

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1951—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th February, 1953.

Pursuant to adjournment the House of Assembly met on Tuesday, the 10th of February, 1953, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Mr. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. R. G. MAPP, Mr. O. T. ALLDER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER and Mr. C. E. TALMA.

Prayers were read.

His Honour the Speaker informed the House that the Minutes of the last meeting were not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPER LAID

By command of His Excellency the Acting Governor the following paper was laid:

Mr. ADAMS: Report of the Regional Economic Committee of the British West Indies, British Guiana and British Honduras for the year 1951-52.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

The following Government Notices were given:

Mr. ADAMS for Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to advance the sum of \$12,000 from the Public Treasury (to be subsequently refunded from Loan Funds) to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1952-53, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1952-53, No. 37, which form the schedule to the Resolution.

Messrs. BRANCKER and VAUGHAN entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$1,920 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1952-53, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1952-53 No. 38, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS for Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to make it lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease to the Vestry of St. Michael a parcel of land at Probyn Street containing by admeasurement 714 square feet for the purpose of erecting sanitary conveniences thereon.

Mr. ADAMS for Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to make it lawful for the Vestry of St. Michael to lease from the Governor-in-Executive Committee a parcel of land at Probyn Street containing by admeasurement 714 square feet for the purpose of erecting sanitary conveniences thereon.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the the House and took his seat.

DEBATE ON SUSPENSION OF RULES

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolutions of which I have given notice, except the Resolution for \$1,920 which I shall ask leave to deal with something this evening. The purpose of the Resolution is to pay for the Queen's Colours and Regimental Colours which are to be presented to the Barbados Regiment. Inasmuch as it is intended to take advantage of the visit of the Princess Royal who has been asked to present the Colours, I will seek the permission of the House to deal with the Resolution this afternoon. In that case it will be necessary for me to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89, and I now give notice of my intention to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 to deal with the Resolution to which I have referred.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—This practice of the Government coming down with a money Resolution and having it discussed the same time it is given notice of is becoming too regular. I think I am speaking for all of us on this side of the table when I say that this is the first time that we have been able to know of Government's intention to spend money in this respect. None of us has even seen a copy of the Resolution, and while the amount of money involved might be small, this practice might become dangerous. On those grounds I am raising objection. As I have said, this practice may well become dangerous, and it will continue unless honourable members strongly object to it.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—More than a year ago I gave the House the assurance—and I have never broken it—that the Government would not come here and ask for the suspension of these rules if it were humanly possible that we could avoid doing so. According to a note that I have and which is dated the 26th of January the Crown Agents

for the Colonies less than a fortnight ago gave notice to the Secretariat about the cost of these flags. It was circulated to the Executive on the 31st of January and dealt with by the Executive last Thursday. The Princess Royal is coming on the 19th of February and she has been asked to present these Colours. I challenge the honourable member to say that from the time I gave the undertaking to which I have referred the Government has asked the House to consider a Resolution in this manner except when it could not possibly be helped, like on this occasion, or when it was some non-controversial matter like the Resolution for Miss Alleyne which was passed last Tuesday. It was not foreseen that this Resolution would have had to be sent to the House. It was never intended to spend one cent to get these colours apart from money from the Regiment's vote in last year's Estimates. But it was discovered that there was not enough money in that vote to purchase these flags. Now that that has been discovered, we have already asked the Princess Royal to make the presentation. I am not saying that the honourable member is wrong to make the point that he has made; but I do want to remind the House that the Government has stuck to the undertaking which I gave.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—On previous occasions that we have been asked to consider a Resolution at such short notice, members have been treated to the courtesy of being circulated with a copy of the Resolution. If this were dealt with in Executive Committee last Tuesday I am wondering if copies could not have been prepared and circulated so that honourable members would have had it before them. I take it that the Resolution refers to some flags or Colours for the Regiment. I do not know, Sir, but from what I have heard it seems strange that we will have to pay for these things before we can use them on this occasion, when sometimes bills from the Crown Agents are outstanding for over a year. I do not understand why we have to pay so urgently as if we were going to be put in the Petty Debt Court. I do not know if in future the Crown Agents will follow this same method in letting us have bills for the things that they purchase for us.

The question that leave be granted to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 was put and carried on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER that the ayes have it.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox Rules 88 and 89 were suspended.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking leave to move that Committee of Supply be the first Order of the Day. There being no objection leave was granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction to the Committee to deal with the Resolution for \$1,920 for which Rules 88 and 89 were suspended.

Mr. Cox seconded.

The question was put and carried *nem. con.*

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

RESOLUTION FOR PURCHASE OF COLOURS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I am sorry that any honourable member should think that this Resolution is the result of any recklessness on the part of the Government. The Resolution is nothing extraordinary. Honourable members would need

a copy no more than they needed one of the Resolution for Miss Alleyne passed last Tuesday. It is a simple matter. The order for these Colours was placed in October. It was expected that the cost would be about £50. Late in January the Crown Agents informed us that this money would come to about \$1,920. On the 26th of January the information was handed in to one of the Assistant Colonial Secretaries as a minute from the Financial Secretary. It was circulated to the Executive Committee who dealt with it last Thursday—five days ago—and we decided that in view of the fact that the Princess Royal had been asked to present these Colours that we would ask the House to consider the Resolution today.

We are asking the House to approve of this Resolution because in a matter of nine days the Princess Royal will be here to present the Colours. There might be an abortive meeting next Tuesday for all we know, and we are asking the House to consider it at today's meeting. I repeat, Government is well aware that it is better for them to avoid trying to rush things through the House, or trying to push things down people's throats. Government has made it their policy not to come and ask for the suspension of these rules unless we get information so late that we cannot help doing so, like in the case of the Foot and Mouth Disease in Martinique. There is no intention of rushing anything through. On this occasion we cannot help ourselves.

I beg to move, Sir, that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. HOLDER seconded.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I voiced no objection to the motion for the suspension of the rules because I was ready to concede that in the matter to be considered a comparatively small sum was involved. But I see now that I have made a mistake because I am sure that if honourable members had before them the information that they have now been given there would have been considerable opposition to the motion for suspending the rules to deal with the matter.

The honourable introducer of the Resolution has said that it was the Government's estimate that the cost would be around \$240.00; now the cost is \$1,920, and for what, may I ask? I feel perfectly certain that unless the Government have completely lost their senses, if they had been aware at the beginning that the cost would have been £400 they would not have committed the colony to spending this amount. I for one feel that the visit of the Princess Royal is an excellent opportunity for making a stand against the excessive costs which we are being asked to pay for British manufactured goods of all sorts sent to these colonies. Let the Princess Royal be told that although we expected her to present the Colours the cost was so much more than we anticipated, that we are very sorry, but we can no longer afford the expense of this frumpery and we will therefore save her the trouble of being present on this occasion.

Year after year, and month after month we utter protests against the abnormally high cost of British goods which we are compelled to import. In a matter of this sort we are under no obligation, and I can think of no better opportunity to impress upon the British Government and the British Royal Family how completely disgusted and dissatisfied we are over this state of affairs. Why should we squander \$1,920 merely because we asked the Princess Royal to present these Colours? What is the use of crying out that you are poverty stricken; that you need financial assistance from Colonial Development and Welfare when you can take up the

few dollars you have in the Treasury and throw it away in absolutely meaningless gestures? What does it matter if we have these flags or if the Princess Royal presents them? It is sheer tomfoolery. If the majority of us would have winked our eyes at the expenditure of a couple hundred dollars although we might question the desirability of doing so, we certainly, sir, are by no means willing to agree to raising this money from \$240.00 to \$1,920. It would be, I think, a far better advertisement from our colonial point of view to impress the fact upon the Princess Royal that some advantage is being taken of these colonies, and that in Barbados she could no longer carry through a ceremony which she had been asked to perform because of the abnormally high cost of a few flags which were to have been used for the occasion. I certainly hope that honourable members will view this Resolution in that light and register their opposition by voting against it.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I think it is very peculiar that an item which someone thought would cost £50 should turn out to cost eight times as much. It shows that something has gone wrong somewhere, and as a result the expenditure of £400—an amount which would probably build a house for the Housing Scheme—has been incurred without the sanction of the Legislature. There are all these high sounding people whom we employ because they have a great knowledge of things regimental. We pay them a good salary and we give them what they would get in England—free medical services etc. Do you mean that none of them could have instructed us as to what it would cost to supply our regiment with Colours?

I am not denying that supplying our regiment with Colours and having the Princess Royal to present them is not something to the credit of this colony. Especially as the Princess Royal has had a long connection with this island through her husband, and then it would be nice to have someone in so exalted a position to present the Colours to our regiment. But evidently, if information had been sought before hand we would have known that the Colours would have cost £400. I do not think that the fact that they will cost so much money is anyone's fault. Perhaps £400 is the normal cost of these Colours. I am not in a position to say that the cost is too high. It is just that someone assumed that the Colours would be bought for an expenditure of two or three hundred dollars out of the regimental vote, and failed to make proper enquiries. As a result we are committed to this Expenditure of £400 which it would be very embarrassing not to pay. We have been committed to this without the people's representatives knowing anything about it. It is most regrettable.

If this is the sort of thing that the Government is willing to condone it might lead someone to commit us some day to a debt of great magnitude that we might not be able to pay in such an easy way. I think that there has been slackness on the part of someone, and you should not be slack in the spending of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—I am not aware of the cost of Colours, but I do feel that whoever had the initial job of advising the Government as to the estimate went far from the actual cost. I cannot conceive that the Crown Agents or anyone in England would send us Colours at a price three or four times the right cost. I must presume that this cost is the right one. It would be most embarrassing to the Government and to the island as a whole to invite Royalty to present these Colours and then tell her that the Colours are too expensive and therefore we have cancelled the ceremony. I

think that the prestige of the Government and the island is worth more than \$1,920. Where the Government probably went wrong was in not finding out in the early from the Crown Agents what the cost would be before the order was placed. The Leader of the House may be able to give us a further explanation as we do not have much information on the matter. But I understand and appreciate the position of the Government in this instance and I am not one to embarrass them on an occasion like this.

Mr. ADAMS: More than a year ago when the King was alive and the Queen had not yet succeeded to the Throne negotiations were going on as to whether the Barbados Regiment would be treated like old regiments of the British Army and be allowed to have these regimental colours. Negotiations were prolonged. You had to get the King's approval. You had to get designs made and forwarded to the Inspector of Regimental Colours. All that was done in 1951. The Governor had to send a history of the Regiment, and things like the Barbados Coat of Arms etc. These things took place up to and as far back as July 1951. Is it unreasonable that someone in the Secretariat in those days had one cost in mind, but that now that all the negotiations have been completed the cost has run into hundreds of pounds? That is all that happened.

I have before me, for instance, a despatch from the Secretary of State dated the 29th of July, 1951, referring to these Colours. As I have said, these negotiations were going on for a long time. Designs had to be prepared and submitted to the Inspector of Regimental Colours so that he could approve of the proper design. The King had to approve of them. In the meanwhile the King died and the Queen had to approve of them in turn. I also see a letter dated 26th of October, 1951, from the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies dealing with the matter and asking for further information about the regiment, information about battle honours, if any, and referring to a badge to be placed in the centre of the Colours. Then he referred to the fact that the Liecester Regiment with which the Barbados Regiment was affiliated had a particular badge, and said that the Barbados Regiment could not have the same badge etc. I am giving all these details to show the long negotiations that had to go on before this matter was settled.

Is it anything extraordinary even in private enterprise to be told that so and so will not cost you more than a certain amount, and then for further information to come and show you that your price is completely out? There was a long period of negotiations on this matter. Many telegrams were passed. It is nothing that has been done haphazardly. The Press was told in October—and the honourable senior member for St. Philip is a shining light in the Press—that Her Majesty the Queen had granted permission for the Barbados Regiment to carry Colours, and that the designs had been forwarded. They were not told what it would cost. People were aware that if they had asked for further information they would have been told you will have to go to the House of Assembly to pay for these Colours.

In November the Secretary of State and the Crown Agents were asked to hurry up the matter because the Princess Royal was coming and it was hoped that she would be able to present the Colours. Then along came this information in January about the increase in price which has surprised all of us. Surely now that I have given all that information

there is no necessity to waste any more time. It is not something which we foresaw and then waited until the last moment to spring it on the public and the House. It is like a private business house ordering a bale of cloth. The price is not guaranteed before delivery date, and when it arrives you know the price. Is there anything extraordinary in the fact that the price of these Colours is very much more than we anticipated? We should not have a division on a matter of this sort. Imagine the fantastic nonsense uttered by the honourable senior member for St. Philip to the effect that we must bring into Barbadian politics the Princess Royal who is not in British politics and ask her to go back and tell the British Government that we did invite her to present the Colours but we do not have the money to pay for them. That is an argument which you would expect to hear from a bunch of young morons; not from a responsible member of this Chamber. I appeal to honourable members to remember the dignity of the House and not to have a division on this matter.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that the further back the honourable senior member for St. Joseph goes in the file the more reprehensible this matter becomes. If these negotiations were going on since 1951 can he say that the people's representatives were told that this debt was being incurred? The fact that you cannot invite the Princess Royal to present the Colours and then not have the Colours or not pay for them is no argument against anything that has been said on this matter. The safeguard for not placing the House in an embarrassing position in the future is for people in the Government Service to find out the price of things beforehand. It is not quite a parallel to quote the instance of a man conducting his own private business. This is a case of someone ordering things which will have to be paid for out of the taxpayers' money. It is true that people in private business order things without knowing the guaranteed price. But in no case does the article on delivery cost eight times as much as anticipated. I do not know of any goods that have gone up 800 per cent. except things like pins and buttons. The further back these negotiations are proved to have gone the more true it is that this House should have known about this debt. No Government should attempt to place the House in the embarrassing position of being forced to vote money for something. You should have had some good idea of what the Colours would cost and let the House know about it.

The remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will encourage Civil Servants to do as they like with this House. Once we have got permission to have Colours the people's representatives must vote the money for them. I fear that in the future the 300-year-old Barbados House of Assembly which controls the money of the colony will be intimidated into voting money for something which it would be embarrassing to turn down. Where does the freedom of the people's representatives come in when someone feels that because they want something it must go ahead? Civil Servants who are in charge of these things should do their job properly and find out the cost of things. They are not dealing with their own deposits on the bank. It is not their own businesses that they are running. Here we are placed in this embarrassing position because some well paid Civil Servant failed to find out the price of a thing that he was ordering. I think that the Government is condemning itself by the information that it has given.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I am going to vote against this Resolution if I stand alone. I will vote against it on three grounds. In the first place, the Government continues to break the rules of the House. They break the rule which says that no financial resolution must be dealt with until seven or eight days after it has been given notice of. The Government continues to come down with these Resolutions, give notice of them, and then attempt to rush them through. I think it is time that a stop should be put to that. In spite of the criticisms levelled at the practice they continue to bring down Resolutions in the manner that they have brought down this one this evening.

In the second place, no private enterprise would continue to do business with an overseas agency like the Crown Agents for as long as this Government has continued to do. For many years we have seen that when we order an item and understand that it will cost X pounds they delay in forwarding the item and when it arrives you have to pay 30 or 40 per cent. more. I am told of a case where a certain private concern used to supply Government with certain items and the contract was taken away from that private concern and given to the Crown Agents. I am also told that since that was done the Government has had to pay about 30 per cent. more for those items. That in itself is an argument in favour of taking away from the Crown Agents the business of purchasing anything for us overseas. I am told that many items which the Government depends on the Crown Agents to purchase for them could be got at cheaper prices from local business houses. The Crown Agents continue to fleece this Government and as a result fleece the taxpayers.

I have heard it mentioned by many honourable members that the Government should cease purchasing things through the Crown Agents, but the Government continues to disregard the suggestions and objections which come from honourable members. It seems to me, sir, that the Crown Agents are nothing but a bunch of racketeers, and it is no uncommon thing to get racketeering carried on in high quarters in this post war period. It is time that the Government should think of the method they should adopt in the future in allowing the Crown Agents to handle their transactions. What is more you have to pay the Crown Agents a higher percentage for purchasing goods than the profits which private business houses make under government control; and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph knows that too.

My third objection is this: Inasmuch as Her Royal Highness is related to the British Imperial policy which is now being worked out against our distant brothers in Kenya, I do not see why we should not take the opportunity to express in some way our sympathy with them. We cannot take up arms in the field on their behalf, but we can refuse to spend one cent for the royal member of the set-up whose policy permits the destruction of people who are related to us by blood and race. It is only fortunate for us that our ancestors were caught in the early days and brought here which resulted in our being Barbadians. Otherwise we might have been in Kenya being destroyed by the policy which is permitted by the set-up which this royal lady represents.

My views might sound extraneous to the matter under discussion; but it is my opinion that this money could be spent to better advantage in removing some of the squalor in the island, than on a formality of the nature of the one proposed, a formality which must lose its moral aspect; for when all is said and done there are still people who must

continue to suffer although they are assisting in bearing the burden of this expenditure. I regret, sir, that the majority of the members of this House have not developed what in my view is the correct outlook as far as our origin and relationships are concerned, and that they no longer feel an affinity with those who are beyond these shores. But however we may try to hide our identity and our origin there are silent ties that bind us; and if we have any morality at all we would do all that lies in our power to extend sympathy to those by whose side fate does not permit us to be fighting.

I am not an obstructionist, nor do I agitate anything extreme. But refusal to agree to a Resolution of this sort would have a sane effect on those who can decide whether more of the Kenya natives should be destroyed or whether a compromise should be effected, and they be allowed to live as human beings regardless of colour or race. In that respect, sir, I am saying that I am going to vote against this Resolution on three grounds, and while I know that few will have the temerity to follow my example, I hope that my protest will be understood.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I will not make any reference to the absurd allegation that I am trying to mix the Princess Royal up with Barbados politics. I think that every schoolboy knows the relationship of the British Royal Family to the British Parliament. I merely want to say this: I do not think that the Clerk of the Secretariat who was concerned with this matter is an idiot; nor do I regard the Executive as idiots. And if it were expected that the cost of these colours would be between £50 and £75, I think there is some justification for querying the new cost of £400. Making allowance for the increased cost of goods from abroad I think that the disparity is too great. There must have been some reason for the Administration and the Executive to think that the cost would have been about £50 or £75. They must have had some idea that that would be so. They were not even referring the matter to the House because they anticipated that the cost would be met from the Regimental Vote. That being so, what are the people's representatives to say when we are told that the cost would be £400? Are we to consider that a jump from £75 to £400 is nothing at all? I have heard nothing to convince me that my original argument was incorrect.

The question was put and on the declaration of the Chairman that "the ayes have it" a division was called for. The question was then decided in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. COX, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD.—(15).

Noes: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. ALLDER.—(3).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I now declare the ayes have it.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. COX, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

DEBATE ON FEDERATION RESUMED

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the consideration of the second Interim Report and the Final Report of the

Select Committee on the subject of British West Indian Federation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,— I think I—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking on the matter that is before us?

Mr. CRAWFORD: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the last occasion that the honourable member spoke he made a motion for adjournment which had no seconder. Another motion was subsequently made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and was carried. In my opinion the honourable member has finished his speech, and cannot resume the debate. That is my ruling.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I would just like to say, Sir, that on the last occasion I gave way in order that the Government might proceed with a Resolution, and I was given an assurance from the floor of this House that I would be permitted to resume my speech on the next occasion. I gave way to the Government purely on that understanding.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a matter for the House to decide whether the honourable member should be allowed to continue his speech or not.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—Inasmuch as I did on the last occasion ask the honourable member to allow me to deal with a Resolution and he gave way, I now beg to move that he be allowed to continue his speech.

Mr. LEWIS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. CRAWFORD: Merely to take up the threads at where I left off on Tuesday last, I mean to refer very briefly to what I said then. I said Sir, that this Rance Report should be taken merely as a basis for discussion. It was not to be regarded in the same manner as the laws of the Medes and Persians which change not. As I said, Sir, the mere fact that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who was a signatory to the Report could criticise it and tear it to pieces as he did, demonstrates my contention that this Report should be regarded merely as a document for further discussion.

I made the point finally, Sir, that in view of the fact that when the Regional Federation Conference first met at Montego Bay, Jamaica was the only colony with adult suffrage, and that there have been far-reaching constitutional changes in the British Caribbean group since then so that any far-reaching reforms which we introduce into the proposed Federal Constitution would receive greater support from the new delegates who will meet in London this year than would have been possible either at Montego Bay or during the deliberations of the Standing Closer Association Committee.

I take it, Sir, that on all sides of the House we are agreed in principle on the question of Federation. But in order to clear up some confusion which seems to have existed in the minds of the public since the statements by Government members on the last two occasions that this matter was discussed, I want to make passing reference to some of the remarks made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. These remarks have been widely interpreted both inside and outside of the colony as meaning that Barbados is no longer interested in Federation. Therefore, in my opinion some of these points need a little clarification.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said with reference to the necessity for starting off with a proper Constitution that it is not an easy matter to alter a federal constitution. He pointed out that the American Constitution had been altered only about 17 times. I think that his reference to

the recommendation in the Report of the Select Committee implemented with regard to the nomination by the Prime Minister of the members of his Cabinet.

Although I said that there should be general agreement with that recommendation, I cannot say the same thing about the proposal with regard to the appointment of the Senate. Paragraph 4 of the Report suggests that the Legislature should be a bicameral one and the feeling is expressed that the members of the Senate should be elected for a period of five years by the elected members of the respective local Legislatures". I am wondering if that is the intention of the signatories to this Final Report; I have not heard of any part of the Commonwealth or Empire in which the members of the Upper House are elected by the elected members of the local Legislature. I do not see how it will work in actual practice. What this proposal really means is that the insular legislators would elect the members of the Federal Council or Senate, and it is to be presumed that each colony would have the same numerical representation on the Senate following the American practice. In the American Senate each State returns two members, but in actual practice I am apprehensive that it will be found that this recommendation cannot work, at least not satisfactorily, with Federation. This proposal does not apply in any of the Dominions; in Canada the Governor-General and the Senators are appointed for life and, in Australia, I think they are elected for six years. What is important is not so much the election of the Senate as regulating the powers of the Second Chamber. I doubt very much whether there will be any agreement on the part of the delegates in London with regard to paragraph 4 of this Report; I am not particularly enthusiastic about it myself; it seems to me that we should fix the basis of nomination to the Senate giving each part of the Federation a number of seats on the Senate and follow the British practice of defining and regulating the powers of the Upper House. The Senate in Canada has very wide powers; it can amend Money Bills and what not. In Australia there is well-defined legislation setting out the powers of the Senate and laying down the procedure in cases of disagreement between the two Houses of the Legislature. That is, I think, what we want; we want to have the powers of the Senate clearly defined and to lay down the method of procedure to be followed in cases of disagreement between the two Houses of the Legislature. The stipulation that the insular legislators should elect the members of the Senate may occasion considerable controversy and delay in the progress of the proceedings in London.

Similarly with regard to the recommendation that members of the insular Parliament should be permitted to run for election to the Federal Parliament. The Rance Report recommended that this should not be the case because it was thought that it would be impracticable. I believe that on mature consideration, honourable members will agree that it will not be a very easy matter neither will it be entirely desirable for the members of the insular Legislatures to be also members of the Federal Parliament, not if we intend to preserve what is really meant by Federation. You do not want your Federal Parliament to be merely a rubber stamp for the local parliament. I appreciate the apprehension on the part of the smaller colonies that there may not be found a sufficiently large number of men of the calibre for conducting affairs in the local Legislatures and also to carry on well in the Federal Parliament. Barbados has only four seats in the original recommendation and are we implying in this Final

Report that in Barbados it will be impossible to find four men who can give effective representation to the colony and carry on its affairs in the local Legislature? This recommendation to permit local Parliamentarians also to sit on the Federal Legislature is based on the assumption that you will not find a sufficiently large number of capable men for giving effective representation locally. When you come to representation in the Federal Parliament, the actual nomination of the candidates will cut across Party lines. In my opinion, at least as a beginning, voters will have this in their minds: Is such and such an individual capable of representing this colony in the Federal Parliament? Is he capable of representing the interests of the colony not only with regard to the conflicting interests of other West Indian colonies, but also with regard to other countries? You elect a legislator not merely to represent a constituency in a colony, but also to represent the colony in the Intercolonial Parliament where the interests of the entire Federation will conflict occasionally with those of the outside world. If we bear these factors in mind, I think that there will be general agreement that your Federal Parliamentarians should not, as the Rance Report proposed, be at the same time members of the local Legislatures because that cannot work. It may suit the personal ambition of some people to occupy seats in the insular Legislature, the insular Executive Council and similar posts in the Federal Legislature. Some of us might like to be Ministers in the local Legislatures and also Ministers in the Federal Parliament; while that might suit our personal ambition, it cannot serve the best interests of the Federation as a whole. Therefore, the representation in the Rance Report should stand, although I am a bit apprehensive that when it comes to the adoption of the Report there might be so few honourable members here as not to have a sufficiently large number to amend certain vital parts of this Report, and it may go abroad to the West Indies that the Barbados House of Assembly agreed with this Report *in toto*. I am suggesting to the members of the Select Committee that they themselves should re-consider their decision and agree, on more mature reflection, that it is undesirable to adopt the recommendations contained in paragraph 4 of the Report.

I am also very concerned about paragraph 3 of the Report in which this is stated: "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

The "and/or" is significant and it seems to be a compromise between the members of the Select Committee—between those who feel that the United Kingdom Government should make a grant towards the financial success of the Federation and those who feel that the most we should expect is a loan. When we first began the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee, the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said that in so far as financial assistance was concerned, we had to wait and see what the United Kingdom would do by way of a loan; now we see in this Report this talk about a grant and/or a loan, implying that if we do not get a grant, we will get a loan. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph took objection to the interference on the part of Her Majesty's Government with the financial stability of the proposed Federal Government. Paragraph 76 of the Rance Report says this:

"Having regard to the inescapable responsibilities of Her Majesty's Government arising out of problems of defence, international relations and ultimate financial stability of the Federation in its ex-

ternal relationships, it has been thought necessary to provide that, in certain carefully defined circumstances related to the foregoing, His Majesty in Council should have certain overriding powers of legislation sufficient to enable those responsibilities to be discharged. These powers are defined in paragraph 42 of the Consolidated Recommendations (Appendix 5) and relate to defence, the regulation of the relations between the Federation and foreign countries, securing and maintaining financial stability and, in certain emergencies, securing and maintaining public order and supplies and services."

In other words, the Rance Report was allocating, so to speak, to the Imperial Government certain Reserve Powers with regard to legislation in view of the definite financial obligation which Her Majesty's Government would be expected to assume with regard to Federation. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph has expressed sound objection to any Reserve Powers for the Imperial Government, and what is the position? One would expect that a member of a West Indian Legislature who is diametrically opposed to Reserve Powers would, at the same time, insist that the Federation should start with every possible factor for financial success. In other words, if you want to have complete control of the financial affairs, you should be in such a financial position that your financial stability is more or less guaranteed; it therefore becomes strange to hear the same individual who is so much opposed to Reserve Powers, speaking about a loan in the circumstances of West Indian self-government. It should be easily understood that the relationship between the West Indian colonies and the British Government are such as to make a loan out of the question except the loan is in addition to a grant. I sincerely hope that the House will be willing to delete the word "or" in paragraph 3 of the Select Committee's Report.

I do not want to tire the House at this hour with any detailed reasons for this suggestion because I imagine that we have been going on with this matter for a long time and other hon. members want to speak on it and we want to go home; but if you consider the assistance which other Imperial Powers give to their colonies, you will see that the British Government has only begun to make a small beginning with the new arrangements under the Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation. If you consider the steps which the American Government took when granting self-government to the former American Colonies, you will see the absolute absurdity of talking about a grant and/or loan in respect of West Indian Federation. The arrangements made between the American Government and the Cuban Government at the time of the grant of independence to Cuba, and the commercial relationships between the two countries were placed on such a sound footing that the future prosperity of the people was never in doubt. Those arrangements remain today, and with regard to the production of sugar, Cuba has the other West Indian colonies at her mercy. Similarly with Puerto Rico, which is now on the verge of independence, and the Philippines; within the last seven years the American Government has spent no less than three million dollars in the Philippines in materials and cash and to underwrite the self-government of the Philippines. You cannot have countries completely in subjection to you for centuries and then suddenly, because of conditions over which you have no control, throw them into the cold, unfriendly world and tell them that they must struggle for themselves; you cannot do that. The Imperial control to which these colonies have been subjected for years and years has had a great effect on their actual conditions of life; the economic depression, malnutrition and undevelopment of these colonies are due more to

Imperialist domination than to our conditions as having a tropical climate. Every aspect of our economic existence has been conditioned according to the dictates of Imperial regulation; every law made by the Imperial Government for these colonies has been made not for the special advantage of the colonies themselves, but for the advantage of the Imperial Government itself. Let us take the question of devaluation; it has been admitted even in Parliament that devaluation has hit the colonies very hard, but nothing has been done about the matter because it suited the Imperial Government. These colonies are undeveloped industrially and they are economically depressed as against the United Kingdom which is one of the most highly developed countries in the world with economic resources. Throughout our entire existence that state of affairs has continued: we are expected to provide markets for British manufactured goods, to provide the raw materials, and so on, and at long last for reasons with which we need not concern ourselves tonight, the Imperial Government has found it expedient to talk about granting us some sort of self-government and grant other colonies complete independence. I say that it comes not only with bad grace, but it more or less implies complete indifference to the historic relations between the two countries to talk about a grant and/or a loan. Barbados is the only West Indian island to talk about a grant and/or a loan. In Jamaica the Head of the Government began to talk in big terms about the money which the Imperial Government should give to underwrite the Federation; I believe he suggested something like one hundred million dollars. Even recently when the Opposition in the Jamaican Parliament agreed with the principle of Federation and it was decided that active steps should be taken immediately to do something about the matter, the Jamaican House of Representatives passed a Resolution to the effect that in the implementation of Federation adequate finance was needed to assure effective functioning in the development of the area as a whole. In other words, you want economic assistance to implement your self-government; you want to dovetail your political and economic progress and you do not want to do it under financial obligations of such a nature as to make you, in another 25 years or more, financially obligated to the Imperial Parliament which will be forever demanding the right, as the Rance Report suggested, to interfere with your financial affairs. If you see the evil inherent in suggesting any sort of Treasury control in the Federation, you should at the same time appreciate the vital importance of getting all financial assistance possible, not by a debt which you have to pay, but by a grant to which you are entitled. Let us start the Federation on a firm footing.

For all these years the conditions in this colony beggars description; we have had bad roads, lack of social services and so on. Therefore let us have a grant to be allocated between the constituent parts of the Federation; let us be able to provide proper roads, hospital services, educational facilities, public works, development programmes and improve our economic position so that when Federation is functioning for ten years there should not be any fear of any reversion to the Crown Colony system or of anybody talking about Treasury control, because we would have started off in such a manner that we would have guaranteed our financial stability and we would have started off with every prospect of assuming our rightful place among the advanced countries of the world. It is nonsense for this House in 1953 to be talking about a grant and/or a loan; we are the only West Indian colony to talk about a grant and/or a loan. Bustamante talked about an outright gift of one hundred million dollars. (Mr.

MAPP: Nonsense): The honourable member says "Nonsense!" He has no conception of what control of these colonies for the last three centuries has meant to Great Britain. She has had the power to subjugate the world. What was the Barbados share of money on the sale of West Indian sugar by Great Britain to Canada?—Four and a half million dollars for three years! Somebody talked about the generosity of the British Government in giving back this money; it is through shame that Great Britain has been compelled to give back this money to us. The honourable member does not appreciate what the British Government got out of these colonies by way of dollars during the War. Ask what they owe to us now: ask about the sterling balance to these colonies: it is over one million pounds today and if somebody asks for a hundred million dollars for the purpose of underwriting the Federation, certainly we should get it. The only difference is that Britain might be too bankrupt to pay it, although that does not mean that she cannot find the money. She can find money to advance in Greece for the purpose of restoring the monarchy and she can find money to invest in the Balkans. If Great Britain wants to help the West Indies. She will find money to underwrite the Federation. I am serious in suggesting that line 3 of paragraph 3 of the Select Committee's Report should be amended in the manner I have indicated. I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas is sufficiently aware of these things as to appreciate what I am saying.

Let us say that Great Britain does not intend to hamper the West Indies: let us say that the West Indies had their interests put at a disadvantage in favour of the Commonwealth countries at Ottawa by accident: I want the House to appreciate this: even if this harm was done accidentally, none the less it has happened because the interests of the Imperial Government in the colonies could never be the same as those in Commonwealth countries. With the best intention in the world, no country can dominate another country except to the advantage of the dominating country. I say the mere idea that the British Government has not tried to give freedom to some of the colonies by force is in itself a confession that if I keep you under Imperial subjection I must exploit you, but in fairness to the awakened conscience of the world I must no longer do it.

When this question of Federation was first discussed in September last, I suggested the appointment of a Committee—I suggested that the House should go on record as favouring the appointment of a Committee of five persons, three to be nominated by the British Caribbean Territories and the other two to be nominated by the British Government, to make a thorough survey of the economic position of the West Indies and make a report embodying the results of their investigation and study. I suggested that the Report made should contain recommendations as to the form of Constitution and financial and economic assistance which the United Kingdom should render to the Federation of the British West Indies to enable the colonies to obtain the greatest possible degree of economic and social well-being. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that the Caribbean Commission or some Body like that, was at the moment working along lines of this sort: I do not say that that is not correct although we have heard very little about it. I express doubt as to whether the Select Committee would concern itself with correlating facts and figures for the special purpose I had in view even if the Committee were functioning on the matter. It is my conviction that we should have some number of people engaged

in the task of trying to arrive at some fair decision as to the amount of aid which we should get from the Imperial Government to underwrite the Federation. We do not want to do things haphazardly: there are a lot of records and statistics from which you could draw and arrive at some sort of fair allocation as to what we are entitled having regard to the special circumstances of the case. Today I want to suggest even more than what I suggested then; I believe that we should be actually concerning ourselves at the moment with arriving at the conditions for conducting trade between the new Federation and the United Kingdom on a mutually satisfactory level. We do not know where we are with Imperial preference; we do not know where we are with regard to sugar in the next three years. We do not know where we shall be when Cuba starts to dump her sugar again. This year the position with regard to Cuban sugar production is such as to warrant serious consideration on the part of the sugar-producing colonies in the Empire; what we do know is that, whether or not we get any sort of sugar agreement or Imperial preference is retained or amended or abolished, the British manufactured article will enjoy certain preferential protection in the British colonies. Therefore I feel that apart from considering what money we should get to finance the Federation, we should consider at the same time, the conditions under which trade relations should be continued between the Federation and the Imperial Government. Let this Committee correlate all the facts and arrive at concrete proposals with regard to continuing to conduct all business between the two countries on a mutually satisfactory basis. You do not want the boot to be on one foot and not on the other; you want your Federation to be in a position such as to be able to insist on a bi-lateral agreement which is satisfactory to both sides and to see to it that in your commercial relationships the interest of the new Federation is maintained and not, as at present exists, merely the interest of the Imperial Government being kept to the fore. That is, in my opinion, one of the pressing needs of the moment—one with which we shall have to concern ourselves. Let us have things in a proper perspective: we have a fairly good idea of what the colonies want to put them on a good economic foundation and provide them with social and other services. We want to guarantee trade relationship for the Federation.

There are one or two other matters in this Final Report, which are deserving of a little attention, but before I go on to them I want to refer in passing to one or two remarks which have given me a great deal of concern during this Federation debate. One of the speakers is reported to have said that while we are asking for Federation, after having met some of the West Indian leaders, he is not so enthusiastic about it today as in the early stages. That, in my opinion, was a very unfortunate remark; it has been fairly widely reprinted in the West Indian Press, it has been the subject of considerable comment locally and it is naturally bound to cause confusion. Would that we see ourselves as others see us! Numbers of West Indian legislators have come into this Assembly here and decried even our conduct of Government affairs; we have got a similar reputation outside a lot of the colonies and we are only putting our heads in the sand like the ostrich if we think that we are regarded to the same extent as being leaders of the world as we were some time ago. Hon. members in this Chamber have sat with me in this building and heard visiting legislators say in reference to the representation of Barbados at a big Conference that it would have been better if we had clothed a draught-ox and sent it than the representative we had sent.

The Managing Editor of the "Advocate" got a letter from London in which a West Indian stated that he had never met a man who knew so much about everything under the sun and knew so little about anything in the matter of the representation of Barbados; that West Indian wondered as to the legislation we conduct here. A lot of West Indians say the same thing; they were very keen about Federation before they met certain West Indian leaders but they appreciate that we are all passing through a certain stage and in the interest of West Indian unity and nationhood they are willing to forget all the little jealousies and prejudices which would tend to keep us apart. There may be personal dislikes and at no period in the history of the West Indies will you find every politician liking the other. That is impossible; you will find jealousy and rivalry in 1953 as you will find them in 2053, so that whether or not we all admire contemporaneous West Indian leaders is beside the point. The point is whether or not the interest of the West Indies at this stage demands political unity.

I have quoted the honourable senior member for St. Joseph when he claimed that economic progress depended entirely upon political Federation. The situation remains the same to-day as it was at that time: let us press forward to our goal. We are all more or less agreed on the recommendation with regard to the unification of the Public Services, and with regard to Customs Union and what not, but we cannot get these things without Federation. If we want to have our Public Services unified if we want to have freedom of movement between the colonies and what not, we have to forget insular prejudices and personal dislikes and make every possible effort to sink our differences and present a united front in this matter. It is to be expected that in the discussion of this matter some attention will be paid to the particular financial conditions under which the Federation is likely to be started. However, I do not intend to go into any details now because the hour is late, except to say that we cannot afford to forget that in a discussion on this question of Federation the financial position of a lot of the West Indian colonies needs to be given very careful study. The Rance Report and the original Memorandum from the Secretary of State for the Colonies before the Montego Bay Conference paid detailed attention to the then financial state of the Colonies especially the grant-aided Colonies, and it is very unfortunate to have to record that one or two of the colonies which were financial then, are no longer so. In 1947 Grenada was balancing her budget but now the balance is on the red side of the ledger. I think that in the interest of this particular phase of the question, there should be some public pronouncement made in order that the public might be enlightened as to the position. For that, perhaps, I have to await some other occasion. The time is much too late to attempt to start this matter now, it is merely my intention to say that I hope the London Conference will re-consider the question of the site of the Federal Capital. I feel that Barbados possesses considerable advantages which merit our consideration as the Federal Capital. I am very serious about that. Trinidad has its advantages, Jamaica has the University College of the West Indies but I think that Barbados should be entitled to be the site of the Federal Capital. In the Swiss Federation the site of the University, the Head of the Federal Capital and other factors like those were all apparent among the more important matters in giving satisfaction all around. I sincerely hope that in London the delegates will agree to make Barbados the Federal Capital of the West Indian Federation.

There is also the question of Barbados having six representatives instead of four; we should all like to get as many seats as possible, but I am afraid that, as we are all aware, these seats were allocated on the basis of population and it will be very difficult to re-open that question now without causing considerable offence and probably delay in the implementation of Federation.

If there is any general objection when the idea is mooted of giving Barbados more than the already allocated number of seats, I think we should be content with four. That is all I want to say at this stage except to remind honourable members that much, or almost all of what has gone before throughout the entire history of the West Indies should be regarded as a prologue, so to speak—all the economic exploitation; all the attempts to improve the situation; the economic assistance given by Colonial Development and Welfare; all the constitutional advances; all these should be regarded merely as a prologue; and we should make every possible effort towards the attainment within the shortest possible time of a completely self-governing West Indies, sinking all insular prejudices and rivalries, and endeavouring to the best of our ability to put the new West Indian Nation in the forefront of the countries of the world. (Cheers).

Question that His Honour leave the Chair and the House go into committee was put and carried *nem. con.*

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. MILLER the honourable senior member for St. James was appointed to act as Chairman for the rest of the day's sitting.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into committee, Mr. Holder in the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS : Mr. CHAIRMAN,—While I do not wish to say anything which might seem to be a reflection on His Honour the Speaker, the speech of the last honourable member, or a great portion of it, dealt with items in the Report as if we were in committee, and I shall, I hope without trespassing too far on your good nature have occasion to reply to some of the points that he has made. I suggest that we should take these recommendations and pass them one by one with such amendments as the House may feel fit to make. As far as the first paragraph is concerned, I suppose that honourable members will agree that it is merely a formal beginning and that the committee will agree to it as it is. It is merely a repetition of what has been said in the Interim Report and I beg to move that from the beginning to the word "Federation" stand part of the Address.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

Paragraph 2 was read as follows:—

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 did 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.

Mr. ADAMS : Mr. Chairman,—In moving this second paragraph I think that possibly some honourable member will move an amendment. I would suggest the addition after the word "Deportation" of the words, "and the movement of persons other than aliens between the units." Whatever the honourable senior member for St. Philip or anyone else may say, I want to ask the forgiveness of the House

for repeating that my views have not altered. The honourable member knows that this Report appeared on a Friday, and that I wrote an editorial in the *Beacon* next day declaring that the Report should only serve as a basis for discussion. He tried to make a stupid sneer when every member of the Standing Closer Association Committee knew that it was only on that declaration that I signed the Report. I have said, and I am sticking to it, that Barbados should not enter into federation unless we safeguard ourselves with this. What has Barbados to gain by going into federation? In the first place helping in the building of a West Indian Nation, and secondly the possibility of our people going abroad through the whole West Indian area.

When on one occasion in the past the honourable senior member for St. Thomas suggested that the Barbados Government should retaliate against Trinidad when they began the deportation of other West Indians, it was pointed out that we should not try to pass legislation to exclude others because with our redundant population we had to overflow all over the world. At that time the Hon'ble Mr. Butler pointed out in the Trinidad Legislature that what Trinidad was doing was strongly against Federation, and he was told by one of his fellow councillors who has great influence on the Council that federation or no federation Trinidad was going to keep her immigration laws. I know as well as it can be known that that is still Trinidad's attitude, and it is one of the greatest obstacles in the way of federation. It is all very well to get here and say flowery things; but human nature has always been the same. Except in that remarkable country of Switzerland coming together as a federation has not caused rivalries and jealousies to subside. If, as I have the best possible reason to know, Trinidad is still declaring that she is going to retain her discriminatory laws against other West Indians, let us say that we are not going into federation unless there is freedom of movement for the members of every community in the West Indian area. In moving the passing of this Address I am going to suggest that we add a paragraph at the end saying that unless the views expressed in such and such a paragraph are agreed to, this portion of the Barbados Legislature are not going to agree with entering federation.

If we are not going to be strong, Mr. Chairman,—I have every reason for saying this—if we are not going to speak with a united voice on certain things, we are betraying the people of Barbados merely in the name of federation. We must be able to roam about the West Indies, and the rest of the West Indies have as much to gain from a proper spread of population as we have to gain from emigration. Why I feel that freedom of movement should be on the Exclusive List is this: The Federal Parliament must as one of its earliest measures, pass laws respecting emigration, immigration and deportation, and freedom of movement. If these things are placed on the Concurrent List the Federal Parliament may sit for years without passing any such laws.

I do not want to reply to the honourable senior member for St. Philip in the same vein in which he spoke. He was unnecessarily abusive. If he is trying to help the debate could anyone expect him to say the things that he said to-night? He agreed with giving the Governor General reserve powers—

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member can reply later if he likes. If he really means what he says about excluding Guianese—he repeats damnable lies about a meeting of the Executive that never took place. No threat was ever made against Mr. Joshua or anyone else. If the honourable member is genuine about being desirous of seeing this freedom

of movement he will help convince the House that it is essential.

One can say that although this subject might be treated as exclusive there will be nothing to prevent the Federal Parliament from saying that generally speaking, so and so is the law, but that each unit may pass subsidiary laws. You will have to be careful in drafting this, or you may find you have legislation relative to immigration, emigration, deportation and freedom of movement saying that subject to these provisions each unit is competent to make laws affecting the number of persons who may enter on economic grounds. There is a very great danger of our finding ourselves with a federal set-up and still finding that other units can bar the entry of Barbadians on the ground that they are taking away jobs from their own nationals.

The honourable junior member for St. James suggested that some latitude should be given to the delegate who is selected to go to the London Conference, but I think he went a bit too far. As I have said, Sir, this disagreement with freedom of movement is still Trinidad's attitude, and it may be the attitude of other units as well. I am not trying to hit at Trinidad alone, but I have heard it only in connection with Trinidad. I am asking leave to move as an amendment the insertion of the words that I read out earlier. I would like to hear honourable members' views on it. They may not agree with me.

Mr. MAPP seconded.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—In my opinion federation is an issue of such magnitude that I felt that all the parties in this House should have met before and discussed the matter. That is why I have been conspicuous by my silence. I rise merely to say in the absence of the honourable junior member for St. James whom we felt was capable of putting our views—and therefore we did not think it necessary to waste any time—I merely want to reply to the Leader of the House. He has said that the honourable junior member for St. James in putting our point of view suggested that some elasticity or some plenary powers should be given to the delegates who represent Barbados at the London Conference. I want to say here and now, speaking for this party that we entirely agree that in the absence of freedom of movement within the federation no delegate from this country should have the right to say that we agree with federation. In truth and in fact, Sir, 90 if not 98 per cent of Barbadians are not interested in, and do not care anything about federation. What is of interest to them? Freedom of movement. I can say on behalf of this party that I heartily agree with freedom of movement between the units of the federation. That is the only thing from which Barbadians look forward to immediate gain today. Someone may ask if we are going to agree to freedom of movement where people coming into Barbados is concerned. The answer is yes. All that we can offer is sunshine and good sea bathing. How many would want to settle in Barbados compared with those who would want to settle in Trinidad, British Honduras etc?.

I have been very much worried myself about the political bigotry of the Trinidad politicians. I said that they have reasons, because of their oil, sugar and other things, and I can see Trinidadians keeping out the Barbadian because of his competitive spirit and his desire to work. I am bound to agree with the necessity of freedom of movement and I hope the delegate who is selected to go to London will not change his tongue when he gets into the atmosphere of the other West Indian delegates.

I am speaking on behalf of this conservative element on this side of the table. These four members carry a lot of weight in this country. I want to sound a note of warning that much as I agree very heartily with the honourable member in this paragraph, there are other amendments which I wish to make. I want to say too, that I see federation is going to come whether the West Indies wish it or not. It is something which the British Government is throwing on you, and you have got to take it. Whether Barbados goes into it or not, you will have a federation of the people of Trinidad, the Windward and the Leeward Islands. Nothing that we do can stop it. The question is whether we can stay out. I have discussed this with every important person who could give me some enlightenment, and I have come to the forcible conclusion that the most important question is not how much we have to gain from it, but how much we stand to lose if we stay out. That is why I will not agree with anything that will hamper it, except this paragraph. I am fully conscious of what it would mean to any delegate from Barbados who went to London and agreed with federation without this freedom of movement. No freedom of movement for Barbadians to Trinidad, British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica? What would federation be? How will you compensate the Barbadians for the financial assistance which they must give to the federation unless you can offer freedom of movement? I agree with this amendment; but I do not want the honourable member to turn his coat when he gets to London. I am accustomed to West Indian politicians turning their coats in the hospitable atmosphere of England. If the ordinary man in this country cannot raise \$35.00 and say he is going to Trinidad or British Guiana, what will be the use of federation? After all, sir, travelling itself is an experience. If I had never travelled I would not have had the ambition to become a member of this House. Every square foot of land in this country is taken up. Within the last 100 years have you heard of any crown lands? There have been all sorts of schemes in Barbados; but no crown lands. In other places you hear of crown lands.

I do not think there is need to fear that any member will disagree with this paragraph whether he is conservative, socialist, or liberal. Anyone with a full sense of responsibility realises that Barbadians want an opportunity to emigrate. If you hold a mass meeting anywhere in this country people will turn up. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is speaking they will turn up in their thousands. If the honourable senior member for the City is speaking, more will turn up. If the subject is emigration and the honourable senior member for St. Philip is speaking the whole island will turn up. If the honourable senior member for St. George is speaking about industrialisation you will get the whole of Dash Valley.

I do not think it will be necessary for Government's supporters to express any views on this paragraph. I believe that even the honourable senior member for St. Philip who in my opinion made a very interesting and informative speech is bound to agree that freedom of movement is the principal thing as far as Barbados is concerned. Trinidad will say no. They do not want Barbadians. We are serious competitors. Let it be known that this Chamber — the Other Place has refrained from discussing this matter up to now because they want to hear the views of the elected representatives — let it be known that this Chamber says with one voice: When you get to London, after the cocktails and the dinners, and after all the persuasive chat

—because federation is coming; the British Government has got to do it, and everyone knows why. The boys at the U.N. are talking, and in another few years Britain has to be able to show that her colonists have grown up and are no more children. As I was saying, after all the persuasive chat, let it be made plain that Barbados is not agreeing unless there is freedom of movement. Do not let any British spokesman or West Indian politician think that wide awake Barbadians do not know why federation is around the corner. I repeat, let it be known that Barbados with its population, with its circumscribed area, with its one industry and only its sunshine, sea bathing, and the gift of its people to populate the country faster and faster, can only agree with federation if it means freedom of movement.

If history records me as one of the people who expressed a view that caused federation not to go through, I am satisfied to be so recorded. I want the delegate to London to make it clear to everyone there that the Barbados Legislature has laid it down that there will be no federation for Barbados if there can be no freedom of movement, because that is all that we have to gain.

Mr. ADAMS: I want to tell honourable members that where this matter is concerned I do not believe in any delegate having plenipotentiary powers. On this matter the House should express a definite point of view. I do not believe you should accept the Rance Report unless there is a compromise. I repeat that the one and only mistake that I made was not to write a Minority Report. The honourable senior member for the City can rest assured that if I am sent as a delegate there will be no question of compromising on this question of freedom of movement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let us be factual and admit that the only colony which will be more or less largely concerned in this matter is Trinidad. The other two Caribbean colonies which can take West Indians — British Guiana and British Honduras have so far shown no desire to enter federation. So it really means that you are trying to secure freedom of movement to Trinidad. If you find oil here, other West Indians will want to come to Barbados too. I am going to vote for putting this question on the Concurrent List. In the Canadian Constitution immigration is a matter in which both the Federal Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures have concurrent powers. Of course if the Federal Parliament passes an Act on immigration the Provincial Legislatures cannot pass legislation against that Act. In Australia it is on the Exclusive List. The honourable member for Christ Church said that is what we want here. I understood the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to say that insular governments should be in a position to make certain laws or regulations controlling immigration under certain conditions, which means placing it on the Concurrent List.

I want at this stage to say that nowhere in my speech tonight have I defended reserve powers for the Governor General. Some powers will have to be reserved. We cannot defend ourselves. But I said that normally no reserve power should be exercised by the Governor General.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are we dealing with reserve powers now?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, — I do not want to detain the committee very much longer on this matter. Of course we have to agree that Barbadians would like to go abroad. But we have also got to remember that British Guiana and British Honduras are not in the Federation. In Trinidad there

is a decline in the number of people whom the bases can employ, and the industries there are not expected to reach the peak of expansion within 30 years. Again, all over the West Indies the population is rising. At the same time I feel that a matter like immigration should be a matter for the concern of the Federal Parliament to deal with exclusively. I think that getting rid of this insular prejudice should be a *sine qua non* of federation. I think that the matter of immigration should be looked at from a broad federal basis.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to get the point clear. I take it that the intention of federation is to make it possible for land resources and other resources in the area to be redistributed for the benefit of the people in the various colonies which join the federation. As far as I can see, sir, there will be only two benefits which Barbados has to gain. Already we have various West Indian organisations operating and making progress among themselves. We have the Standing Closer Association Committee, and the Regional Economic Committee. We have also the amalgamation of the various Chambers of Commerce. In the economic field there is unity of action already. The only other field of activity to be united is the political field, and I do not think it would be wise to bring about political federation if as a result, we do not make it possible for our redundant population to be able to use some of the land area of British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica or even Trinidad. If it is true, as one honourable member has said, that these larger colonies do not intend joining the federation, I think that Barbados should be reluctant; because the only means of our benefitting would be having an outlet for our population. I think we should be very careful and very chary about joining federation unless we can see clearly the benefits that will accrue to us. I do not think that West Indian politicians who have expressed insular prejudices can be entirely blamed, because we have all been trained that way—to have a sense of responsibility towards the well being of our people.

There is another point which I would like to stress. If big colonies like British Guiana, British Honduras and Jamaica want to stay out, I see no reason why we should want to rush in and father the smaller colonies.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—After so much discussion from time to time on federation, it is comforting to be able to say that we are for the first time really at work on what can be regarded as West Indian Federation. The question is, when will federation become a reality? From the time I was a boy I used to hear my father talk about it. For the last few years we have been having conferences as though there was some force behind the scenes more or less encouraging all this talk. And when it appeared that the matter was becoming stalemated you would get some English newspaper asking what has happened to West Indian Federation. About three years ago there was the question of whether or not Jamaica would come in.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the honourable member to deal with Paragraph 2.

Mr. MILLER: I am dealing with that. I am dealing with freedom of movement. We are for the first time in a position to decide what constitution we will accept. The Rance Report is a wicked, evil instrument. It wants to take away from us the freedom we have enjoyed for so long and push us into some Crown Colony system. I agree with freedom of movement, Sir. What is going to take place at the London Conference? They are relying on British diplomacy as served up by Rance. Our delegate

must go to express the voice of the Assembly which represents the people. We are in a position to claim freedom of movement within the area. That is important; but I want the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to understand that that is not the only issue which must be taken care of.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, — The question of emigration, immigration and freedom of movement is of paramount importance, and I think it should fall within the aegis of the Federal Assembly. It should be on the Exclusive List and not on the Concurrent List. I will go even further and say that not only should there be freedom of movement between the islands, but certain passport restrictions should be removed. One has to bear in mind that in a federal set-up we will all be West Indians. My whole point is that the very essence of federation will be destroyed if there is not this freedom of movement.

What is surprising is that the British Government who are very anxious for us to federate—anyone who can read and understand will see that they are anxious to throw the West Indian burden off their shoulders—has not fostered better communications between the islands, so that West Indians can get to know each other better. If there had been easier communication between the islands the whole idea of federation would have taken root better than it has up to now. The whole trouble is that so few of us know anything about our fellow West Indians.

I think we should make it clear that unless the barriers to freedom of movement are removed, we will not be willing to federate. I would like to see Barbados go into the federation; but I firmly believe that a matter like freedom of movement should be under the control of the Federal Assembly. Trinidad's voice will not be so heard in the Federal Assembly as to be able to perpetuate the old restrictions on immigration. But if the question is on the Concurrent List Trinidad will have the power to do so. I take it that the Federal Assembly, composed of leading West Indian Statesmen, should be broad minded enough to realise that this problem is the main one they must come to grips with, and that they should not view it in the manner in which it would be viewed by the politicians in the local legislatures.

The question that Paragraph 2 as amended stand part of the Address was put and agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, — In moving Paragraph 3 of this Address I wish to assure members of the Committee that this is not a compromise. I suppose it is the sort of thing that people do. You put in "and/or" as a matter of over-cautious legal phraseology. There is no question of compromise. I say that for the benefit of the Committee generally. I am not going to bandy words with the honourable senior member for St. Philip. No one suggests that you should not ask for a grant for what one might call capital expenditure. Where certain colonies are concerned the Imperial Government will probably have, for some time, to be making up deficits. It is no question of not asking for a grant.

If honourable members want to cut out the word "or" they can. Every country has to ask for loans sometime or other. If honourable members wish I would suggest that the better thing would be to insert the words "from time to time loans" after the words "grant and" in line 3. I now make a formal motion to that effect.

Mr. MAPP: I really cannot see the difficulty that some honourable members seem to

see, nor can I follow the amendment. I do not see anything wrong in saying "and/or loans"

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion.

The question was put and agreed to.

Paragraph 3 as amended was passed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, — In moving that Paragraph 4 stand part let me say that this is one of the things on which we are compromising. I do not believe in the two-chamber system. Two thousand years ago it was believed that the old men of the tribe were the repositories of all the wisdom. That is nonsense today. No one can say that the House of Lords is any wiser than the House of Commons, or that the Other Place is any wiser than this House. But at this stage of West Indian History I think it would be difficult to persuade the majority of legislators that there should not be a two-chamber system.

Now it is seldom that I agree with the gentleman who writes in the Sunday "Advocate", but I agreed with the point he made over the radio that the unitary system is better. We may as well face up to the fact, however, that we still have our insular prejudices and jealousies, and I cannot see West Indians agreeing to having one big, central Government making laws for every colony in the whole area. That is the only reason why I agree to this—because I do not think we are ripe yet for the unitary state.

But the two-chamber system does not work to-day. Look at what happened in New Zealand. In general principle the Upper House is supposed to check hasty legislation. The reverse happened in New Zealand. What has happened in many parts of the world is that you get members of the Upper House nominated by the Governor or Governor-General with the advice of the Prime Minister, and he takes the Upper House and fills it with his political party. But in New Zealand the Labour Government was in power so long that the Upper House was full of Labourites, and far from the Upper House putting a check on hasty legislation they thought the lower House was not going fast enough.

I do believe that the House will pardon me for what is a historical digression. I believe that if you do have an upper House with the old men, the wise men, the experts in the various subjects they should not say one word on policy. The elected House should say what the policy is, and the upper House should look after the administrative part—the carrying out of the policy.

I am prepared to subscribe to this paragraph because I do not see that we are likely to get the majority of legislators agreeing to the single-chamber system, because of course, there will be a great number of people in the West Indies who, with Adult Suffrage, are not going to get into the Federal Assembly, and they are going to feel that the Governor-General should be able to make use of them by putting them in the upper House. Regretfully, therefore, I have to compromise.

I think we should insist that the Senate should have a five-year life; the life of the House is to be only five years. If you start off with a purely nominated system and say that these Senators should be there for ten years when the Lower House has a life of five years, we cannot agree with that. For the next half century the life of the Lower House would be five years and we should insist that the life of the Upper House should also be five years.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip knows that the constitution of the Upper House varies in different parts of the world; you get the Upper House elected in some Constitutions, but

from a logical point of view it is absurd to think that if you elect both Houses, the Upper House could claim equal authority with the Lower House. This is not the first time it has been suggested that the Lower House should elect the members of the Upper House for its territory alone, and I see no great difficulty in saying that the Barbados House of Assembly shall elect two persons to be sent to a West Indian Conference. I am putting the case which has been put up by the Select Committee and honourable members can amend it. There is no unanimity on the question of the election or nomination of the Upper House; in some cases the Upper House is elected in other cases it is nominated then, it is hereditary and so on. It is only that the Select Committee felt that if the idea in the minds of the majority of West Indians is that a certain number of people should be automatically selected by the Governor-General, we should make the position more democratic. If the majority of honourable members feel that this paragraph should not remain as it is and the Governor-General should be allowed to nominate members for the Upper House, we could put in the words "on the advice of the Prime Minister." That is the constitutional practice from the British point of view.

In the Rance Report it was suggested that as a qualification for election to the House of Assembly, you must be living in the area for a certain time. If a person lives here for a certain time and then goes abroad, returns, and takes part in politics, he would be all right, ordinarily speaking, because he lived here for a certain time and then went abroad; but if Mr. Churchill were to retire and come to live in the West Indies, he would not be eligible for a seat in the House of Assembly. Let us take any West Indian born person who might have been carried away as a child; according to the Rance Report, he must live here for five years before he is eligible for a seat in the House of Assembly. I do not agree with that.

Inasmuch as this paragraph deals with the Legislature I suggest that we can express our point of view and the Clerk can use simple language. I am rather surprised at the honourable senior member for St. Philip suggesting that we should not agree to the proposals contained in this paragraph of the Report. Think of the whole West Indian area sending two people to the Federal Assembly and forever barring them from participating in the local Legislature! You will not find individual people throughout the West Indian area who are prepared to stand for election and who will pull their weight; you will get people who, to-day, cannot persuade the electorate as a whole to support them, just standing by to step into the shoes of others. Mr. Chairman I am asking the Committee to consider this matter very carefully and agree to the suggestion that for an initial period, at any rate for the first five years, members of the Federal Assembly should be allowed to remain in their local Assemblies. The only logical argument against that proposal is that if a member of the Federal Assembly remains a member of his local Assembly he will try to push his own views for his community. If there is exclusive jurisdiction in the Federal Parliament, he is not doing anything he has failed to do in his own Parliament; he may press for the same thing in the Federal Parliament as in his own Parliament. If he stays away from Barbados and presses the case for sugar in the Federal Parliament how does it affect the position of the West Indies when he is pressing the case for sugar whether he is a member of the local Legislature or not? I do not think

we should idly throw overboard this suggestion of the Select Committee. I have heard it stated that some politicians would not stand for membership of the Federal Assembly; they prefer to remain in their own Parliaments. In that case the whole area would be deprived of the benefit of a man's service because in the Federal set-up he will feel that he could be of more use in his own island at home than in the Federal Parliament. The Select Committee has suggested that members of the Federal Assembly should be permitted to remain as members of local Legislatures for the first five years and if that procedure does not work well, there is no reason to repeat it. I say again that there is nothing to prevent one from pushing his own island whether he is in the Federal Parliament or not. I think we should give this proposal a trial for five years; if it does not work, no harm will have been done, but both the Federal Assembly and the local Assembly will have had the benefit of the parliamentary skill of members.

I would like to ask; how can any Barbadian be honestly content with the Leewards absolutely refusing to come in as a colony? They must come in as a separate island. Antigua has been allocated two seats and Montserrat one. Mr. Bustamante has asked "What about Montserrat?" At the Trade Union Conference in Kingston, "Montserrat" was spelt "Monsterrat" so little did the Jamaicans know about Montserrat. I should like to say that Barbados has a first-class Constitution as compared with other islands; we have never lost our Constitution because the colony could not pay its way, whereas three or four colonies are dependent upon the British taxpayer to balance their budget. The hon. senior member for St. Philip says that he is satisfied with four seats in the Federal Assembly for Barbados, but even Mr. Bustamante has agreed that Montserrat, who wants two seats, and St. Kitts having together the same number of seats as Barbados in a Federal Assembly is nonsense; I am asking for six seats for Barbados. When the allocation of seats was made, the position of the bigger islands was taken together, and the allocation was made like that. We can ask for six seats for Barbados if British Guiana is not in the Federation; I suggest that this is one of the matters on which we might compromise. We should certainly not agree to four seats for Barbados if two of the Leeward or Windward Islands together will also have four seats.

Mr. COX : I agree with a part of paragraph 4 of this Address and I will state the part with which I agree. In the first place, I think that the proposed five-year period is reasonable inasmuch as the life of Parliament will be for five years. When it comes to the question of the Lower House electing the Senators, I cannot agree with that at this stage; that proposal would mean that the Upper House would be merely a duplication of the Lower House. For example; if you have a majority of Labourites in the Lower House, it is obvious that they will elect to the Upper House people whose views are strongly in accordance with Labour views. Equally so if you have a majority of Conservatives in the Lower House; that is why I cannot agree with the Lower House electing the members of the Upper House. I believe that there is only one country in which that is done; that is Northern Ireland. I feel that just as we have the Governor nominating the members of the Other Place, the Governor-General should nominate the members of the Upper House, and we should have a Parliament Act as in the case in England, whereby the House of Lords cannot hold up legisla-

tion for longer than a year. If the Committee decide that the Upper House cannot hold up legislation for longer than six months, as in Jamaica, or for a year, I will agree with that. As we know, the Upper House might claim at some time or other that legislation is hasty but they could not hold it up for longer than a certain period and the Federal Assembly will be able to have that legislation passed. I think that is a perfect brake for the Other Place.

Surely we want an effective Upper House if we are to have an Upper House. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph stressed the point about having members of the Federal Parliament being also members of the local Legislature; he has used an argument which can be considered as partly reasonable, but I am not convinced that we cannot find in the various colonies persons who are interested in legislating for the good of their country, persons who are qualified to legislate if others are elected to the Federal Parliament. However, at this stage, inasmuch as the Federal Parliament will be, in the initial stage, it might be reasonable and sensible to have the members of the Federal Parliament also retaining their seats in the local Legislature for the time being; but I am not convinced that that is the best thing to do; I would like to hear a little more about this matter before I can vote in one way or the other on it. I think we should also agree to Barbados having six seats in the Federal Assembly; but, frankly speaking, I do not think it is reasonable and good politics to have the Lower House electing the Upper House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY : It is now 12.30 a.m. Wednesday, and this paragraph which we are now considering is the most controversial one of the Report. I am sure that there is no hurry to have this Address ready to be sent to the Governor or anybody else later on today, and when we are dealing with a matter as important as this is, there is no point in dealing with it at a stage when we are tired and cannot think clearly and freely. I think the hon. senior member for St. Joseph must welcome criticisms and suggestions; I agree with some of the things which the hon. member has said but there are many things with which I do not agree. At this stage, I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again; I am suggesting to the hon. member that he should accept that motion.

Mr. MAPP : I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD : In connection with the question of the allocation of seats for the Federal Assembly, I should just like to make it clear that what I said was that since the allocation would be done on a population basis we should not agree with four seats for Barbados, because every now and then the question should come up for review.

The question that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS : I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 17th day of February, 1953, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. COX : I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 17th day of February, 1953, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.