

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1951—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd February, 1953

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 7 o'clock p.m. today.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Messrs G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., M. El. Cox, L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), F. L. WALCOTT, R. G. MAPP, E. St. A. HOLDER, C. E. TALMA and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

MINUTES

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

Messrs. MILLER, ALLDER and VAUGHAN entered the House and took their seats.

ILLNESS OF THE CLERK

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that on medical advice the Clerk cannot perform his duties to-day.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Clerk be granted leave of absence for today's sitting of the House.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Mr. D. A. Banfield be appointed to act as Deputy Clerk in place of the Deputy Clerk who will be acting as Clerk for to-day's sitting.

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

Messrs. E. K. WALCOTT and BRANCKER entered the House and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

A Government Notice was given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution that the sum of \$1,500 be advanced from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of making a loan to Miss Gwendoline Austin, Headteacher, Workman's Junior School.

QUESTIONS

Mr. ALLDER for Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting:—

Will the Government investigate the possibility of sending agricultural workers to the United States Virgin Island of St. Croix where workers are needed annually for the reaping of the sugar crop?

Mr. ALLDER for Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting:—

Will the Government state whether or not it proposes to pay compensation to the legal dependents of the late Louise Jordan who died, reportedly as a result of injuries received whilst loading manure at Seawell in August last, and whose death was reported to the authorities in Sept., 1952?

ADDRESS RE BRITISH WEST INDIAN FEDERATION

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume consideration of the Interim and Final Reports of the Select Committee on the subject of British West Indian Federation. When the debate was adjourned on the last occasion the honourable junior member for St. Peter was speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—On the last occasion when I was speaking on these Reports, I made certain generalisations with respect to my personal view on the question of federation and on the Report of the Rance Committee which was set up to carry out this work. I stated on that occasion that I did not understand the attitude of the Barbados House of Assembly in this matter, and I am of the same opinion today, because the Report of the Rance Committee was in the hands of honourable members for a long number of years. It is true that this Interim Report was not circulated to honourable members before the last meeting of the House, and it is for that reason that honourable members felt that there was a reasonable excuse for postponing the consideration of this matter. On that occasion a correction was made in the daily newspaper and I hope that a mistake of a similar nature will not occur again. I said that I am in favour of the principle of Federation and from the point of view of West Indian nationalism, a federal structure

would remove the shackles of colonialism and give a freedom of independence which is desirable. I say that that is one of the reasons why I am in favour of a federal structure in the West Indies. When I look at the Report of the Rance Committee I have some misgivings about it; I am not convinced that I could agree to a system of federation based on that Report. I feel one must admit that in any new scheme of things there will be a certain amount of give and take; I do not believe that you can have a federal structure unless you are prepared to give up some things, and in giving up some things it is a matter of sacrifice. I will say that I must be able to measure the sacrifice of what I am giving up in my own territory with the advantages that I have to gain. In attempting to make such a serious step like this on behalf of the people of Barbados or on behalf of the people of the various territories, serious consideration must be given to it. Let us not lull ourselves into any feeling of complacency that creating a federal structure is something which can be brought about overnight, or that by any stroke of the pen you can amend the federal structure and place yourself back in the position in which you were before.

I regret that I have not seen any individual enthusiasm displayed by members of this House or any leadership given to the people in the community so that you could say that the people of Barbados are willing to enter federation; although this House agrees to the principle of federation, I will say that the people of Barbados are not yet aware of all the implications of federation; they are not even aware of the Rance Committee's Report. I repeat that where we make any serious constitutional step, the people on behalf of whom we make that step should be well aware of what we are doing, because if we do anything which will have an adverse effect on the lives of the people, it will be stated that we undertook to do something with which the people themselves were not fully aware. It is a fact that the technicalities and the niceties of any federal structure have not been made known to the average man in the street; it is a fact that to the average Barbadian the full realisation of federation is not known. The very word "federation" connotes a fight and not unity. It may be a reflection on the Barbadian standard of education, but if you want to face the issue in this territory, even if you excuse some of the areas in the metropolitan parish in the rural areas when people hear the word "federation" they regard it not as any unity at all; they regard it as a fight where implements such as pickaxes and so on are brought out. With that background, the members of this House must be fully aware of their responsibility in any agreement to a Federal Institution. Speaking as an individual in this Assembly, I want to say that I am convinced that for the future of the West Indies a Federal Parliament with more powers than are now given, would mean a lot to these territories. I am not one of those who believe that with scattered territories we can go on everlastingly living in isolation and expect our views to be heard in the world Parliaments and Governments with the same effect as if we were a federal structure. I am not going to adopt any dog-in-the-manger attitude and say that Barbados cannot run anything and therefore that is the reason why we should not federate; I want to be very realistic about this whole affair and I say that I am not convinced in my mind that at this very moment the attitude of the West Indian leaders—I do not mean in the narrow sense—is such that I can say they have reached the stage where they are ready to have that solid unity which would spell

for the federation of the West Indies. There is still a strong insular feeling among the majority of the people in the Parliaments of the various territories.

Speaking as a Barbadian it would be foolhardy for me to say other than that I have not seen a greater lack of enthusiasm for anything than I have seen for this matter of federation among members of this House; whatever the outcome of this debate might be, what is clear to me is that the Barbados House of Assembly could not commit the people of Barbados to federation with this attitude which is prevailing in this House. If the public is committed to any federal structure with this lack of enthusiasm in this Assembly, then I say that such a serious step will spell no prospect for the people of this territory; it will mean that legislators with an amount of lukewarmness have agreed to something as a matter of principle, and other territories are forging ahead with it. For that reason I am not at all happy at the present moment about agreement to a federal structure; I am not against federation as such.

I have given some study to this Report and I agree that the matter of finance should be left to the people in London. The last Report of the Comptroller for Development and Welfare is not before this Chamber, but I read in one of the West Indian newspapers some of the financial implications of federation, and I want to say at the outset that while it is true we would have to ask the British Government for a large subvention in a matter of this sort, we would have to have our finances in the West Indies on a basis that we can undertake certain financial commitments ourselves. It has been suggested that in the financing of this federal structure we should pay attention, or we should agree, to giving up some of the customs revenue which we now take. If, for one moment, you stopped to study what are the present financial commitments of this island by itself apart from any Federal Government, you would be bold enough at this stage to say that Barbados cannot afford one penny more to give to any superstructure other than its own. We are aware that the Public Servants of this island are clamouring for greater remuneration for their services to the colony; to what extent that would lay additional financial commitments on this island, I cannot say because the matter is still in the process of negotiation; but I do know that you cannot lightly resist the claims of your own people for added remuneration. You will find that with our present financial position and with a growing desire for greater social services, it is a financial impossibility for this colony to undertake higher expenses or a drop in its revenue so as to build up any federal structure at this stage.

I would like any honourable member to realise that the figures which have been set out in the Rance Report have to be modified a great deal because many changes have taken place in the Civil Service; when the salaries of Civil Servants throughout the territories have been increased the salaries of Civil Servants in the federal structure will automatically be increased. With the growing necessity for social services in this country, I wonder if we can look through the window quite calmly and say that we can agree to the expenses in a federal structure. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I prefaced my remarks by saying that I am in favour of the principle of federation; I did that because it is necessary in the course of my speech to make clear some of the difficulties which I see at this present time, and I think it is best for me, as one of the representatives of the people of Barbados, to state them here. I have dealt with the question of our revenue and our being able to give up any of it to this federal structure. I do not want to belittle any other territory or say

what any other territory should pay, but what I want to say is this; I do not see from the economic position of Barbados—and this is where it would appear that we are somewhat selfish—that we as a territory in ourselves have much to gain. Industrially we produce sugar and that sugar is sold to the British Government in harmony with other sugar-producing territories in the Colonial Empire. We have a by-product in rum and there is a sort of prohibition where rum is concerned within the territories. We have before us a memorandum in respect of Customs Union and we have not yet made any pronouncement on the Customs Union Report. It is true that Barbados would become the outlet for greater things within the territory; you can see certain advantages which will be gained in inter-territorial travel. Instead of having to get a passport to go from here to Grenada or St. Lucia it will be a matter of free travel; the movement of goods will be freer and there will be an expansion of inter-territorial trade. Therefore, from a broad point of view you will see that there are certain advantages to be gained, but in all of them Barbados would gain very little in that there is very little to be sent to the other territories. If we have the advantage of gaining what some of the other territories can gain in getting cheaper and better goods, then that is all to our advantage. However, one of the points I made on the last occasion was that I am a bit grieved when I see that federation in itself is not going to be successful unless human beings make it successful. I am not convinced that the human beings existing today are ready to make federation successful; you can have a superstructure of gold but if you have not got people to work on it, that superstructure will come tottering down. I am a believer in real unity; I would prefer to have a quarrel every day rather than make you believe that there is unity when there is bloodshed. As I see it, I do not know what there is at present existing in the West Indies that makes it imperative that federation must come now, or we will be lost for ever and there will not be any hope for us; I wonder what are the reasons which make federation more imperative now than it was before. Owing to the general world economic position today, it seems to me that far from federation being a problem to press immediately, it is one of the things which we should watch cautiously. I am not a believer in accusing metropolitan Governments of any bad motives; I am not a believer in making a scapegoat of people; but sometimes I am somewhat suspicious and I believe that my suspicion is grounded on facts. I believe that the impact of world conditions from metropolitan Governments and colonial territories on the British Government today—the impact of the criticism and other conditions—seems to me to be one of the reasons why there is an apparent readiness on their part to relieve themselves of the burdens of the territories which they once possessed. I feel that because that is one of the reasons for the impetus which has been given to federation, that would make me reject it. I am a believer in West Indian unity and West Indian nationalism and I would like to see the West Indies come to a position where they can say that they want to run their own affairs in the Commonwealth of Nations; but there is no individual communication or knowledge by people of each other in the West Indies. There are many educated people in these territories who do not know enough of the very geography of the territory or the history of the territory so as to be able to appreciate the unity involved; there are a large number of people who will die as Barbadians, Grenadians or Trinidadians with the feeling that these are just figments in the territory and they do not mean much to them. Federation is something which is com-

ing from above. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that Federation is not a political matter in the sense that it does not make any difference to your constituents or mine whether there is federation or not. No honourable member could say that because he is in favour of federation he will be elected to membership of this House; federation is not one of those things which people take to heart so much as to say that it will mean anything to them; that is why I said earlier that I have no objection to the Conference being held in London and other people have agreed to that.

As to the question as to how many seats we should have in the Federal Assembly, I do not want to say too much, but the federal structure as set out in the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee seems to be a glorified Crown Colony. You want to give the West Indies a certain amount of freedom, but at the same time you want to keep them under thumb because you feel that these people have not reached the stage where they can run their Governments by themselves. I know of some instances in the West Indies which have caused people to ask: How can we give responsible government to people when their very approach to public life is not as serious as it should be? Sometimes corruption and bribery in some territories seem to be the order of the day, and it may be a question of how cleverly the corrupt can dispose of their spoils and how careful they are. Those are some of the statements which are used against West Indians aspiring towards West Indian nationalism.

In this Report you have the idea of the Governor-General possessing powers far exceeding those of the Prime Minister; it is clear that the idea of making the West Indian Parliament comparable with any other Parliament where you have full power is something that is being withheld from this territory. Then there is a Clause dealing with the Governor-General's Reserve Powers; I would say that no West Indian who is aspiring towards greater responsibility on behalf of the people he serves could agree to Reserve Powers for any Governor-General no matter who he may be. I would like to say that even on the question of finance, I have some strong views; I am not one of those who believe that because you do not have a tremendous amount of military or naval or air power, you cannot have that amount of independence to agree to certain things. There are many countries today, like the Scandinavian countries, which are independent powers who are unable to defend themselves in so far as the United States and other Powers are concerned, but their alliance with others does not make them lose their independence to run themselves internally. You can have a West Indian Government and you may have one battleship to show that you have power over internal matters. The question of one Power defending itself has been completely lost and there has been the force to have an alliance. I feel that this is a matter to which this Chamber should give some serious attention.

Then there is the question as to whether the members of the Federal Parliament should also be members of the local Parliament; you can well see that Barbados will have so few members of the Federal Parliament that it will not make any difference to this colony whether the members of the Federal Parliament are also members of the local Parliament. If four men leave this Chamber there will still be twenty members left; four members in a Parliament of fifty members would be like a mosquito beginning to interfere with a rhinoceros. From the point of view of principle, I know that many Barbadians would feel that in the whole structure where we are given four seats, it is a matter of heartburn; and if you say that that number of fifty seats should be di-

vided differently, then all the other territories will come in for a greater share. It is clear that Montserrat has been asking for two seats instead of one; if Barbados wants six seats, Montserrat will ask for more, British Guiana will ask for more and all the other territories will ask for more, but I must say that to my mind, four seats seem to be somewhat slender for Barbados. I realise that it would mean quite a lot to go over this matter.

I do not intend to deal today with all the points which have been raised in this final Report; I was a member of the Select Committee which produced this Report, but I did not attend all the meetings and I am sure that honourable members will be glad to hear the views of those members who attended all the meetings of the Committee, and especially the view of the Leader of the House on certain matters which are vaguely set out in this Report. I cannot see how, at this stage, we can agree to anything unless there is a full-dress debate on this matter and at the end of the debate honourable members are willing to say: "This is what I am going to commit this island to, or this is what I am going to ask representatives to commit this island to in this matter which is of such great importance." It is true that this island has a bi-cameral Legislature and the Other Place is entitled to submit its views on this question. The members of this elected Chamber are stating their views we have no control over the views of the members of the Other Place, but the views of the members of the Other Place will reflect the opinion of the Barbados Legislature. What is worrying me is this: if representatives leave here to represent Barbados at these Federal Talks, I should like to know in what way will they speak and on whose behalf they will speak; If they speak on their behalf on or behalf of the Legislature, will that be a reflection on the people of Barbados, or will they be committing people to say: "That is my opinion?" When a member of this Chamber says: "I agree to the principle of Federation", if Federation should come 50 years hence in what respect would we be able to say; "This is the view of Barbados?" The Other Place have been more reluctant about Federation because from the time the Rance Report has been published, they have not discussed this matter of Federation; they have gone Chamber before they make a pronouncement. I have never read where they have put this matter of Federation on their agenda for discussion, so that the public cannot say that they know the views of the Other Place in connection with this matter. That is an aspect which must be considered; we must have some views from the Other Place on Federation, the Other Place being still a part of the Legislature.

Under Head 9 of the Interim Report on this subject of Federation, this is what is stated: "The Committee agreed to adopt the recommendations on page 3 of the Report of the Select Committee of Jamaica that the Federal Constitution should provide for self-government in all internal affairs of the British Caribbean area which are under Federal administration." I do not see how any progressive West Indian could agree to a Federation which does not give full internal self-government. Again, I am aware that, with the upsurge of different political thinking prevailing in the West Indies today, there should be a break on the power given to the Federal structure in internal affairs, and that is past a matter of doubt and suspicion on behalf of the people who, in recent times, have been thrown up in the councils of Government. The Governments in all parts of the world ought to abide by what the people provide in that which they elect to the various Legislatures. We will make our mistakes; with the political up-

surge we have had in this colony it was felt at one stage by many people that Barbados would be a place of the past and that many people with secure incomes would be provided with solace in some place other than Barbados. But those evil days have not come upon us yet and we can see a measure of stability being given to the people. I would like to hear what views will be expressed on this matter of West Indian self-government. I will say that I am glad to have the opportunity of speaking on this matter, but I cannot help feeling deep down in my heart that in Barbados there is absolutely no enthusiasm over Federation; I am in favour of Federation but I see no enthusiasm over it; I see no unanimity on the part of representatives on this question of Federation, and there are too many different opinions as to what Federation means for one to be able to say that the people of this territory are aware of it. Therefore I say that with that lack of enthusiasm for, and an intelligent understanding of Federation, it would be dangerous for us to proceed to do anything unless we are aware that the public would be thankful to us for it.

I am not a hypocrite and the most I can say on this Report is that I agree to the principle of Federation but at this stage I would be lacking in a sense of responsibility to state, from what I have observed, that the people of Barbados are ready to federate. You cannot produce a greater edifice than the foundation can provide for it and I believe that a lot of these territories are still struggling against the cost of a Federal structure. If we agree to Federation we want to be able to go to our constituents and tell them at the end of an election: "I agree to Federation so that you can leave here and go to Trinidad and I hope you will get work in Trinidad." I do not believe that the mainland of British Guiana or British Honduras could absorb the over-population in Barbados or Jamaica; Jamaica's economic position has not risen at the same rate as its over-population and I cannot see how the surplus population in the West Indies could be absorbed in British Guiana and British Honduras. I am not agreeing to Federation on the basis that it will bring new economic life in the territory; I agree to Federation on the basis of West Indian nationalism. You feel proud as a West Indian on the basis that the Government is your own and you are inviting people to federate; any nation which is aspiring towards nationhood must be prepared to take on the role of Government. I feel that the West Indian Government should be run by people whose interests are rooted and grounded in the West Indies; West Indians are very quick to acquire a way of life which is alien to themselves, and they are very quick to acquire an air of responsibility which seems to salve their conscience. We have to realise that no airy talk can mean anything to the future of the West Indies; we have to be willing to put up with certain hardships and if it is a question of sacrificing anything, I am willing and prepared to sacrifice anything for the benefit which that sacrifice can bring to the territory as a whole. We can come out of Federation with our hands full; when we enter Federation we must be prepared to make a sacrifice, but at the same time it must be clear to me how much sacrifice I am making towards the goal which we hope to achieve.

I hope that by this London Conference the air will be cleared, that the financial implications of Federation will be made known and that there will be a frank discussion so that West Indians as a whole will be able to come back to their various territories and discuss this important matter. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have made myself clear.

I have spoken from my experience in going to many West Indian Conferences and meeting West Indians in other walks of life. I have made the statements I have made because as a member of the Barbados Government I am not clear as to the financial implications with which this colony is faced in this matter of Federation. As I said last week, I am not as enthusiastic about Federation now as I was about it eight years ago. In 1945 there was a Conference in this island on Federation, and on that occasion I was really very enthusiastic about West Indian Federation; I felt that there was much unity, but I am not so enthusiastic about this matter as I was then. Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking as a member of the Select Committee; I am expressing my views because, unfortunately, I have been in and out of this Chamber when this question of Federation was discussed on former occasions, and I did not want to lose the opportunity of saying something on this occasion. I hope that there are not any honourable members who have not read the Standing Closer Association Committee's Report and I hope that this House will agree to sending somebody to this Conference in London. I also hope that it will be made clear as to why I cannot agree to the system of Federation as indicated in the Rance Report; it falls too far short of what can be regarded as any progressive West Indian aspiration.

Dr. CUMMINS, MESSRS E. D. MOTTLEY, CRAWFORD, and GODDARD entered the House and took their seats while Mr. F. L. WALCOTT was speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Thomas, who seconded the motion for the adjournment of the debate on the last occasion, has the right to speak now.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—As a member of the Select Committee which submitted this Report, I am seconding the motion for its adoption. Before I do so, I would like to say that in respect of such an important subject as this, the House should be afforded every opportunity of shaping the proposals set out by the Select Committee, and I do not think we can adequately do so in the House. I feel that we should examine each of the nine sections contained in this Report in a Committee of this House. I cannot remember how many times we have discussed Federation in this House, but I think that this is about the third time we have discussed the principle of Federation, and this House has expressed itself as being in favour of the principle of Federation. In listening to the honourable member who has just sat down it seems to me that at one stage he was condemning Federation with faint praises and at another stage he was condemning it altogether. However, I would like to make it clear that this House is of the opinion, so far as I can remember, that we should accept the Rance Report as a basis for discussion, and so far as I can remember, it is perfectly true, as contained in paragraph 1 of the Report, that this House has accepted the principle of Federation. That is a point I would like to make at the present time because it has been embarrassing to me to hear on certain occasions, and especially in the recent past, that Barbados has suddenly changed its attitude towards Federation, and that far from our being in favour of Federation, we are now opposed to it. I have heard that said by responsible people in Legislatures like those of St. Vincent, St. Lucia and Antigua, and I have often tried to clear the air by saying that the House of Assembly of Barbados, while disagreeing with some of the main proposals contained in the Rance Report, has gone on record as being in favour with the principle of Federation. If we reiterate that, as is

set out in the Report of the Select Committee, I think we would clear the air, especially after the speech of the honourable junior member for St. Peter. After all, we have been debating this matter for many years, and I think it is time that we make up our minds in one way or the other. We should either be in favour of Federation and state on what lines we think we should have it, or we are not in favour of Federation and we should say so. That is the stage we have reached, and it does not do the name of Barbados any good to have it appear that we are lukewarm towards Federation and cannot make up our minds exactly as to what we desire in so far as Federation is concerned. That is why I regard it as a very important matter that this House, in deciding on the Report of the Select Committee, should go very thoroughly into the details and come to a definite decision in the matter: we should state clearly along what lines we feel we should federate or we should state that we do not want to federate at all.

I do not propose to make any lengthy speech on the principle of Federation: the honourable Leader of the House has spoken on Federation already. The honourable junior member for St. James spoke heartily in favour of the principle of Federation, and as the leading member of the Party in opposition, he has given the views of a section of the community which the Party in opposition may claim to represent. We have had the views of the honourable senior member for St. Philip and those of other members of the Party at times in opposition and at other times claiming to have independent minds, but also claiming to represent another section of the community. Many of us have already expressed our views on the principle of Federation, and if you look back to previous debates on this issue you will find an overwhelming majority in favour of the principle of Federation. I feel that what we should decide tonight is not now whether we are in favour of the principle of Federation, but whether we are in favour of the Select Committee's Report and indicating exactly where we agree to the recommendations as set out in the Rance Report or the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee of which Sir Hubert Rance is Chairman, or indicating exactly where we disagree with those recommendations. That is the issue which this House should decide tonight.

I may say this; I attended nearly every meeting of the Select Committee and I can say that while the Committee approached Federation from the point of view that Barbados is in favour of Federation, the Committee was at pains to examine the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee; we were at pains to indicate exactly where we felt that the Report fell short of the aspirations of Barbadians and Barbados as a whole in our march towards a Federal Dominion. That is no mere phrase; indeed in the Report itself those very words are used. The Select Committee differed fundamentally from the framers of the recommendations where those recommendations would retard us by scores of years — where it would take probably half a century before we attain self-government in the West Indies: we could reach that goal much more quickly along the lines indicated in the Report of the Select Committee. That is why we used the language contained in paragraph 8 of this Final Report of the Select Committee, that we cannot agree to the insertion of items (c) and (d) of Paragraph 42 of Appendix V in any legislation by Order-in-Council affecting Barbados. When the House goes into Committee on this Report, I have no doubt that the majority of honourable members will agree to that paragraph and

with the language we have used in framing it. I think that we are quite willing to go into Committee on this Report and we will debate fully the points which are raised at this stage. I am just pointing out to honourable members who feel that Barbados is lukewarm towards Federation or that for some reason which cannot be ascertained, Barbados does not desire Federation at the present moment—I am just pointing out that the Select Committee felt strongly on these particular points, and it was stressed by a member of the Opposition that even if we govern ourselves badly we cannot do it any worse than it has been done for us in years gone by when the West Indies were governed more so by the Colonial Office. It is very important for us to say that Barbados disagreed with the Rance Report wherever it fell short of our ambition and our feelings in so far as West Indian nationhood is concerned.

As I was saying at the beginning, and I will develop the point a little further, I feel that the sooner the House consider this Report, the better it will be for the reputation of Barbados as a whole. After all, this is not a matter of expediency; this is a matter in which is bound up the destiny of Barbados. This is a matter which we have to consider very carefully and seriously and we are doing that: it does not behove us to appear that we are lukewarm towards Federation. Even although I agree with the last speaker that the approach to Federation by some of the other West Indian Islands makes us a bit cautious, although I agree that we have certain misgivings, yet we ourselves would be entering into the spirit of hostility if we say, as leaders of opinion in this island, that the people do not know about Federation. If it does appear that the people of Barbados are not enthusiastic about Federation, on the other hand, in so far as Barbados is concerned, if we know that Federation is a good thing, if we know that it is absolutely necessary in order for us to have a West Indian nation and West Indian self-government and in order for us to strengthen our own economy—if Federation is absolutely necessary in order that these things can take place, then it is our duty in this Chamber to say that and not point to any drawback or to the position in other colonies and say that our people do not appear to be enthusiastic about Federation. Sometimes people do not realise what is good for them and very often they have to be told what is good for them.

The first paragraph of the Report of the Select Committee confirms the remarks which I made earlier. It reads: "The House reaffirms its acceptance of the principle of Federation." As a newspaperman I know it is a bit embarrassing to hear that Barbados was in the van in so far as Federation is concerned, but now she seems to have taken the rear; that is embarrassing because Federation is too important a matter with which to play hide and seek. It is too important a matter to be approached in any lukewarm manner; I thought that that statement was unfair to Barbados for the simple reason that Mr. Bustamante of Jamaica did not seem to be at all anxious to jump on the waggon or declare his hand in so far as Federation is concerned. From the start Jamaica sent a Clerk to the Legislature to represent them at a most important meeting on the subject of Federation, but for some reason or other Jamaica has had a change of attitude and has stated where it stands, and the House has submitted a Report in connection with the Rance Report. This House has already indicated on what lines it has differed from the Rance Report and it appears that we are lagging too far behind. I think that we should be particularly anxious to get

through with this matter of Federation as early as possible without hastily adopting any decision in the matter or making it appear that we are entering upon Federation lightly; we should attempt either at this meeting or in two or three meetings to go through the Report of the Select Committee and arrive at a decision in this very important matter of Federation. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion for the consideration of this Report.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I want to ask for your ruling first. I take it that inasmuch as we are considering the final Report as well as the Interim Report, if the ruling as regards speaking once were enforced honourable members would not have a chance of expressing our views on the final Report. You see, Sir, the motion as it appeared in the Order was that we discuss the Interim Report. Several speakers have made speeches on the Interim Report; but before that debate was concluded we have added the Final Report to that Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: If my memory serves me correctly permission was granted on the last occasion to honourable members that the Final Report should be considered as well as the Interim Report. Any member who spoke on the last occasion would not be entitled to speak again. That would only debar those who have already spoken. As far as the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is concerned, he of course has the right to reply. The custom is that the mover has the right to reply so that he can further enlighten the House on any points that have been raised by other honourable members.

Mr. ADAMS: Perhaps a misunderstanding has arisen. One order and one only was moved on the last occasion. The order which was in my name was to move consideration of the Interim Report. I have done so. Last Tuesday I had to leave the House, and I suggested to the honourable senior member for St. Peter to continue the debate. There is therefore no order before the House to move consideration of the Final Report. But the Final Report has been integrated into the Order to move consideration of the Interim Report. That is why I asked if it would be in order for those who spoke on the Interim Report but did not have a chance to speak on the Final Report to be allowed to speak again. At the end of this speech I am going to move that the House go into committee on the Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am instructed that the honourable senior member for St. Peter made no motion on the last occasion except a motion for the adjournment of the House. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph will be allowed the opportunity to reply and to make the motion which has not yet been made, that the House go into committee.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—With all respect I would point out that you cannot allow the honourable member to speak unless he was making a motion because there would be no motion before the House.

Mr. ADAMS: This is what I propose to do: We all agree that we should go into committee on a matter such as this. The Chairman of Committees would allow a certain amount of latitude. If therefore there are any points that need to be made, they can be made on the various portions of the Address. If I do speak now, whether it is a speech *de novo* or in reply, it would not make any difference to the final deliberations of the House.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Sir, if I may make a suggestion to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph — the usual procedure as soon as he wants to pass an Address is to get the leave of the House

to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor; and then you go into committee. Since before you go into Committee you cannot alter the Committee's Report in any way, the discussion that goes on is purely formal, like a second reading speech. Since the substantive part is the passing of the Address, and since the Address itself is contained in the Report you can speak on it in connection with the Interim Report if you have not spoken already. It would not I think make much difference, because if you ask leave to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor leave is always granted as a matter of form, and then it is usual to go into committee. That is the usual procedure as I remember it.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not propose to do that immediately. I am not going to repeat what I said when the Interim Report was first discussed. I only wish that the members of the public who have a better memory than some newspapers would remember what I said when I moved the Interim Report. It was not for me to attempt to make another introductory speech. The only thing that I intended to do, and which I would have done had I been able to remain in the House last Tuesday was to refer to those matters in the Final Report which may not have arisen in consideration of the Interim Report.

I also want to apologise to honourable members for repeating that my action in signing the Rance Report has given rise to misunderstandings, and has made some people feel, now that we have come to the final discussion, that I have changed my views. What I am saying about Federation now has always been my attitude; what I said during the sitting of the S.C.A.C., and what every member of that Committee knew: That I would be perfectly free in my own Assembly to put forward those views which I held, different from the views of the majority. It is more than likely that you would not have seen any Report at all had I written my minority report. It is the one thing in my public life that I regret—not having written a minority report.

Having made those preliminary observations, Sir, let me say this: I am not afraid of what seems to be slightly frightening the mind of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. I wish to be careful in my remarks because I do not wish to retract anything that I am going to say to-night. Barbados used to be simply blank as to the very principle of federation. That is not true to-day. We have seen Barbadians of all classes expressing the views that the principle of federation is a good thing. But after all we are not talking of an intercolonial trade treaty to last for five years and which at the end of that time can be stopped or renewed. We are talking of establishing a Federal Constitution—one of the most difficult things to alter. In the nearly two centuries of the American Constitution it has been altered only a few times. A Federal Constitution is a very difficult thing to alter because it has to be written. We with the constitutional set up of Barbados can alter anything any Tuesday night. The exact opposite is true of a Federal Constitution. Therefore, we with our constitution—I am weighing my words carefully—a constitution which is about to be improved, have to be more than careful as to what we agree to in any federal set up, no matter what we may be told of selfishness or insularity.

If I have the honour to be selected to go to the London Conference I would be betraying Barbados which has the best constitution in the British Empire today if I agreed to some of the things in the Rance Report. We have a democratic set-up; adult suffrage; no reserve powers for the Governor. In no other colony in the British Empire do we find

all these together. The Bahamas have no reserved powers, but call the name democracy in those two colonies. We have the best constitution bar none in the British Colonial Empire. As the P.N.P. of Jamaica pointed out in a minority report on the Rance Report when the Jamaica Assembly made suggestions for this conference, are we going to agree to a federal constitution less than the constitution we have now? That is what the Rance Report taken as a whole is. It is little better than a glorified Crown Colony system in some respect.

In one respect I am going so far as to say—whatever may be said about me in the Press of the West Indies—I am going so far as to say invite the House to lay down terms which if not accepted, we will say we are not entering into federation. As the Rance Report puts it, we will have to give reserve powers in the hands of the Governor General. But I am saying that these reserve powers should be for matters in which we cannot possibly legislate for ourselves, let alone provide the financial means of carrying out—for example defence. We cannot see a West Indian Army or Navy financed by these colonies within the foreseeable future. So to grant reserve powers in respect of Defence we would not be giving up anything. Similarly, until we are a Dominion in the sense that Canada, Australia or South Africa are Dominions we cannot make international trade treaties ourselves. One hears so much airy talk about our being able, when we federate, to sit down as an international body and barter. That is sheer, unadulterated nonsense. Until we are a Dominion we are still in the Sterling Area, and regrettably or not, we will still have to go along with the policy of Her Majesty's Government. As I am saying, to grant reserve powers in those respects we will not be surrendering anything that we now have. But where other matters are concerned, are we in Barbados, having reached the top of the hill, to march quickly down the other steep slope? That is the position which we have to face.

I will now call attention to the way in which the Select Committee has worded what is suggested should be Paragraph 8 of the Address. It reads:—

The House of Assembly feels that Item (d) of Paragraph 40 of the Consolidated Recommendations in Appendix V to the Report should be modified and that Item (h) should be deleted from any proposed legislation as unnecessary. The House can never agree to the insertion of Items (c) and (d) of Paragraph 42 of Appendix V in any legislation by Order-in-Council affecting Barbados.

It is perfectly true that if we see only obstacles we will never get anywhere in life. Still, it is the height of absurdity to walk with your head in the air when the ground beneath your feet is punctured with deep wells. I invite the House to say that they will never agree to that. It is the essence of Crown Colony Government of the most ancient type, that on the advice of the Secretary of State for the Colonies the Queen-in-Council can make an order for public order or the preservation of law and order throughout the federal West Indies. What she cannot do for Barbados now she will be able to do for Barbados in the future. On the advice of the Secretary of State or the Commonwealth Minister she will be able to make an order prohibiting a meeting in Queen's Park; because she can make an order for the whole territory saying that there shall be no assembly of more than 12 people. That is what has happened in Trinidad and in Jamaica. It has never happened in Barbados; and we are being asked to say after 300 years, that we should make it possible for it to happen here. I personally

can never agree to that, and I invite every honourable member to say the same.

It is well known to all law students and others who have studied these things that it is a settled principle of law—a case affecting taxation of Grenada by the King-in-Council was decided on this principle—that once the King has granted a representative constitution to a colony he forever bars himself from making laws for that colony. The Imperial Parliament can make laws to cover the whole Colonial Empire, but not the King-in-Council. Today the Governor of Trinidad, or Jamaica or the Gold Coast can sit in his own office and write a law over the heads of the elected representatives of the people. No Governor of Barbados can do that; neither can the King or Queen. Are we to leave these two specific items—financial control and law and order—to the tender mercies of the Secretary of State for the Colonies or the Secretary for Commonwealth Affairs who may be taking the advice of the Governor General?

Those are the points which cause me to suggest to honourable members to say in any Address that we pass now—it will have to be circulated to the Governments of these other colonies and to the Secretary of State—to say for my guidance that on these things Barbados is not giving in. It is true that (c) of Para 42, Appendix 5 may be modified. That deals with matters affecting the financial stability of the area. While it is argued, and one can even agree with the argument, that if the British taxpayer has virtually to underwrite you in the Caribbean area he should have a say, he will have a say through the Queen-in-Council. But if you give powers as here suggested—it is not like the Barbados House of Assembly where you can amend a law any Tuesday—you will be dealing with a written constitution which is difficult to amend, and which can be difficult to interpret. Malan in Africa is taking coloured people off the vote, and you get a Cambridge Professor saying he is right. It is easy to have conflicting interpretations of a written Constitution.

In this Paragraph 42 we see that (1) It should be provided that His Majesty-in-Council should have power to make such laws for the Federation as may appear to him to be necessary—(a) for the defence of any part of His Majesty's dominions (including the Federation) I agree with that. (b) for regulating the relations between the Federation and any foreign country or any other part of His Majesty's dominions or for carrying out the obligations of the Federation under any international agreement. Of course we agree with that. We have not got that power now, so we will be giving up nothing. When you come to (c) for securing and maintaining the financial stability of the Federation; I repeat that you must agree that if in the last resort the British taxpayer has to pay your debts, there should be some provision whereby the Federation should not be allowed to run into debt and then say to His Majesty's Government "you pay it off." But it should not be put in the bold way it is in this paragraph.

Now we come to (d) for securing and maintaining public safety and order and supplies and services if the Secretary of State is satisfied that a public emergency exists. I know it may be argued that you cannot make a law for Barbados if a state of emergency does not exist in Barbados. But if an emergency exists in Grenada and one public meeting is held in Barbados which may appear to be in sympathy with this or that person at whose instigation the public emergency arose in Grenada, there is nothing to prevent a general Order-in-Council pro-

hibiting any Barbadian from visiting Grenada, without the necessity of declaring that a public emergency exists in Barbados.

I will not dilate any more on that, because those are points for consideration in Committee. But I quoted that paragraph to show the effect that this proposal about maintaining public order may have. That is a point that is going to be made whether representative members of the P.N.P. of Jamaica go on the delegation or not. The Secretary of State cannot ignore the fact that on some of these matters there was no unanimity in the Jamaican Legislature. Without intending to give offence, although it is difficult not to give offence to some of these Windward and Leeward colonies, the fact that these colonies said let us start federation now and we can correct our mistakes later only shows that they had the best reasons for wanting to federate as soon as possible without being aware that you cannot correct mistakes so easily in a written constitution. Therefore I say that when it comes to certain things we should give way; but, as regards of this we should not.

I did make notes of one or two other points when the honourable junior member for St. Peter speaking, but perhaps they can best be discussed in committee of the whole House. And there are one or two things which I invite honourable members to say when they go into Committee. Take for instance the proposal that the Governor-General should at his discretion nominate members of the Upper House. We cannot agree to that. And the preposterous reason given for the proposal is that a man may not like the hurly burly of standing for election and therefore the Governor-General should put him in. We have nearly killed that in Barbados. At least the death warrant of the Other Chamber is signed as regards holding up legislation indefinitely. In due course I will ask the Committee to say in the Address that until such time as we have a couple of West Indian national parties—the House of Assembly should elect the Prime Minister. But you cannot do that in the absence of proper party Government. But to have the Governor-General at his own discretion nominating any portion of the Cabinet is carrying things much too far. The argument that the Prime Minister should be able to elect eight members is going back to the see-saw of Leeward and Windward Islands. For five years you get the official members outnumbering the others; then you get it the other way round etc. That is sheer nonsense. It is a thing that should be put behind us in this century.

I invite honourable members not merely to say that the House wishes, or feels, or hopes or desires, but the House considers that Barbados should not enter federation unless these points are straightened out. At this stage, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is no formal motion whereby the Address can pass, I move that the Address as embodied in the Report of the Select Committee that was appointed to consider and prepare a draft reply to His Excellency's Message No. 2/1953 do now pass.

The Address is as follows:—

*His Excellency the Acting Governor
To
The House of Assembly*

The House of Assembly has the honour to refer to His Excellency Sir Alfred Savage's Message No. 2/1952 on the subject of British West Indian Federation and to state that the House has reviewed the Report of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee, which, as it has affirmed in a

previous Address to Sir Alfred Savage, it accepted as a basis for discussion on the form that the proposed Federation should take.

The House of Assembly has the honour to make the following comments on the Report and expressions of its views on the subject:

1. The House reaffirms its acceptance of the principle of Federation.
2. The House is of the opinion that the Federal Constitution should follow the Australian model and the units should retain such powers as they do not specifically agree to give up. In this it concurs in Paragraph 21 of Chapter II of the Report, but the House feels that Immigration, Emigration and Deportation should be included in the Exclusive List and not the Concurrent List as set out in Paragraphs 6 and 7 of Chapter II of the Consolidated Recommendations.
3. The House feels that it will be essential to the success of the Federation for the Government of the United Kingdom to give financial assistance by way of a grant and/or a loan but nevertheless, it strongly endorses the recommendation in the Report that there must be no direct and general control of the economic and financial affairs of the Federation by the United Kingdom Government.
4. The House agrees with the establishment of bi-cameral Legislature but feels that the members of the Senate should be elected for a period of five years by the elected members of the respective local Legislatures. The House feels, too, that there should be no time-limit to residence as a qualification for election to the House of Assembly as recommended in the Report.

The House is of the opinion that for the first five years, and thereafter for such a period as the Federal Legislature should enact, members of the Federal House of Assembly should be permitted to remain as members of local Legislatures and Executive Councils or Executive Committees. The House considers that the Speaker of the Federal House of Assembly should be elected from its own members.

The House does not agree with the proposed allocation of seats and recommends that Barbados should have 6 representatives.

5. The House feels that the Executive Body should be called, not a "Council of State", but a "Cabinet". This Cabinet should contain no officials and should be nominated by the Prime Minister.
6. The House considers that discussion of detailed financial provisions should await the holding of the proposed London Conference.
7. The House is of the opinion that the question of the site of the Federal Capital should be reconsidered at the coming Conference.
8. The House of Assembly feels that Item (d) of Paragraph 40 of the Consolidated Recommendations in Appendix V to the Report should be modified and that Item (h) should be deleted from any proposed legislation as unnecessary. The House can and (d) of Paragraph 42 of Appendix V never agree to the insertion of Items (c) in any legislation by Order-in-Council

affecting Barbados.

9. The House feels that the Federal Constitution should provide for full self-government in all the internal affairs of the area, which is under Federal administration.

The House of Assembly respectfully requests Your Excellency to forward copies of this Address to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies and to the Heads of Government in the Report.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I think we all agree that you could not really discuss this Address properly without going into Committee on it and dealing with it paragraph by paragraph. I therefore beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this proposed Address. This is the time when you can make the equivalent of a second reading speech and I intend to do so now.

As the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has said, I am entirely committed in my mind to Federation. I am in agreement with the two points before the last that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph made and this is the second time that I have had the opportunity to do so. Those two points are the reserve powers which the Governor has never had in Barbados, and which I am sure I am right in saying is one of the things that caused the Federation Talks in 1876 to fall through; because to have agreed at that time to these reserve powers we would have been federating downwards and not upwards. The recent point is the power of Her Majesty-in-Council to make laws affecting the Federal West Indies.

I would never agree to allowing Her Majesty-in-Council to have the power to make laws for the public order, and the preservation of law and order throughout the Federal West Indies. Now today in Barbados we have got an equivalent law; but we have put it on the Statute Book ourselves; and it can be read only by the Governor in consultation with his advisers who are our own people. We have to give the right to make emergency laws to someone; but it is almost entirely in the hands of the representatives of the people as they will soon be holding the powers of Ministers. But it does not matter whether it is the Executive Council, or the Executive Committee. It still means that no stranger from abroad is able to impose on us something that will restrict our opportunity for having a chance to make representations which may prove the unfairness and unworthiness of the action.

As I have had occasion to say before, there are some things which we have to tell our delegate to the forthcoming conference in London that we entirely agree with, and that he shall make it clear that we are sticking to those conditions. We are prepared unanimously to those two points raised by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. If I am not incorrect I think that Jamaica is now trying to free herself of that burden. In going into a federation, as I see it, you will not have any difficulty with that for the obvious reason that every colony now like Trinidad, Jamaica and possibly British Guiana is moving in the same direction, because in other respects they have got as good or almost as good a constitution as ours, though not in every respect.

As a matter of fact my only doubt about Jamaica which I know was lukewarm in 1946-47 is that she is likely to remain so in the future because she would desire to have some form of constitution by such as Ceylon, because she feels she is big enough to be able to do better, and far

enough away to be able to do better if she remains by herself. In my opinion if we are going to start a federation, we should not allow the question of whether or not Jamaica will come in prevent us from proceeding because the difficulties of distance may undoubtedly be overcome as they are being overcome day after day by more rapid transportation.

But while the Jamaicans are expressing themselves in favour of Federation today, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can bear me out that they were rather hesitant at Montego Bay. Not only Bustamante, but Manley's sweet and clever tongue seemed to hide a sinister design. He appeared to me like a minister in the pulpit preaching a religion in which he does not believe. With Bustamante saying that he was not sure if it would suit Jamaica there seemed to be the unanimous opinion that Jamaica wanted to move on its own. If they really agree to come in now, that is a welcome sign.

There is no doubt about it. I remember Mr. Hannays saying one day that you do not federate lands; you federate peoples, and the people of Jamaica seem to us more different from the ordinary Barbadian than any other of the people of the West Indies we met. I say Trinidad excepted because Trinidad has managed to make itself out of a mixed set of races so that we have before us a successful example of federation on a small scale and the knowledge that federation on a large scale can be just as successful in due course.

I say that because the Windward and Leeward Islands and Grenada would have unhesitatingly federated with Barbados in 1946. I heard them speaking and asking questions. Not only were they willing to federate with us, but with a constitution such as ours. I heard some of the representatives of those islands say that they would be more than pleased to place the capital at Barbados, because they felt a kinship with us, and felt they would accept political leadership from us.

I am convinced of the necessity for federation, and the ability of us, not merely Barbadians, but particularly us because we pride ourselves on our political ability, to make a success of it. I hope that whoever goes to represent us will be prepared to give some and take some, always excepting those two paragraphs to which I have referred and to which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has referred at length. I would feel very dissatisfied if we hindered ourselves with something which we have never had; because the Barbadian is naturally rebellious of restraint and the idea of giving anyone the power to restrain us would be horrible after these 300 years.

I know that when the delegates get around the conference table there are things on which they will have to give and take, and the Rance Report has convinced me of the necessity of the small units entering into a combination so as to make themselves into a bigger unit. I see no hope for us except we enter into some form of federation.

The next point that I wish to speak on is the question of freedom of movement between the federated states. That is a very important point, and if there are going to be objections to it we are wasting time. There have been objections in the past; but you cannot have a federation in the true sense of the word in which one State or one island wants to keep out the members of another State or island, except of course as regards undesirable for whom we always have the right to make laws. But whenever you say to the Trinidadian or the

Grenadian that federation must include freedom of movement, he raises his hands in horror.

I would like to remind honourable members about something which happened during the war. We made a contract to send some of our people to work in Trinidad. So successful were they in the performance of their duties that the contract was broken by Trinidad because the Unions of that island claimed the Barbadians were putting Trinidadians out of work. What was happening was that in their search and desire to make a livelihood the Barbadians were showing how work should be done. To a lazy man there is nothing more galling than to find someone taking his job from him because that someone can do it better and faster.

This freedom of movement question is very important to us. No matter who governs Barbados in the future they will find it difficult to cope with an increasing population unless we can find some places to let these people emigrate according to their tastes and wishes. We have tried the scheme of sending people to St. Lucia. It was a failure because a Government will never succeed in spoon feeding people. People who go to work abroad must be prepared to suffer hardships which they will not suffer in their native land. But the moment you make it a government scheme in which an emigrant knows that he can look to you for 15 dollars a week you kill his initiative.

None of that will happen in the Federation if we are allowed freedom of movement. If Trinidad is still raising her hands in horror our delegation will find itself in difficulty. If we only lay down our minimum conditions for joining the Federation, then the ability of our delegates, the suavity of their talk, their intention to give as well as to take and their knowledge that it is necessary that we should combine will undoubtedly help the conference, to reach a conclusion.

But I must say with all the force that I can that it would be preferable for them to meet in the West Indies. In 1930 I had the opportunity of going to Trinidad to take part in discussions on the question of tariff. We insisted that we alone should be present, and but for the fact that we were not allowed to go to Canada to make an agreement there would have been absolutely unanimous consent in what we would have to give to Canada and ask from her. Even in 1930 I knew the value of having West Indians get around a table and discuss their affairs. A man may fight you where the good of his country is concerned, and then he will back you to the limit. I have no doubt that the bickering which goes on at a distance of 200 miles, accentuated by cables will disappear when it comes to the question of what is good for us.

I have never wanted to make the terms for our delegates too hard because they will find themselves in the position that they have to do something which they have been told to do by the House, and which may interfere with the latitude and breadth of their bargaining.

I do not think I need say much more. It does not matter if I do not agree in every respect with the method of federation. The Rance Report never claimed to be the last word on the subject. It was always looked upon as something on which we could get together and talk. I see no difficulty in departing from some of its terms. There is one thing that we must remember. The West Indies cannot expect to be talking at one moment about freedom and nationalism etc. and when we have

a chance to get it we muck it up by asking for terms which we know we cannot get.

You cannot ask England for more than you know you can get. She is subject to the accusation that colonialism is rank, and how we suffer and are oppressed. No Russian wants to know the truth of the matter. No answer can be given although it was attempted by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph; because the Russian does not intend to believe where it does not suit him to believe, and he is not coming to see for himself. He does not want to know that the Barbadian has from time immemorial rebelled against any form of discipline, even when it has been for his own good. The only answer that can be given is for us to take what is offered, and which will free England from the accusations against her, and at the same time give us the pride of saying that we are West Indians. We cannot give ourselves this nationalism by talking about Barbadians or Trinidadians alone. It means a lot more than some people think to be able to say we are West Indians.

Now, Sir, the idea that we have been content for years to let an organisation like Colonial Development and Welfare represent us at conferences to do with sugar and such things is a shame. Do you think in truth and in fact that apart from one or two of the men at C.D. & W. they have greater ability than some of us? And they certainly have less interest, because they represent us mechanically.

I am saying that if we enter federation with heart and soul it will be a success. England will not be sparing to help us, because they are helping us now, and after all it will be another step towards freeing her from the strain of colonialism. In addition to that it is almost a certainty that British Guiana will come into the Federation from the moment that we make a success of it. British Guiana will not remain isolated in her continental destiny when her people hear that the West Indies are making a success of federation and are representing themselves, while British Guiana will have to go to the Colonial Office and get some clerk, who hardly knows where British Guiana is, to represent them.

I do hope, sir, that we will stick to essentials and not confine our delegates to non-essential terms and conditions; but that we will regard them as having the ability to make the best terms they can. I say without hesitation that I pity the men who will have to run Barbados in the next ten years, if sugar fails or some other crisis occurs and we have not got some of the other colonies to fall back on, not merely as regards reserves, but also as regards united action which can only come out of Federation. (Cheers).

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second that. I should like, before I say anything further, to express my complete endorsement of almost all the remarks made by the honourable junior member for St. James. They are remarks which I was confidently expecting to hear from the other side of the House; but in any case, Sir, I am satisfied that they have been said in this Chamber, regardless of the source, and I believe I am expressing the opinion of the majority of the people of this island when I say that the remarks of the last speaker represent the feelings of the greater portion of the population of Barbados on this issue.

I propose to begin, Sir, by reminding the House that this Rance Report on Federation should not be regarded as the beginning and the end of federation, nor should it be regarded as in any way comparable to the laws of the Medes and Persians which change

not. The mere fact that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who was a signatory to this Report can come into the House and criticise its fundamentals is itself an indication that in the final analysis this Report was regarded by its authors as a basis for discussion. This is a draft report. I repeat, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was a signatory to it, and the casual person seeing his name appended to it would more or less come to the conclusion that he made no reservations with regard to anything which appears in it. Those of us who have heard him make some explanation since then may refuse to accept that explanation; but I repeat, that when normally you pick up a Report and see the signatories to it, you feel that they endorse the principles contained therein. So the mere fact that we are discussing it here in detail tonight, and that someone who signed it is criticising its fundamentals shows that this Report is merely a draft report, and that without going to the extreme of saying either accept what the Barbados House of Assembly wants or no federation, we can discuss this Report and propose amendments to it, confident that both Her Majesty's Government and the other West Indian Governments will be willing to listen to suggestions which we make for its amendment.

I also propose to make it clear at the outset that I appreciate the reservations in the Report with regard to amendments of the proposed constitution. Para. 78 says: "We make no recommendations for any special procedure for constitutional amendment. That is to say the Constitution, which we anticipate will be embodied in an Order in Council, should be amendable by His Majesty in Council."

It is elementary to say that the Constitution for the Federal West Indies once agreed to, will not be easily amendable, and that therefore we should exercise every caution in the preliminary stages to ensure that before we embark on Federation we have the sort of constitution which we really want to have. I would also like honourable members to remember the background of the production of this Report. At the time when the members of the Closer Association Committee were engaged in the deliberations which resulted in this Report the Constitutions of the West Indian Colonies were, in many cases, different from what they are to-day. Even at the time when the original delegates met at Montego Bay, the delegates there were not representative of the West Indies as the West Indies are to-day. Since the original discussions there have been new constitutions in almost all the West Indian Colonies. At the time of the Montego Bay Conference Jamaica was the only colony with adult suffrage. Since then, Trinidad, British Guiana, Barbados and the Windwards and Leewards have had fundamental revisions of their Constitutions with the result that the people who now speak in the Legislatures of these Colonies are somewhat different from those who spoke at the time to which I have referred.

I say that, Sir, and I say this: It is highly possible that were these new Constitutions in effect at the time of the Montego Bay Conference, for instance, the reactionary recommendations in the Report to which we now object might never have been included. So we need not pay undue attention to-night to proposals in this Report which we consider would place the West Indies constitutionally further back than some of them are at present; because it is almost a foregone conclusion that the new delegates who will speak for the West Indies in 1953 at the London Conference will speak with a different voice from that of the majority who spoke at Montego Bay and on the Rance Standing Closer Association Committee meeting.

So when it comes to our objections to giving reserve powers to the Governor General, and to legislation by Order in Council, we can rest assured that those objections will be sustained by the majority of the delegates at the 1953 London Conference. I have no doubt in my mind about that. I cannot for the life of me see any West Indian representative at the London Conference agreeing to legislation by Order in Council for the proposed Federation or giving any Governor General reserve powers in the manner suggested in the Rance Report. So when a person wants to commit a West Indian Legislature to proclaim that unless these two proposals are going to be removed we are not joining the Federation it must make one wonder whether that person is in agreement with federation at all.

The author of these remarks knows full well that the delegates who are going to London will not be willing to agree to reserve powers etc. Let us assume that in 1953 the delegates in London agree with him that these proposals should be removed. Will he agree with Federation or find another monkey winch to throw in the works? I want to suggest, Sir, that the monkey winch seems to be included in the Final Report of this Select Committee.

It seems to be the consensus of opinion, Sir, that we should adjourn at this stage until to-day week at 3 o'clock. I understand that the Government would like to lay some Replies prior to that motion being made. I am willing to resume my seat without prejudice to finishing my speech. If Government wants to lay Replies I am willing to resume my seat, but with the specific understanding that I have not concluded my remarks, and that I will be continuing to speak next Tuesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no motion for next Tuesday before the House. If the honourable member makes such a motion and it is lost he realises that he cannot continue to speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move, Sir, that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not seconding the motion. I would like to make an amending motion. It need not prevent the honourable member from resuming his speech next Tuesday or at some other time. Here I would like to say that this Assembly has already caused this London Conference to be put off three times. The Houses of the Legislature in Barbados not having replied, and on three occasions the proposed Conference was put off. I will suggest to honourable members that since we have only done three hours work to-day we could go on until at least 11 o'clock and then adjourn. By that time honourable members would have finished their "second reading speeches" and we could come back next Tuesday and go into Committee.

I will assure the honourable senior member for St. Philip that if the motion for adjournment is not put now, we will vote next Tuesday for his continuing his speech.

MOTION TO CONSIDER RESOLUTION

I would like to deal now with the Resolution for Miss Alleyne of which I gave notice earlier. It is an urgent matter. So purely as an amendment to the honourable member's motion, I am moving that the House do now consider the Resolution of which I gave notice earlier this evening.

Mr. COX: I would like to know whether a member who seconds a motion is in order to make another motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can make a motion for the adjournment of the House.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89.

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 beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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.

LOAN TO MISS GWENDOLINE AUSTIN

Mr. ADAMS: This Resolution is the one of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon: it is a Resolution for \$1,500. I am sure that when I have read this Resolution, the House will agree to proceed with it although I have not got copies of the Resolution to hand around to honourable members. The addendum reads as follows:

"Miss Gwendoline Austin, Headteacher, Workman's Junior School, has submitted an application to the Government, supported by a medical Certificate for financial assistance to proceed to the United States of America for medical treatment. Miss Austin has represented that she is unable to meet the expenditure involved in proceeding to the United States for treatment, and has asked for an advance by way of a loan from the Public Treasury to assist her to meet these obligations.

2. In the circumstances of Miss Austin's case, it is considered desirable that the Government should render her financial assistance to the amount of \$1,500 (West Indian currency) which is within the limit of her substantive salary.

3. The amount advanced under this Resolution to Miss Austin will be repayable on terms and conditions to be arranged."

Miss Austin got permission for certain currency to be advanced to her. She is a patient at the General Hospital and the Surgeon Specialist has given her a certificate in support of her application relative to the release of United States currency. There are two precedents for advancing money on loan; the cases of Mr. Weekes and Major Foster are the two precedents. Miss Austin has made an offer to the effect that any credit to which she would be entitled would be given as security; her gratuity would cover this \$1,500. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: In supporting this Resolution I should like to say that the honourable member has made out this case with much clarity and honourable members are much in sympathy with this lady.

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. F. L. WALCOTT, 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 Mr. F. L. WALCOTT in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

REPLIES LAID

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—On behalf of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, I beg to lay the Reply to Question No. 75, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Michael.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to lay the Reply to Question No. 20, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the motion for the adjournment is put, I am appealing to honourable members. Let us spend another hour on the Federation debate; let the honourable senior member for St. Philip finish his speech. Are honourable members tired already? We are not going on until 2 o'clock.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The honourable senior member for St. Philip made a motion for the adjournment of the House until 3 p.m. next Tuesday: I am moving an amendment that we adjourn until 6 p.m. next Tuesday.

PROPOSED REMOVAL OF STANDPIPE IN ST. ANDREW

Mr. COX: I am asking honourable members to spend five minutes longer in order to deal with a Resolution relative to the removal of a standpipe in

St. Andrew. I ask leave to take Order No. 6 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 stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael—To move the passing of the following Resolution. Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed alteration to the Waterworks in the parish of St. Andrew.

Mr. COX: This is only a formal Resolution to approve of the proposed alteration to the Waterworks in the parish of St. Andrew. The proposal is to have a standpipe at Walkers Road transferred to another site. I promise the House that in the future these matters will be done administratively rather than have to be brought before the House. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ALLDER: I would like to see the Plan.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 6.30 p.m.

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