling expenses and fees (if any) to which he is entitled tendered to him, to comply with any summons or requisition of the court, or prevents or impedes the court in the execution of its duty, shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable to a fine of fifty dollars or imprisonment for one month or to both such penalties, and, in the case of a failure to comply with the requisition for making any return or producing any document, if the failure in respect of which a person was so convicted is contained after the conviction, he shall be guilty of a further offence and shall be liable to a fine of fifty dollars for every day on which the failure was so continued."

The Other Place has amended that paragraph by inserting the words "not exceeding" before the words "fifty dollars" wherever they occur and by changing the word "contained" occurring in line seventeen to the word "continued". In respect of the insertion of the words "not exceeding," I am informed by the Attorney General that the Interpretation Act makes provision for these words, so that when we passed that paragraph with the words "shall be liable to a fine of fifty dollars." by the Interpretation Act that would mean "shall be liable to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars." However, the Other Place thought that they would make assurance doubly sure and they inserted the words "not exceeding". Similarly in Clause 8 Sub-clause (I). As passed by this House that Sub-clause reads:

"Any person guilty of an offence against this Act or any regulations made thereunder for which no special penalty is provided by this Act shall be liable to a fine of one hundred dollars, or imprisonment for three months, or to both such penalties."

The Other Place has inserted the words "not exceeding" before the words "one hundred dollars" and the words "a period not exceeding" before the words "three months. As I have already pointed out, provision has been made for those words in the Interpretation Act. Finally Clause 12 of the Bill which refers to Clauses 25 to 28 of the Factories Act, has been deleted by the Other Place: it was thought that this Bill would have been passed before the Factories Bill, but the Factories Bill has gone ahead of this Bill. I am informed that Clauses 25 to 28 of the Factories Act, 1947, deal with a slightly different matter. I beg to move that these amendment be now read a first time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House and took his seat.

The question that these amendments be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to make provision for the Protection of Wages of Workers.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Order deals with the amendments of the Other Place to the Protection of Wages Bill, 1951. This matter is somewhat controversial, the Government not being prepared to accept the amendment of the Other Place to Clause 2 of the Bill. Clause 2 of the Bill, the definition Clause, as passed by this House read as follows:

In this Act—

“manual labour” includes work ordinarily performed by mechanics, artisans, handicraftsmen, seamen, boatmen, transport workers, domestic servants and all labourers and any other similar work associated therewith but does not include clerical work;

“worker” means a person who performs manual labour.

The Other Place has amended that Clause by adding at the end of the definition of “manual labour” the words “or work performed by watchmen.” As I have said, the Government is not prepared to accept that amendment. We are all acquainted with the plantation system in Barbados and we know that when anything is lost at a plantation, or when crops are stolen from a plantation, the watchman has to pay for the loss; his money is stopped. That is something which an I.L.O. Convention seeks to abolish. We feel that a watchman employed at an estate of probably 300 or 400 acres, cannot be at all places at the same time, and it is quite unfair when crops are stolen that the watchman should be held responsible for that. We have heard of the boys who confessed that they played pranks with the watchman and as soon as he went elsewhere they stole the canes. The same thing applies to other crops as well; unless it can be proved that there was some collusion between the watchman and culprits, the Government feels that the watchman should not be held responsible for the loss of crops.

The next amendment is the correction of a clerical error in Clause 8 which deals with the deduction from the wages to be paid by the employer to the worker in respect of any fine. As passed by the House, the latter part of that Clause read, “or of bad or negligent work or for injury to the materials or other property of the employer. . . .” The Other Place has changed the word “of” occurring before the word “bad” to the word “for.” Then in Clause 15 (c) where there is a fine of forty eight dollars for a first offence and ninety-six dollars for a second or subsequent offence, the Other Place has deleted the word “of” and inserted the words “not exceeding” before the amount of each fine. Similarly in Clause 17 (2) in respect of the fine of forty-eight dollars. Finally, the Other Place has inserted a new Clause to be numbered 20, which reads as follows:—

“No prosecution for any offence under this Act shall be instituted after the expiration of one year from the date of the commission of the offence.”

As I said before, the Government does not propose to accept the first amendment; I therefore beg to move that these amendments be now disagreed to.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: As the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has said, the first amendment is one in which the Other Place went a bit too far. I doubt very much if the majority of the members in the Other Place know anything about I.L.O. Conventions, because they would realise that in a place like Barbados we are getting rid of these penal sections, these sections which impose a penalty on workers. I think it is clear that in respect of watchmen in this island, we are unique in the Empire; if you exclude watchmen from this Clause you are really putting them under these penal sections, and their wages do not relate to what they were getting before. Many a plantation owner pays \$8.00 a week for watching a plantation of 200 acres and those 200 acres contain the worth of thousands of dollars; if the worth of \$20 was lost in a field, the watchman would lose much of his money. Penal Clauses are today being got rid of all over the world and we cannot have the Barbados House of Assembly entertaining any of these Clauses. I would not waste the time of this House in beginning to discuss penal Clauses; I feel that this is one of those occasions when the Other Place, for the sake of amending legislation, has made an amendment which is a retrograde step. That is an indication that the mentality of the Other Place is still the mentality of the feudal times when people's money was taken out as a matter of course. If this Bill is rejected, it will be brought back in the next session; it will be amended and the Other Place will have to be amended too. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. LEWIS: I am speaking on a point of order. I take it that those amendments are not before this House at all. You cannot bring anything before the House and immediately move that it be rejected; I think that these amendments are put before the House by somebody who is willing to move that they be read a first and second time and then agreed to, or otherwise. I do not think that we are following the right procedure now and we might find ourselves in trouble on the point. Any Bill that is brought in here can be rejected, but you cannot move for the rejection of a Bill when you give notice of it. I think that someone will have to take the responsibility of putting forward the Bill and then a motion can be made for its rejection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point raised by the honourable junior member for the City is a very interesting one, but I am of a different opinion. Rule 261 of the Rules of the House reads:

“When a Bill is returned from the Council with amendments, such amendments are twice read and agreed to, or agreed to with amendments or disagreed to, or the further consideration thereof put off for three or six months, or the Bill ordered to be laid aside.”

When a Bill is returned from the Other Place to this House, the Bill can be deemed to be before the House. That is the first point to be settled. As soon as a member representing the Government gives notice of the return of a Bill from the Other Place, that Bill is the subject of consideration by the members of this Chamber. Obviously the reading of the amendments a first and second time and agreeing to them is one thing, the conditions affecting disagreement are another thing and the conditions affecting the postponement is something else. My ruling is that the motion that these amendments be disagreed to is quite in order. In this connection, I will read from the House of Commons Manual of Procedure in public business; this is what is stated:—

"On the Order being read for the consideration of Lords' amendments, a motion may be made for the consideration of them to be put off for three or six months, or that the Bill be laid aside.

Unless an Order is made that the consideration of the amendments be put off, or that the Bill be laid aside, the Clerk at the table reads the amendments one by one, and unless an amendment be moved, a motion is made 'That this House doth agree (or disagree) with the Lords in the said amendments.'"

Mr. REECE entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I speak with a little difficulty, but I think you will find in looking up the procedure — we once had to look it up when we were dealing with certain amendments — that nothing was said on the first reading of the amendments. On the second reading you do not necessarily say anything, but you go into Committee after the second reading of the amendments and deal with them separately if you want to do so. When you come out of Committee you either agree to all the amendments or disagree to them, or agree to some of them with amendments. It is obvious from the Rule that you have to read the amendments twice before you can make any amendments; they must be read twice, and then there is the fight as to whether they should be agreed to or not. I think that is the usual practice.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am glad to hear the honourable member speak on this matter. As far as the Rules of this House are concerned, there are several of them which are now outdated, and I have had some difficulty in getting the Rules Committee to meet as often as I would like. I must say that in this case I find myself in difficulty because you can have more than one interpretation put on the matter. I do not know if it is the feeling of the House that this matter be postponed.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to say that we bring legislation before this House by our own act, and not by any act of the Other Place.

The question that these amendments be disagreed to was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN, YOUNG PERSONS AND CHILDREN (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas: To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Employment of Women, Young Persons and Children Act, 1938.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Order deals with the amendments to the Employment of Women, Young Persons and Children (Amendment) Bill, 1951. The amendment is in Clause 3 of the Bill, which, as passed by this House, reads as follows: "The Schedule to the principal Act shall have effect as if Part II and Part III thereof were substituted Part II and Part III set out in the Schedule hereto." The Other Place has amended that Clause by inserting the word "for" between the words "if" and "Part," and by inserting the word "there" between the words "thereof" and "were" occurring in line 2. These are just verbal amendments. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

FURTHER AMENDMENTS FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Dr. CUMMINS: I agree with the honourable junior member for the City that we are getting a number of Bills being returned with amendments from the Other Place. We have just dealt with four of those Bills and now we have the Shops (Amendment) Bill and the War Emergency Laws Continuance Bill which have been returned with amendments. I beg to move that these amendments be considered forthwith under Rule 262.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE SHOPS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Shops Act, 1945.

Dr. CUMMINS: In connection with the amendments to this Bill, honourable members will remember that the point was raised in this House by the honourable junior member for the City that the early closing day before Good Friday being Thursday, would apply to people who closed their shops on Thursday, but not to those who closed their shops on Saturday. The Other Place has amended this Bill by deleting the words "Good Friday" occurring in Clause 3 (a) and inserting the words "Easter Sunday" in place thereof; so that the closing day will apply both to the Thursday and the Saturday. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE WAR EMERGENCY LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to continue temporarily certain emergency enactments.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Bill was passed by the House for the purpose of continuing the Exports and Imports Restriction Act, 1939, and the Aliens Restriction Act, 1939, until the 31st March next year. The amendments to the Bill are in the Schedule. In respect of the first mentioned Act the third column of the Schedule, as passed by the House, reads as follows:— In section 10 for the words "throughout the duration of the present war" substitute the words "until thirty first day of March one thousand nine hundred and fifty two and shall then expire unless otherwise continued."

In respect of the other Act the same column of the Schedule, as passed by the House, reads as follows:— In section 9 for the words "during the continuance of the present war" substitute the words "until the thirty-first day of March one thousand nine

hundred and fifty two and shall then expire unless, otherwise continued."

The Other Place has amended the Schedule by deleting the words "unless otherwise continued" in respect of both Acts. These Acts will continue until the 31st March and if it is necessary to continue them they will be continued under the Expiring Laws Continuance Act until it is considered no longer necessary to continue them. I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE "THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 3 ORDER, 1951"

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1951", made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the twenty-second day of October 1951, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Dr. CUMMINS: This is a Resolution which seeks in one case to change the nomenclature of an office and to create offices in other cases. In the Schedule in respect of the Department of Science and Agriculture it is proposed to add "Overseer, Central Livestock Station and Pine Plantation, \$1,200 x 72—1,920": and in respect of the Department of Highways and Transport it is proposed to use the nomenclature "Foreman Mechanic, \$1,920 x 120—\$2,520" (2) and to add "Lathe Operator, \$840 x 48—1,080" and "Mechanical Storekeeper, \$480 x 48—1,200." These officers are necessary so that we can have the harmonious working of the Departments concerned. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not clear as to what could possibly be meant by a Mechanical Storekeeper; there are people who are storekeepers in garages and they know the purpose of the various parts although they may not be engineers at all. It appears that this Department would like somebody to keep the stock at the Department and he must be a mechanic as well. Do you mean to tell me that you want a man who is a mechanic to keep a check at the storeroom when all he needs to know is the names of the various parts? Of course if he does not know the names of the various parts he does not have any right being there. I notice that not much money by way of salary has been put down for this office. It seems to me that we have a lot of offices at this Department and I hope that the Government will get work for them and that these salaries do not throw other salaries out of alignment. However, it seems to me to be ridiculous that you want somebody who knows something about mechanical engineering to do this job; you cannot get a man for \$40 a month unless he is of no use. If you want a man to be in charge of the various parts, you should give him a decent salary.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Already we have a storekeeper at the Department who deals with storing implements such as pick-axes, shovels, and so on; now we want somebody to deal with the spare parts. We want a storekeeper to deal with the mechanical side of the matter, and we are starting him off at a

reasonable salary. What is the difference of putting a Stores Clerk at the same salary as you put a Clerk in the Civil Service, who has a School Certificate? The honourable member is thinking about taking a Foreman Mechanic and making him a Storekeeper.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of order. The honourable member should not say that; I did not say it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Foreman Mechanic is one post, but the Mechanical Storekeeper is another. We want a young man who knows something about spare parts; he will have to be somebody who has some knowledge of the things we have, but that does not mean that he must have a knowledge of mechanical engineering. This designation is only to make sure that this Storekeeper does not interfere with the general stores in respect of which we already have a storekeeper. The Department has grown so large that we cannot have one man to be responsible for all the stores; one man is to be in charge of the mechanical stores while the other man is in charge of the deliveries all over the island.

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

ALLOCATION OF THE BALANCE OF THE STABILISATION FUND

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to deal with the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the allocation of the balance of the stabilisation fund fixed on the 25th of October, 1951, by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the advice of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board under the provisions of Section 10 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: This is a formal Resolution in respect of the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board dealing with the allocation of the balance of the Stabilisation Fund. As has been set out in the Resolution: "The balance of the Stabilisation Fund shall be allocated among producers of fancy molasses and among producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar as follows:—

- (a) among producers of fancy molasses at the rate of .2495 cents a gallon on every wine gallon produced; and
- (b) among producers of sugar other than muscovado sugar at the rate of 57.5665 cents per ton of sugar made."

Those are the rates relative to the allocation among producers of sugar and fancy molasses. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended in order to deal with the Bill of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

WEST INDIAN SEA ISLAND (EXEMPTION FROM DUTY) BILL, 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael: To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to provide for the importation into this Island free of duty for a period of one year of goods made from Sea Island Cotton.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—Honourable members will remember that sometime in January last year we passed a similar Bill allowing articles made of West Indian Sea Island Cotton to be brought into this Island duty free. In the "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill it is stated as follows:—

"This Bill seeks to re-enact for a further period of one year, provisions similar to those contained in the West Indian Sea Island Cotton (Exemption from Duty) Act, 1950.

It provides for the importation into this Island free of duty for a period of one year, of articles made of Sea Island Cotton, and is put forward with a view to fostering the development of the Sea Island Cotton Industry.

In order to afford proof that articles are made of Sea Island Cotton, a declaration to that effect endorsed as provided in Clause 3 of the Bill would be made a condition precedent to their duty free admission."

Honourable members agreed to this matter on the last occasion; it was agreed that the provisions of the Act should be extended for three years, in the first place, then it was thought advisable to have them extended for another year and now this Bill has been brought forward asking for an extension of these provisions for a further year. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more in connection with this matter. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1, the title Clause was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read.

Mr. COX: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I want to say that there is a provision in the laws of this colony for continuing a Bill which expires annually; to pass a Bill every January or October or whenever it is, and then you have to remember when it will expire, does not seem to me to be using the machinery which we have for this purpose. I suggest that we put this Bill in the Schedule of the Expiring Laws Continuance Act and we will save a lot of trouble. Unless that is done, it will mean that every year the House will have to be given cyclo-styled copies of this Bill to be passed. This Bill should expire on the 31st March and be put under the Expiring Laws Continuance Act; if you have a Bill expiring on the 31st October, another expiring on the 30th June, and so on, all of these Bills should be collected and put under the Expiring Laws Continuance Act. That is a perfectly sensible thing to do; there is no sense in dealing with this Bill in the way in which we are dealing with it now. This Clause reads as follows:—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, or any Act amending the same, all articles manufactured from Sea Island Cotton

which are accompanied by a declaration in the form contained in the First Schedule hereto, endorsed as provided in section three of this Act, shall, for the period of one year from the date of the coming into operation of this Act be admitted into this Island free of customs duty."

I am suggesting that all the words after the word "shall" occurring in line 6 down to the word "of" in the next line be deleted, and that the word "on" be inserted before the word "the" in line 7. I also suggest that we add a Clause to be numbered "4" as follows:—

"This Act shall expire on the 31st March, 1952."

This Act would then be added to the others which expire on that date.

Mr. COX: I appreciate the honourable member's remarks and I promise him that I will report his suggestion in the proper quarter.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was read and passed.

The three Schedules were read and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—At this stage I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:—

Dr. CUMMINS laid the Reply to Question No. 105 standing in the name of Mr. ALDER.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT laid the Reply to Question No. 74 standing in the name of Mr. Brancker.

DEBATE ON FEDERATION

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to revert to Order No. 1 on the Order Paper. There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order therefore stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas: To move 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 the Unification of the Public Services in the British Caribbean Area.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—This is the Interim Report of the Select Committee appointed by the House to consider the question of the Reports of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee, and also the Holmes Report on the Unification of Public Services in the British Caribbean Area. This question of Federation is a very big one, Sir, and the Leader of the House is desirous that we begin consideration today of the Report of the Select Committee. Of course it is a question on which almost every member of the House would want to express an opinion; so there is no hope that we will finalise the debate this evening; but we can get the

view of a few members and continue the debate next Tuesday.

The Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee was handed in a good while ago, and it has been considered by almost every island of the British Caribbean except Barbados. We are being asked to consider it as soon as possible. There are some islands which have accepted this Report in principle and it is proposed that early next year — I believe around January or February — the Committee will meet in London and consider the details further. As it stands now with the Report, there are a good number of points with which the West Indies in general, and we in Barbados in particular, do not agree, and I think, Sir, the most that can be done by this House at this time is to accept the principle of Federation as the Other Place has done, express our points of view and leave the matter of the finalising of the details to the Committee which hopes to meet in London early next year.

I will say no more, Sir, and at this stage I beg to move formally the passing of the following Address to His Excellency the Governor :—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly repeats its acceptance of the principles of establishing a Federal Government of the British West Indies, and accepts the proposals of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee's Report as a basis for discussion of the form which the proposed Government's Constitution should take.

2. The House, however, does not accept in their entirety the detailed proposals of that Report, and will in due course forward to Your Excellency its suggestions for the amendment of some of these proposals.

3. The House is convinced of the advantages to be gained from a Unification of the Public Services in the British Caribbean Area and agree therefore in general with the "Holmes" Report on this subject.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker — In seconding the motion for the passing of this Address I will say, as the honourable mover has said, that this is a very important matter, and it is a pity, Sir, that it has come before the House at a stage when this House will die next Tuesday. It is a pity that this Report was not dealt with before, because as you will remember, Sir, the question of Federation or Closer Association has been in the air in the West Indies for a long number of years. You will also remember that the Secretary of State for the Colonies opened this Conference in Jamaica on Closer Association in 1947; and it is now close upon four years that the principles of Federation were agreed upon by the various representatives of the territories that attended that Conference, and this body known as the Standing Closer Association Committee was set up to deal with this question. Their Report was handed in to us sometime last year.

You will agree, Sir, that this matter is one of the utmost importance. While some, or nearly all of the units in the British Caribbean Area have agreed on the principle of Federation, we find that an important Colony like Barbados which must play an important part in any Federal Structure, has not debated it, and you will remember that many references were made to that fact in the House of Commons. It is now before us, and I feel that honourable members must have had an opportunity

over all these months to have read this Report so as to be able to discuss it; because it is no use believing that we are going to give authority to any member to go to a Conference as our delegate unless we are going to express our views on this vital matter of a Federal Constitution; because it means that the day any particular constitution becomes the Constitution of a Federated West Indies our opportunity for amending it will be very remote and whatever its defects we will not be able to change it like how we can come here any Tuesday and amend an Act.

I hope, therefore, that honourable members are aware of what they are doing, and that they have given serious consideration to every aspect of it; because the Report itself says that in a matter of this kind there is hardly a point which can be set aside as a matter of detail. Every word and line counts, "and we have felt it our duty to eschew generalities and do as much as possible of the spade work ourselves." So the framers of this Report have made it clear that the various legislatures and representatives must be willing to state in no uncertain terms where they disagree with this Report. You will find that the Standing Closer Association Committee may not be a true reflection of democratic institutions in the Caribbean Colonies. Therefore you will find that there are many sections of this Report that we have to discuss.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself, I must say at the outset that I am not a believer in double chambers. I am not one of those who believe that two heads are better than one in legislation. As soon as you say that you will have to say that four heads are better than two, and you will be going to ridiculous lengths in increasing the process of framing legislation. Recently in New Zealand, when their Constitution was amended, they abolished the Upper Chamber. It would surprise the Opposition here to know that it was a Conservative Government that abolished the Upper Chamber because when they got into power they found that the Upper Chamber would not pass any legislation that they put up. I am not a believer in the double Chamber system because if you are a real believer in Democracy, if you really believe in the will of the people you must believe then that any mistakes made by the will of the people must be corrected by the people, not by those who do not form part of that body. This business of an Upper Chamber is a relic of the old feudal days when it was felt that the barons were the best people to rule. But if you are a true believer in Democracy, I cannot see how in this 20th Century you can perpetuate the idea of a second nominated Chamber. This Report itself speaks of people who have something to offer to the community, but who would not seek election. We will get that in any community. But if you have people who are afraid to offer what they have to the people, it would seem to mean that they are not associated with the people in truth and in fact, and they want the people to come to their ivory doors and ask them to come out. I do not believe in that, and I do not believe in double Chambers. As the Caribbean Labour Congress has stated, I would much rather see a unicameral set-up.

We know who will be in this second Chamber—the financiers, the merchants and planters—instead of people who can contribute something to the common good. That is a set-up which we have to avoid in this 20th Century. We in the West Indies who represent the masses should express wherever and whenever we can the wishes and desires of the people. For that reason, I can never find myself agreeing with a second Chamber. In Great Britain there is one which is of a hereditary nature. The U.S.A.

has a Senate and a House of Representatives. Their system was patterned more or less on the British system, and the same is true of Canada. I feel that if the West Indies when federated will be a young nation, and we can see here in Barbados how things are dealt with in our own Upper Chamber, I see no harm to the people of the West Indies if in the wider superstructure of a West Indian Federation we have a single Chamber. I say that because I do not believe in the theory that you should not abide by the mistakes that the people make. It will be said that all over the world you have the two-chamber system. New Zealand has only just abolished it. But if the West Indian Federation will be a new thing, a creation of the 20th Century, there is no reason for continuing this double system idea which is but a relic of the past.

Let us watch the proposed structure of the double Chamber. You are going to have a nominated Chamber and an elected one. The life of the nominated Chamber will be ten years while that of the elected one will be five. Do you want a more fantastic idea than that? Imagine having a nominated Chamber with a longer life from its inception than the elected body! So you will find people who will have to go through the length and breadth of the countries of the West Indies asking people to elect them, while a few who have never been to the people, and who care nothing for the people—because there is no indication that a man cares anything about the island that he represents merely because he has a good education—will be nominated. A good education is not all that you need, or England would not be ruled today by people in the House of Commons. But here in this proposed federal system you are asked that people should be elected to the Lower Chamber known as the House of Assembly, while members of the Senate will be nominated by the Governor General, and will sit for ten years.

What could have been operating in the minds of the framers of that proposed system? What is their excuse? They want a certain amount of continuity. But parliaments are never based on the mere idea of continuity. Any man with an ability to serve the people well may be returned; and if you do not serve the people they must have an opportunity to kick you out. There will be very little opportunity for getting rid of a member of the Senate who does not represent the wishes of the people of the West Indies.

Those of us who hold Socialist views and who are looking forward to a progressive constitution for the West Indies expected that in this Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee we would at least have been given some sort of responsible government. We expected to see proposals for a Prime Minister similar to a dominion. Instead of that we have been given more or less a glorified crown Colony system where after an election, instead of the man with the majority being given authority to form the entire cabinet, he can only form a part of it, while the Governor General has the right to form the other part. You can see that even our little Bushe Experiment in Barbados is better than this glorified Crown Colony system. If joining a federation will give us in Barbados less authority than we already have, we may as well remain as we are.

There is another matter of great importance to all West Indians—the reserved powers of the Governor General. In Barbados the Governor has no reserved powers. I agree with giving the Governor General reserved powers in matters of defence, because the Federal West Indies will not

have an army or navy. But when you give the Governor General broad reserved powers, it will place us in the position of Jamaica, where, with all its talk about Ministerial status, the ministers cannot prevent the Governor from signing a Bill over the head of the Assembly, and which the Assembly does not want. It happened last year when the House and Council rejected something, and the Governor said that it must become law. I cannot see that happening in Barbados. Any honourable member who has given any thought to this matter must see that there are these aspects of Federation that we cannot agree to.

I will not deal with the financial aspects of Federation at this stage. I will say now that it should go on record that this House should not agree to go to London in January because Jamaica says so. Jamaica must understand that you do not base a country's intelligence on its size or wealth; so we should not allow Jamaica to force us to go to London until we have discussed here every aspect of federation. There is a prevalent idea in the West Indies that Jamaica and Trinidad must lead the West Indies; but leadership must be based on ability, and not on size. In our small island of Barbados we feel that we are not lacking in ability to lead in matters of a political nature.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who takes notice of the financial implications will find that some of them are very costly. Look at the section dealing with legal matters. You are creating a judicial superstructure that is going to be very costly. No one has yet said anything against the present judicial set-up of the West Indies, and in looking at the costly proposals for the new system I am wondering if it will produce any better results than we get from the present system. There are other financial aspects, Sir, and here I will say this: After years of British rule of all these territories, after these years of domination by the British Imperial Government, now that we are going to get our freedom no West Indian should be ashamed to let the British Government know that we should, at the outset, get substantial funds to put our Federation on a good financial standing. Because it will be a great financial imposition on the financial reserves of many of these territories to find the money to carry out these things. Many of them now depend on grants-in-aid, and some of them are under treasury control, and they will find it difficult to enter into a federation on the same basis as Barbados and other colonies which can balance their budgets. On that ground you will find that you will have to be very careful before we agree to any matter as far as the details of this Federal structure are concerned.

When the honourable senior member for St. Thomas spoke, he said that this Interim Report would form the basis of our arguments and discussions. I very well remember that the same thing was said about this Report—that it should form the basis for discussion. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how many sections of the West Indies have really given the matter this consideration; because, as you will realise, this is not a question where one can say: "I went to the country on the matter of Federation." At the same time, however, the effects of any political federation will be felt by the people sooner or later. This is one of those matters as regards which the representatives of the people must be well aware of its implications, and its effects on the people themselves. I am sure that the word "federation" has a peculiar connotation in Barbados. It is regarded by many as some

big fight or riot. I believe that we should have a clear discussion on it.

Now take the point about the division of seats in the Federal Legislature. That is one of the most difficult things that you will have to decide. The proposal is as follows: Barbados, four seats; British Guiana, six; British Honduras, two; Jamaica, sixteen; the Leeward Islands, five, the Windward Islands, eight; Trinidad, nine. So between Jamaica and Trinidad will have 25 seats. Barbados will be getting four. Without putting the other colonies down, Barbados is more important than the Windward and Leeward Islands put together, and they will have eight seats. Look at our economy. It may be that the Jamaican and Trinidadian delegates dominated this conference; but the fact remains that out of 50 seats they are getting 25 between them. Then you share out the remainder so that Barbados and British Honduras bring up the rear with four and two respectively. Should Barbados with 300 years of self-rule, and with a constitution such as it now has enter a federation through the back door? We are not saying for one moment that we should not stand out, or that we should like to stand out. We are not so stupid as to believe that we are important enough to be able to stand by ourselves. But in everything, without federation, we have gone ahead of the rest of the West Indies, and we have never been behind. To offer four seats to Barbados is an insult to a place with an ancient constitution such as ours and an economy such as ours. See how our economy has been built up, and then compare with it the financial position of other colonies. They have had to praise us at the state of our public debt.

It is not that I am being narrow. But lives there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, 'this is my own, my native land'. I must speak of Barbados first, and then enter into the wider field of a federation. I cannot come from Federation to Barbados. I have to see what part Barbados will be able to play in a federation.

I cannot be accused of narrowness. The legislation with regard to Immigration laws just passed by Trinidad and by Grenada too, is an indication that on the eve of Federation you still find Trinidad—they have ministerial status so they cannot put the blame on the Colonial Office—Trinidad is putting a bar on Barbadians and other West Indians from entering Trinidad. There was a time when they used to blame the Governors of these colonies for the restrictions; but now the Trinidadians and the Grenadians themselves are doing it. Of course we are not discussing that question now, but I mention it to show the attitude which still prevails in the West Indies. So I am saying that we should not enter federation for the sake of entering it; but because we all wish to be united and to be recognised as West Indians. I am not a believer in passports. I believe, Sir, that if there is anything that causes friction and fear between the various peoples of the world it is the barriers we have created. I read recently in a Trinidadian newspaper words used by a criminal before he was hanged, and although he was a criminal his words contained a philosophy we should not lightly discard. He said that conditions in the world today had made him bitter with society, and he had had to react as he had reacted. Imperial Governments and powers create barriers and restrictions and make it difficult for us not to have war.

Another vexatious matter is the question of the Speaker of the Federal Assembly. Section 66 of this Report says that the Speaker of the Federal House of Assembly should be elected. Imagine that!

You, Mr. Speaker stand as equal with all the members here. You stand as a representative of the people like every other honourable member and you in addition hold the dignity of Speaker. How can any Barbadian agree to go into a federation which has a superstructure in which the Speaker is elected from outside of the Assembly. That is tantamount to saying that among the elected representatives you cannot find any one good enough to occupy that high office. I cannot agree with that.

Now, Sir, we come to the point which to my mind would not matter to rich people. I mean the question of cost. Imagine what kind of federal structure you are going to get. They offer a member of the Federal Assembly £600 to live away from home, when a member of the Trinidad Legislative Council gets £800 and a member of the Jamaica Assembly gets over £500. Unless you are confining seats in the Federal Legislature to rich people I do not see how you can ask people to serve on what they are being offered. They offer people in the Senate the same thing. I believe that some of the signatories to this realised that they could not face the people to seek election, and they were making sure that some way was left open to them. But you should not put certain restrictions against some people. However, Mr. Speaker that may be one of the details which can be worked out at other meetings.

As I have said before, Sir, the man who can get a majority in the Federal Assembly should be the man to choose the cabinet to run the Government. Also, let us get away from the idea that we need a second chamber to "check legislation." Let the people use their own check when they go to the polls. I have seen it happen that a man has sought legislative honours by election, was repudiated by the people, and then got a seat on the Legislative Council. Mr. Speaker I do not believe that I am revolutionary in my views. I belong to a school of thought which does not believe in double chamber legislation anywhere. Anyone who has read the books of Harold Laski—and even Conservatives should read them because they contain things that they should take to heart—will realise that he regarded this question of a double chamber as a relic of feudal days, and nothing that could be regarded as the epitome of honest and good legislation.

I am sorry that I have had to speak at such length, Sir, but this is a matter which means much to the future of the people of the West Indies. I hope that many other honourable members will be able to contribute something to this most important debate because this is not a question of vote catching. Voting for or against this will not give a member one more vote at the elections. The majority of the people are not in a position to appreciate all that federation implies, and it rests upon the representatives of the people to make their minds clear on these issues before they do anything.

We have a lot to do, Sir, before Federation comes. I repeat do not let us be forced by Jamaica to go to London in January. Barbados has made a name for itself in the West Indies and all over the world. Jamaica and Trinidad are big; but we have nothing to be ashamed of where they are concerned. Anyone who goes into the Jamaica House of Representatives and listens to the debates comes out very disappointed. I feel Mr. Speaker, that on this question of federation we should not tow any line, or believe that we should come in at the tail end. Do not do that just for the sake of entering a federation.

I am voting for this with a lot of reservations. I am not in favour of going to London before all

the issues are made clear. I am very sorry that the Leader of the House is not here. He attended the Montego Bay Conference, and he represented Barbados at the meeting of the Standing Closer Association Committee. I would have liked to hear his views because this is an issue above party. This is not an issue where the Barbados Labour Party is putting forward a Report. This is a Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee and each member of the House should interpret this Report in the light of his own views. I hope that as the Deputy Leader says, he will adjourn this debate. I want to emphasise that we should not hasten to reply. I think we should discuss all the details before any decision is reached.

There is another point I want to make. I think that when we send delegates to this London Conference they should all be from this chamber. I think that when it comes to a question like Federation it should rest upon the people of this Chamber. At the Montego Bay Conference the Leader of this House was a delegate, and so was Hon'ble Mr. Cuke. I do not like this kind of half-and-half business. I feel that we have been very lukewarm about it.

When it comes to the Holmes Reports on the unification of the services of the British Caribbean there again I think that most honourable members will agree with it in principle, but the details will have to be worked out. I agree with the principle of unifying these services, but again with reservations. I agree with it from the point of view of making these services more efficient; but we should not create a financial strain that we cannot bear. One of the results of federation should be the raising of the standard of living for the people of these territories.

Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my views on this matter of federation, and I think that in fairness to you, and the other honourable members I will sit now. I have read this Report four times, and I would like to hear the views of honourable members on it. I feel that on this important matter, now that we are coming to the end of a session, they should avail themselves of the opportunity of letting the Colonial Office know how they feel.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,— I agree with the last speaker that a question of such magnitude and importance to the people of the West Indies should be threshed out fully in this Chamber. I think that the representatives of the people should have an opportunity to express their views on the Report of this Committee. I think that we are right when we say that we agree to the Report in principle, and that it serves as a useful basis for the discussion of federation. For years now we in Barbados have been expressing ourselves in favour of it. We realise that the West Indies will get nowhere in a rapidly progressing world if we remain as small scattered units. It is only by federating as a large unit of the world that we will solve many of our problems; and Barbados has always been in the vanguard of those islands that have stood in favour of federation.

But, Sir, whenever we get together to discuss federation we find ourselves up against such things as the type of federation we should have; the type of constitution; legal problems; the powers that the Federal Government should have in relation to the powers of the constituent governments etc; and therefore it is an issue that involves many arguments; many and various notions; many and various ideas. It is therefore important that this House of Assembly should express in a very clear manner the atti-

tude of the people of this colony towards the Report that has been issued.

Now, Sir, I remember when the Report was being prepared, even before the Leader of this House went abroad to represent Barbados, it was said that the best constitution for the Federal Government of the West Indies was the one based on the constitution of Australia. But I think that this Report, in many of its proposals, has gone a long way from following the constitution that Australia enjoys today. The States of Australia are federated on a basis of equality. Each enjoys responsible government. When they send representatives to the Federal Government they elect them on the basis of Adult Suffrage. Each of the units enjoys the same measure of constitutional development. That is the position in Australia on whose constitution it was suggested that the members of this Committee should base their Report. But what has happened to this Committee, and what has happened to the West Indies is this: This Committee has fallen into the error of adopting what is little more than a glorified crown colony system. Since many of the constituent units still have a crown colony status the advisers of these delegates made sure that the Federal structure should not be so powerful that these crown colony governments should get ahead of their present status. That is the fundamental fault of this Report.

At the Conference, Jamaica was represented not by a representative of the people but by the Clerk of the House. Trinidad who at that time had not reached any constitutional change, and who was still very much a Crown Colony, was represented by a man whom the people of that Colony might not have voted back into the Legislature at the time had there been a General Election. Others were nominated representatives who have lost their seats in the General Election. I say again, that one of the fundamental mistakes that this Committee made was recommending that the form of Government should be based on that of Australia so that they tried to fit into the Federal structure the form of government that most of these islands of the Caribbean still have to-day.

Although at the time the Barbados Labour Party did not make any official pronouncement, I did not view with any great enthusiasm the idea that you should not wait until the various islands had got responsible government or representative government before federating. We were assured that we could federate without waiting for that to happen. But I am always suspicious of these things. The argument was that if you wait until the various islands attained self-Government federation would take a long time before it comes; as a matter of fact you might never get it because each island would concentrate on attaining that before federation. What is the alternative that we are faced with to-day? It is to accept a scheme in which the colonies at different levels of Government will federate and retain what is more or less the Crown Colony set up, because the colonies have not reached the same constitutional level.

I saw then that that was a danger which we would put ourselves in, and I say, Sir, that it is a good thing that Barbados was not hasty in accepting a Report such as this. It is a good thing that we waited, and left it open for public discussion throughout the West Indies before we came to any decision on this Report. It gives us time for the various islands to reach better levels; if it gives the others time to advance constitutionally to the position which Barbados and Jamaica have reached, it will have been the best thing that could have happened. I am glad to see that since the Report was framed other islands

have been granted Adult Suffrage and have had elections on that basis. British Guiana has been promised, and is in the process of getting a better constitution. We all hope that many of the smaller islands will be given advanced constitutions, because I think the greatest mistake we can make is to federate on the levels we have reached up to now. But if we all come into the federal structure on the same constitutional level it will make for better progress of the West Indies as a whole.

So much for one aspect of the Report and its constitutional proposals. There are other ways in which the Report differs from the model set up by Australia. The Senate of Australia is a wholly elected senate, and the Senator on the Council of State is an elected representative of the people. There again I feel we would be wrong in saying that the Governor-General or the Prime Minister should have the power to nominate a member of the Senate to the Council of State. That is absolutely wrong. I feel that the principle should be upheld that if we are going forward to responsible government only elected members should compose the body that is responsible for policy, and not a nominated member who is responsible to the Governor-General and not to the people. No member who will be nominated to defend and uphold vested interests should be given a seat. That is a departure from the established principles of responsible government; and it is a thing that the West Indian people should condemn. I think we should oppose with might and main the proposal that a senator from a nominated chamber should be put in a seat of Government.

As regards the point raised by the last speaker that there should be no second chamber at all, I feel that if you have a second chamber with powers of delay for a very short time, certainly not the period that is put in the Report, but say three months, it would be useful in the early stages of the federal set-up. But that is a different matter altogether from having a Senator nominated to the Council of State by the Governor-General.

The proposal in the Report says that the Council of State shall consist of 14 members. Seven are to be appointed by the Prime Minister, and six by the Governor-General with the latter sitting as chairman. You will see, Sir, that that proposal does not make for a government that can act with any authority. That makes for a government that will create confusion, frustration, delay and everything that is associated with a bad and weak government. I say, Sir, that all West Indians, all West Indian Legislatures, all West Indian representatives should strongly oppose any suggestion that the Governor-General should appoint members of the Council of State. I think that the day is done, or should be done when the person representing His Majesty's Government should have so much power in his hands as to be able to tell us who should govern us, and who should be appointed to our seats of government. The West Indies must have faith in themselves. We either believe that we can go forward to self-Government or we do not believe it. If we do not believe it we can accept these white washed proposals. We must tell the British Government that we strongly oppose this section relating to the appointment to the Council of State.

The Report says that these suggestions are made with the object of ensuring continuity. I say that the only continuity that this envisages or can bring about is a continuity of confusion and frustration. The Report is full of words; very full of words; but when they are stripped of all the panoply and all the nice things, it can be seen that the actions of the framers

do not follow their high sounding phrases and high sounding assertions. If these proposals are adopted as they are, the West Indies will become an area in which confusion will be worse confounded, and in which not progress but retrogression will take place.

Barbados is told that they must elect four members to the Federal Assembly. Barbados is an island of 200,000 people and has a legislature of 24 members. Unless we look to see that these four people whom we are going to send to represent us are men of sufficient wisdom, intelligence and character to help us on this high level, it is going to mean that Barbados will be in a serious position. I say that there is no one who could think of a Federal Parliament without thinking of the Leader of this House. He is one of the founders in agitating for federation; he is one of the outstanding men in the West Indies. Are we going to rob this island of a man like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, or of other persons who are at present interested in politics or who may in the future contribute much to our political life? Are we going to rob this island of these people to send them to a federal government which in itself cannot enjoy the same powers to legislate for the good of the West Indian people as the present Government of Barbados enjoys? It is ridiculous to think that we can agree to that. It would be a grave mistake.

As regards the number of representatives that Barbados should send to the Federal Government, I think that that must depend on the type of federal structure that we ultimately agree on. If the main proposals as outlined here are finally agreed upon it would be better if the representatives we send are two instead of four. Do you imagine Barbados being robbed at the present time of a man of the stature and ability of the Leader of the House, who would be able to add nothing to the stature of the West Indian people as a whole, because such a government as is outlined here would rob him of power to legislate as he should? Before we can sign our names to this Report we must get down to business and see that the fundamental proposals which we oppose are changed.

I am not entering into the argument of how many representatives Barbados should or should not have. To my mind, that point put alongside some of the proposals in this Report, is a small point. To my mind we should not send two men out of the colony if these proposals are put into effect. We have a party system in this island, and there are party systems in various other islands. You are saying that these islands should be deprived of the best brains, the best minds, the men who have built up these parties, and that these men should be made to participate in a government stripped of any power to legislate for the people of the West Indies. That is a ridiculous idea.

I will not speak very much longer, Sir, but there are a few more points which I would like to comment upon. When Jamaica considered the Report recently the principles contained in it were debated at length. That is the best procedure. We have developed a party system. I do not agree that we should not view this matter as a party matter. I feel that this is so important a matter that a Labour Party such as this should come to certain decisions on it and speak with a united voice, and also the Caribbean Labour Congress which represents the workers of this area generally. If we are a Labour Party I think we should say what we think is best for Labour and for the West Indies as a whole.

There is another point. One of the most serious drawbacks of this Report is that it makes no pro-

vision at all for amending the constitution. The constitution as proposed here is a rigid one, and we know that the American Constitution was also a rigid one and it took years of battle within the Law Courts before President Roosevelt could achieve anything where amendment was concerned. I feel it is right that the means of amendment should be put in the Report. If we are going forward to self-Government, if we have sufficient ability to legislate properly for ourselves, do not leave this point to be dealt with by orders-in-Council, the Privy Council or His Majesty-in-Council. The latter has the right to legislate in certain fields. We cannot quarrel about that. We cannot defend ourselves and we must depend on the British Government to defend us to a certain extent for many years to come, and His Majesty's Government should have the power to legislate for us in such matters as defence. But when it comes to powers of amendment, I feel that that should have been written into the Report.

Finally, Sir, I will say that generally speaking, there is no doubt that Barbados has long ago seen the advantages of federation. We have for a long time realised that that is the only way in which we can strengthen the economies of these islands. I am sorry, Sir, that the delegation from the West Indies which wanted to visit Canada on the dollar question had to visit the United Kingdom first. I think

that everyone of us must agree that if we want to advance we must come together in the West Indies under a federal government. But at the same time we must all agree that there are many parts of this Report which should be changed, and other parts which should be deleted altogether.

What is our next step? I feel that after passing this Address, at the earliest opportunity the various West Indian representatives should meet again. That will occasion delay, but it will give us time to get more responsible government in the West Indies, to get better constitutions, and as a result a stronger Federal Government.

I beg to move, Sir, that further consideration of this Address be now postponed.

Mr. COX seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Monday, November 5th, at 3 o'clock, p.m. in order to continue the debate on this Address.

Mr. BRANCKER seconded.

The question having been put and agreed to, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.