

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1951—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th February, 1953.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*),
Messrs. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., J. E. T.
BRANCKER, Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M.,
Messrs. M. E. COX, T. O. BRYAN, F. C. GODDARD, J. A.
HAYNES, B.A., J. C. MOTTLEY and E. St. A. HOLDER.

Prayers were read.

PAPERS LAID

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

Financial Aspects of Federation of the British West Indian Territories—Despatch with enclosures from Comptroller for Development and Welfare.

Mr. ADAMS: On behalf of the honourable junior member for St. Peter, I beg to lay the following:—

Quarterly return of transactions in Rum to 31st December, 1952.

PETITION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,— I beg to present a Petition from the Reverend Frank Collins Pemberton *et al* praying the House to pass a Bill to incorporate "The St. Paul's and St. Ambrose Home Association." The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$158,482 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. 39, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolution of which I have just given notice.

Messrs. SMITH and MAPP entered the House and took their seats.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S NOTICE

A Private Member's Notice was given as follows:—

Mr. GODDARD: A Bill to incorporate "The St. Paul's and St. Ambrose Home Association."

QUESTION

Mr. BRYAN: To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:

1. Is Government aware of the fact that the owners of an area of land situated at St. Stephen's Hill and Cave Hill, containing by admeasurement 21½ acres, have decided to sell out the same area in lots in the open market.

2. Will Government consider the advisability of purchasing the same for the purpose of (a) securing the tenancy of the above-mentioned occupiers and (b) further developing the area so as to accommodate some of the hundreds of applicants for whom no house spots are available at the Pine and Bay Estates?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. GODDARD, seconded by Mr. HAYNES, a Bill to incorporate "The St. Paul's and St. Ambrose Home Association" was read a first time.

ADDRESS *RE* BRITISH WEST INDIAN FEDERATION

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. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee on the consideration of the Reports, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the last occasion when the House was in Committee on the consideration of these Reports, paragraph 4 of the proposed Address was under consideration.

Mr. MAPP: As a member of the Select Committee which considered this matter, I agree with most of these recommendations, but this is a recommendation which the Committee first considered last year and it was included in the Interim Report. Although I have not forwarded any Minority Report, I stated in the House on a previous occasion that in so far as the composition of the Senate is concerned, I am in agreement with the suggestion that at least one of the members proposed to represent a constituent unit of the proposed Federation should be elected by the elected members of the various Legislatures and one other member should be nominated by the Governor General in consultation with the Federal Prime Minister. If we are holding to the idea of having a Second Chamber I still feel that it is a good safeguard to have some nominated persons in it rather than have a mere replica of elected Chambers; that is what I feel the Senate will become if all its members are elected by the various Legislatures. Politics being politics and elected members being elected members, I feel that you are apt to get just a Second Chamber which reflects more or less the views of the Lower House. What, in fact, I would ask is that there should not be any Second Chamber at all if it will be only a pale reflection of the House of Assembly; for that reason I feel that some of the members should be nominated. I am no advocate of the necessity for nominated Chambers; I feel that they can be very useful in bringing to bear certain considered opinions on legislation passed by the elected Chambers, but I do not think that they are absolutely necessary. I feel that in some cases, nominated Chambers are merely there to obstruct legislation with which they do not agree, and if you are going to have them at all, I think you should only have them on the basis that you are putting in them some body of opinion which you may not necessarily have in elected Chambers. In that particular case, that body of opinion would hardly ever be represented where the Chamber is wholly elected by the elected members of the various Legislatures in the Federation. Some nominated members in the Second Chamber can bring some experience and wisdom to bear on the deliberations of the Federation as a whole.

I agree entirely with the suggestion that members of the Federal Assembly should be permitted to remain as members of the local Executive Councils or Executive Committees. As far as I can see, this Federation as it is proposed in the recommendations of the Rance Committee, will not have any power to impose taxation, and if it does not have that power, it means that the local units will retain much of their present power to guide the destinies of the people within the area and to carry on most of the present paraphernalia of Government which are at present carried on in the various territories. If that is so, I cannot see that there are sufficient members in the various Legislatures to carry on the affairs of Government or most of them, to be retained by the local units and at the same time represent the Federal area.

I think it is a very wise safeguard to allow members of the Federal Assembly to sit in the local Legislatures for the first five years. Later on we could give more power to the Federation, and in that case, since the local Legislatures will not have much power, you could very well bring about a change and make it obligatory on members who may be members of local Legislatures or Governments, to give up seats so long as they are elected

on local bodies. I think it is very dangerous to agree to all the proposals in the Rance Report; Barbados has 200,000 people and if we are to carry on in much the same way as we are carrying on at present planning our financial policy or retaining the power to impose income tax, I cannot see whence we are going to get representatives who will do the job properly and at the same time have other representatives. I say that for the first five years at least, we should allow members who may be elected to the Federal area to be elected to the local Legislatures. This Federation is really a weak Federation; it is not like that of the United States or Canada. You cannot impose income tax on people in the area if these proposals are carried out. There will be Customs Union and the Administration will be a unified one, but the power to tax people directly, the power to plan financially in the interest of each territory will still be retained locally and it would be a good safeguard for the people of the area to say that members who are elected to the Federal Government should also be allowed to retain seats in the local Legislatures and the local Governments. I feel that we would be cutting off the very limb on which we are now standing if we agree to the proposal in the Rance Report to the effect that if a person is a member of the House of Assembly, he should resign his seat in the Assembly if he is elected to the Federal Assembly. I do not think that the time is ripe for that; we are a small community, we are still groping our way and learning all the time and we should not suddenly rob ourselves of much of the talent which we have in our midst by agreeing to a proposal such as that which has been recommended in the Rance Report. I therefore agree with the suggestion that members of the Federal Assembly should not be called upon to resign their seats in the local Legislatures.

Mrs. BOURNE and Mr. LEWIS came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. MAPP was speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: I thank the honourable member for the last part of his Address, but I am inflicting myself on the House to ask honourable members—at least the Socialist members of the House—whether they are going to do what the honourable member has just unfortunately just done, that is, to repeat parrot-like, the traditional argument which the vested interests have always used in the defence of a Second Chamber. I never expected that to come from the honourable member. We are either living in a democracy or not; we are either bringing a democratic outlook into being or not. What justification is there for giving one man the right to put in a Senate people who cannot convince the public that they are worthy of passing laws for them? There is no justification for saying that nomination should be perpetuated; why didn't the honourable member come straight out and say: "Let us forget a Second Chamber, or if we have a Second Chamber let that Second Chamber not be in a position where it can interfere with the democratic process." It is extraordinary that people do not see the utter stupidity of their argument when they use the argument about putting a brake on the Lower House. You are saying that the Lower House is going too fast and you must put a brake on it; that is an excellent argument for the enjoyment of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew, but not for democratic people today. It is not a question of putting somebody in the Other Place since he failed in being a member of the House; it is either that both Houses must reflect the will of the people or you are applying a dead weight to the progress of democracy. I have strong views on this mat-

ter that no Upper House has any right to dictate policy, but my views may be ahead of this generation and in any Conference dealing with the Federal set-up the majority may not agree with me; therefore I am asking for other expressions of opinion.

How can you justify the use of the expression about putting a brake against hasty legislation unless you imply that the Lower House is progressive and and you must put a brake on it? The only justification for that would be that the Prime Minister could say to the Governor or Governor-General that "A", "B", "C" or "D" must be in the Upper House and like-minded people of his Party. Today in Canada, it is obvious that the Senate is only a reflection of the House of Commons; in New Zealand the Upper House has a Labour majority; the Prime Minister always had Labourites in the Upper House. Imagine my suggesting to the Governor to put a stevedore labourer in the Other Place! But that has happened in New Zealand; the Conservatives, however, have abolished the Upper House because it has ceased to be a brake on legislation. I am surprised at the honourable senior member for St. Michael who spoke about allowing the Upper House to have a six months' brake; any brake is bad if the Lower House says that democracy is so and so. The point whether you want to go on with a brake; you cannot believe in democracy and also believe in a brake, either a brake selected by heredity or one selected by the Governor-General.

I have inflicted this further speech on the House because I am asking the House when we come to decide on the wording of this particular portion of paragraph 4 to say that this method which has been suggested by the Select Committee is not so preposterous. Perhaps the wording is unfortunate and I suggest that the word "territorially" be inserted before the word "elected." The position is that the people of Barbados elect the House of Assembly which has the confidence of the people and then the House of Assembly elects two people to go to the Senate. It is difficult to see any improvement on that suggestion; each territorial area elects its own Senate. When the people of Barbados vote for the House of Assembly of Barbados, they will know that they are delegating to the House the voting for two Senators; in that proposal there seems to be less danger of making a mistake than if the people themselves elected the two Senators. The members of the Other Place are now there by virtue of the Governor's choice, not by the choice of the electors; you elect 24 members to this House and 15 will be elected to the Other Place and those 15 members will also represent the people if they are elected by the representatives of the people. There is hardly anything more democratic than the method of letting people who have the confidence of the electors make the selection for the Upper House, and that is the best possible solution to this difficult problem which has been worrying the world for at least more than a century and a half. If you are keeping a Second Chamber, what is the best method of selecting it? I suggest that this method of selection by the elected Body has fewer disadvantages than any other method which human ingenuity has so far contrived. I suggest to honourable members that they express their point of view because, after all, if this Assembly is outspoken and reasonable in its views, it will carry more weight than any other Body which may send delegates to the London Conference. That is because of our constitutional position in the Caribbean area.

Messrs. VAUGHAN and CRAWFORD came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. ADAMS was speaking.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am not differing from the honourable member who has just sat down; I am more revolutionary in this respect than he is. I am not a believer in having a Second Chamber at all; as you elect a Body which has certain powers within itself and you delegate to that Body the authority to put somebody else in power, that is where you have a sort of indirect method of evading the voice of the people. What I do not like about the House nominating the members of the Other Place is that the House will be nominating people from outside its Body. What I am afraid of is this; if in this Chamber people are nominated for the Senate, then the ballot box would become a farce; and if you have a system of elimination you will have to know who want to be nominated and who will be the proposers. What I feel is that if you are going to have a Senate you should limit the powers of the Senate, and say what the powers of the Senate should be. Having the Senate elected by the people could not give it any more power; I cannot see the argument in the Rance Report that if you allow the people to elect the Senate, the Senate should have the same power as the Lower Chamber has. I do not like the idea—I say it without any reflection on the House—of the House of Assembly electing the Senate; if honourable members can see any virtue in the House electing people to the Senate, I do not see that there is any use in the House electing the Senate at all. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has quoted the case of New Zealand where the Legislature is going on all right and there is no Upper House; we are really now at the stage where the Other Place can decide what should be. We have difficulties but I hope I do not see any Federal Constitution where it is necessary to have an Upper House at all; if you have this Territorial Legislature, that is about as much as you want. We have to get away from the idea that there are not always people who are willing to come forward and who are better able to serve the people than those who come forward; in any community you will have more people outside who have ability to be inside a Chamber like this, than those who are inside the Chamber. If we make a mistake, we can rectify it. Are we going to say that the Other Place should be the Body to create policy?

The difference between the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and myself in this matter is that I, personally, am not in favour of a Senate; you want to have power and authority but at the same time you are saying that you want somebody to check the power you have. And the Other Place is going to do that. The only reason for our having a Second Chamber is because there is a Second Chamber in England; England is maintaining a Second Chamber and as long as England is doing that, it is all right. I do not believe in that; having a Second Chamber is purely historical and there is no logic attached to it. I have seen many instances where colonies are run fairly well with a single Chamber. I do not see where it is necessary in a Federal Constitution to have a Senate; it is a saving of money not to have any Senate. The honourable Leader of the House has said that his suggestion would be more democratic than giving the Governor-General the authority to nominate the Senate, but I feel that if you must have a Senate, let the members face the tape. The Vestry do not have the same authority as the House of Assembly; their powers are limited. Our powers are defined and we have to abide by the powers which have been given to us. I feel that if the honourable member's suggestion is carried out, people will feel that the Senate will be subordinate to the House of Assembly; it will mean that the day the

Senate does not do what we feel should be done, out they will go. I also feel that the number of people in the House is too small and restricted and there may be too much prejudice or bias against candidates; a man who is not favoured for his politics will never be nominated. Some people will not get a vote to the Chamber no matter how suitable they are for it; the reason is that there is a prejudice against them. I believe that the best thing for us to do is to leave out the Senate and let the Federation run a single Chamber Parliament.

MESSRS. BARROW, WILLIAMS and TALMA came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. F. L. WALCOTT was speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking the honourable member if he will come to the logical conclusion and say that we do not want any Senate. I want honourable members to put their point of view because if I go as a delegate to the Conference I want to be able to say that such and such is our point of view. If we are saying that the Upper House should be elected by this or that method and we fundamentally and really do not believe in it, let us say so. I suggest that if we are not in favour of having the two Chambers, let us say so.

Mr. MAPP: I do not want to carry on this debate interminably, but if you agree to having a Second Chamber at all, what is the sense of saying that it should be elected by the elected members of the local Legislatures? What is the sense of making it a pale reflection of a House of Assembly? What is the use of trying to defend it on the grounds that if a Second Chamber is necessary then it should be elected rather than nominated? If we feel that a Second Chamber is not necessary, then let us say so. If you agree to the establishment of bi-cameral Legislature then you should have nominated members in the Second Chamber. The powers of the House of Lords today are almost nil; if we want safeguards we should have revising Bodies to go through legislation and revise it. (Mr. ADAMS: Move an amendment that the House does not agree with the establishment of the two Chambers). I am suggesting that the wording of this paragraph should be changed; I beg to move that the third word "agrees" occurring in line 1 and the whole of lines 2 and 3 be deleted, and that after the first words "The House", the words "does not agree" be inserted.

Mr. BARROW: I am seconding that motion.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rose to speak.

Mr. BARROW: The motion could not be allowed unless it was seconded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable senior member for St. George can speak.

Mr. BARROW: In seconding the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, I will say that I was surprised to see that the Select Committee thought it expedient that for the working of the Federal set-up we should have a bi-cameral Legislature. Certain arguments were put forward by the signatories to the Rance Report; I would like to draw to the attention of honourable members that the Conference held at Montego Bay in 1947 was, to the best of my recollection, in favour of a uni-cameral and not a bi-cameral Legislature. It is true that no specific lines of demarcation were drawn by the Montego Bay Conference. The Montego Bay Conference was comprised of the representatives of the people in the Caribbean area who, for the most part, were elected by popular vote. The first argument put forward by the Committee was that a Second Chamber would have the right to revise any hasty or unwise legislation which had been passed by the Lower House. If we pause there, we will see that the innuendo is that the people who are elected to the Lower "Lower Chamber" is one which is deprecated—by Chamber or rather the House of Assembly—the term

popular vote are extremely likely to be irresponsible people. The innuendo is that the people of the West Indies do not know what they want and are likely to be irresponsible people who will pass legislation which is against the interest of the people who put them in power. I say that unless you are electing members for all time, the people can vote them out in the same way as they voted them in. The secret of the revisionary powers entrusted to the Upper Chamber is to allow the people who are not directly responsible to the rank and file in the West Indies, to impede social and economic legislation in the interest of the Chambers of Commerce and people interested in the territories and owing their allegiance not to the people in the area, but to a Governor-General who, we all know, is most likely to come from outside the area altogether.

As far as the argument as to the revisionary aspect of the powers of the Second Chamber is concerned, I consider it a most reactionary argument; on paper it seems plausible, but when clear scrutiny is brought to bear on its ramifications, I suggest that all men of goodwill and all men who have had the slightest acquaintance with the development of bi-cameral Legislatures in all parts of the world—right here in this House we have had first-hand experience of how well our aspirations on behalf of the electorate can be frustrated on the altar of this facetious argument. When you come to the second argument as to each constituent unit having equal representation as being indispensable for the preservation of unit identity, the argument seems to me to be more plausible. To me, the best way in which the identity of the unit could be preserved is by the machinery of the division of powers which has been set out in the Report. As long as there is some provision for the different spheres of influence as between the Federal Government and local or territorial Government, then it is my opinion that you already have effective machinery at your disposal in the Constitution for the preservation of the identity of the particular unit; but as to the question of putting two people from each territory into a single Upper Chamber, far from preserving the identity of the unit, I suggest that that is likely to give way to tactics of manoeuvring, filibustering and pressure grouping, because you will have units lobbying and grouping which will postpone or defeat legislation which they rightly or wrongly considered was passed against their interests in the Lower House. That also, to me, is a direct antithesis of the principle of Federal Government. To answer the argument put forward by the Standing Closer Association Committee I would say immediately that we should carry out the spirit of the Montego Bay Conference in 1947 and not the spirit of the Rance Committee, and I have great pleasure in seconding the motion that this House is of the opinion that there should be only one Chamber. All the arguments which are set out by constitutional lawyers and historians in the large countries of the world as to the efficacy of bi-cameral Government are only rationalisations of a position which those same constitutional lawyers and historians have come along and found, and which they want to carry on for the detriment of posterity. We are now standing on the threshold of a new principle and the mere antiquity of such a system is our recommendation for a uniform and vigorous nation which the West Indies are about to become. We must have it demonstrated that full democracy is in the principle of uni-cameral legislation.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I have listened with some surprise to the views of certain honourable members with regard to bi-cameral Legislatures. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is never tired of telling this House and the island in general that in the Colonial Empire the Constitution of Bar-

bados is the very best, and in this very debate he has repeated that view in the strongest of terms, stating that we have had a bi-cameral Legislature for 300 years. It is therefore passing strange that he should now favour the single Chamber Governments of Trinidad, Grenada and other places whose Constitution in his own words he somewhat despised. In many of the single Chamber Legislatures you will still find the principle of nomination. There seems to be some confusion between the principle of nomination and democracy; one of the pinnacles of democracy in the world is nomination to the Judiciary. If we succeed in having a single Chamber in the Federal Government we will be creating a precedent. I say it without fear that if you want a challenge to democracy let a single Chamber be entirely elected; if you want a single Chamber you must accept the principle of nominated members. I am not saying that the second Chamber must be nominated but I am saying that there must be a second Chamber. We have the American Constitution which, according to the late Harold Laski, is the most democratic in the entire world and you have a second Chamber entirely elected by popular vote. Laski writes in glowing terms of the Senate of the United States more so than of any other Body in the entire world. None of the examples quoted are Federal systems. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has boasted of our 300-year-old Constitution with its two Chambers as being the best in the whole history of the Colonial Empire and therefore I am surprised at his speech today. I am opposed to an entirely elected single Chamber for a Federal Government; we must have the principle of nomination. I think that the best form of Legislature for a Federal Government would be a nominated second Chamber with limited powers; we want in the Federal Government a Second Chamber with limited powers for a period of five years.

When some honourable members talk about the will of the people, that is just a figment of the imagination; they have had no means whatever of discovering in certain issues, what is the will of the people when they talk about the will of the people. They talk about their own will which they would like to be the people's will; the people are not so politically educated as yet as to be interested in certain conceptions and ideas of certain people. It is passing strange, I repeat, to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, speak in favour of having a single Chamber for the Federal Constitution; it is more strange as coming from the honourable member than from any other member of this House, that a place like Trinidad should be followed in a Federal Constitution. I will not vote for any single Chamber unless it contains the principle of nomination; I am in agreement with having a Second Chamber with limited powers for a limited period of time.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The question is whether we should have a uni-cameral or bi-cameral Legislature. The reason why you have a Second Chamber is for the purpose of reconciling jealousies. If you have a second Chamber you can always take the safeguard of cutting down the powers of that Chamber to as little as possible. I think that quite a lot of the heat which has been generated as regards having a Second Chamber is beside the point; the time has probably come when we should abolish the Second Chamber, but the argument about abolishing the Second Chamber is not valid when we are talking about Federation.

Mr. GODDARD: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the honourable junior member for St. Peter, the honourable senior member for St.

Thomas and the honourable senior member for St. George have lost sight of a very important point, and that is the purpose of a Second Chamber in a Federal Government: it is to protect one region from the other. In a Federation where Jamaica has 16 seats in the Lower House and Barbados has 4 seats, it is in our interest to have a Second Chamber. To have a Second Chamber in a Federal Government where you have big units and small units is absolutely correct and essential; we do not want to be playing into the hands of Jamaica. I am 100% in favour of a Second Chamber because that will be in the interest of Barbados. I am hoping that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas will withdraw his motion because I do not see that we have anything to gain from not having a Second Chamber in Barbados. The Second Chamber can be either elected by the people or nominated; I believe in a bi-cameral Legislature; we must have a bi-cameral Legislature in a Federation of the West Indies.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. BARROW: It seems to me that the ship "Federation" is extremely likely to founder on the rocks of insular prejudices. We are discussing a matter affecting the destiny and relationship of our fellow-citizens in the Caribbean and we have the facetious argument which has just been brought forward by the honourable junior member for Christ Church! On both sides of the table we have been guilty of appealing to sentiment as to what would not suit Barbados, but I am making a last appeal to honourable members to keep the issue before them. If we are going to federate we must stop thinking what Barbados has to lose, and all we have to lose is domination by certain vested interests. The minute we introduce arguments such as those we have had throughout this debate, those insular arguments, then our whole approach to the problem of Federation is wrong. The sooner we approach Federation from the aspect that we are prepared to give up something and not to think of insular rights, the faster will this ship "Federation" continue on its journey and we will accomplish our real goal, that is, the building of a nation.

The argument which the honourable junior member for Christ Church has brought forward is the very objection I took to having a bi-cameral Legislature. A nominated Body like that will seek to interfere with the power which has been bestowed upon the elected representatives of the people in the House of Assembly by delaying and defeating measures, and most of those measures will either be measures of a financial nature or measures which will interfere with property interests. If you are going to have a Second Chamber with these powers, I am of the opinion that that is undemocratic, and if the Second Chamber has not got such powers, I am of the opinion that it is useless. I want to make that point very clearly. The honourable junior member for St. John made some mention of the late Professor Laski; he was quite correct in his statement that the late socialist was a great believer in the American democracy and as regards the American Senate—

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of explanation. I said, and I am prepared to stand by it, that Laski, expressed that in his opinion the American Senate was one of the greatest political Institutions in the history of the world.

Mr. Chairman. I do not think we need argue any further. I was speaking from first hand experience, and if what the honourable member said

is true he has become wise in his old age. Such conversation as I have had with him on this aspect of the matter revealed that he almost despised the expert. But I knew that he was a man who despite his advancing years was always susceptible to better arguments. I do not think that it is fitting for this Chamber with its great socialists—and we know that the “deep liberal” on the other side of the table has probably agreed with many of the things which we socialists uphold—I do not think it is fitting for us to wrangle over a person's views; but if that person, now departed, should be cited to support your arguments you should be accurate in your quotations from the person. That is why I think he should be defended, because he is not here to defend himself.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—I think that human nature being what it is it is almost meaningless for the honourable senior member for St. George to speculate on the possibility of the West Indian Federation foundering on the rocks of insular prejudice. If he needs any illustration on how possible it is, sir, he needs only reflect upon the remarks used in this very Chamber about a fortnight ago. Therefore we have to start off with the assumption that there must be and will be for some time a certain amount of insular prejudice and jealousy among the component parts of the Federation, and we have to direct every possible effort to safeguarding the Federation from the inherent dangers which will result from such prejudice and jealousy.

What I think that honourable members are mixing up is this: they are confusing the principle of the desirability of having a second chamber in any system of government with the special principle of having a second chamber in a federal system. Most of us will agree that in a colony like this a second chamber is not only an anachronism, but is superfluous. The same argument can apply to Great Britain; but it would not apply with equal force to the United States of America, or the Federal Parliament of Australia or the proposed Federation of the West Indies. Because in the early stages the second chamber will be regarded as the bulwark of the states' rights. The honourable junior member for Christ Church and the honourable junior member for St. Lucy were very careful to point out this: In your lower Federal House Jamaica with 16 seats, Barbados with four, and a Leeward Islands colony with two, human nature being what it is, there must be a certain amount of apprehension on the part of the islands with such a small representation in the Legislature that there is need, at least at the beginning, for something approximating equal representation in some part of the legislature.

As I said last week, sir, the United States Senate is comprised of two members from every state in the Union. New York has two seats, and a small state like Rhode Island also has two seats for the simple reason that legislation cannot be enacted in the final stages unless the smallest and the biggest states have equal representation. We have very small representation in the lower House. It is therefore in our own interest, in my opinion, at least in the early stages of the Federation, to have a second chamber in which each part of the Federation has equal representation. Like the honourable junior member for St. John I find it very easy to recall how at one time we were told that Trinidad is the most backward colony in the West Indies and at another time that we must follow their constitution, forgetting that at least in the beginning of Trinidad's advance towards self-government they have a single chamber legislature with a nominated element and an elected element. Much as we oppose a nominated element, it was in-

cluded to safeguard, it was felt, the rights of all sections of the community. I agree that if we were to adopt paragraph 4 of this report and say that the House of Assembly should elect the Senate it would be stupid to have a second chamber.

Mr. ADAMS: I know that as it reads that is the impression which may be got. But it is not proposed that the Federal Assembly will elect anyone to the Senate. The Trinidad Legislative Council will elect two members to the Senate and so will the Barbados Legislature. Instead of the electors of each territory electing both the lower and the upper House, the electors of Barbados will elect members for the lower House—the Federal Assembly—and the 24 members of the House of Assembly will then elect two senators for Barbados, and the Trinidad Legislative Council will do the same for Trinidad etc. The honourable senior member for St. Philip was in the House when I suggested that if the words “territorially elected” were put in it would make it clear. No local legislature elects the whole senate. It only elects the island's two senators.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is no precedent for that in any part of the world. (A MEMBER. Therefore it is wrong.) I am not saying that in consequence it is wrong. The nearest thing approaching it is the Northern Ireland set up, and even in that set up both Houses elect the senators. In other words, to apply the principle of Northern Ireland you will have to give the Barbados House of Assembly and the Barbados Legislative Council, sitting jointly, the right to nominate the two senators for Barbados. I want to submit that we cannot afford to experiment with such a radical departure from established precedent in the establishment of such an important matter as West Indian Federation. After a while we can try it if we like. But if we want to safeguard the future of the West Indian Federation let us start with our best foot forward. We can therefore amend paragraph 4 to suggest the establishment of the upper House for the first five years.

I am making a motion that paragraph 4 read as follows: “The House agrees with the establishment of a bi-cameral legislature for the first five years, and thereafter for such period as the Federal Legislature shall enact; the members of the Senate to be nominated by the Governor-General from panels presented (I am adding this to meet the objection of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph) by the territorial legislatures.” You can go on then as it appears in the last three lines. I have suggested “territorial legislatures” so that a colony with a single chamber set up can do it. We or any other colony with a bi-cameral legislature will present a panel of names to the Governor-General from which he will select the two members of the Senate to represent the particular colony in that Senate. That is how I feel. I am not thinking in terms of the West Indian Senate being entirely a bunch of reactionaries whose sole aim and purpose will be the blocking of progressive federal legislation. It is easy to get around that by defining strictly the powers of the body. In order to protect federal rights for the beginning of the Federation and to make everyone feel that they are starting off with equal representation no one could disagree with having an upper chamber nominated along the lines that I have suggested.

Mr. ADAMS: I semi-apologised for making a second speech earlier. But I am not going to apologise now. Let me again warn the House that a Federal Constitution cannot easily be changed. We are talking about five years. I am going to suggest that we make a straight issue now of this matter of two chambers or one chamber. If the vote is in

favour of two chambers we will say two chambers. I am going to take advantage of the fact that I am on my feet to say that the two chamber system is a historical accident. (A MEMBER: No.) Why did the two-chamber system start? It started at a time in history when it was necessary to protect yourself from some maurauding neighbouring tribe. The young men of your tribe had to be out fighting. The women had to stay behind and cook the food, and the old men who were too old to defend the community by force of arms sat down and passed laws. Go back in history and deal with Western Europe because you may say that the East was ruled by despots for a number of years. So let us take the history of western civilisation. All modern civilised states that have even the semblance of democratic government still try to preserve the semblance of rule by the people by establishing a Senate or legislature. The mere existence of two assemblies is no indication that the working of that system of government is sound.

In short, sir, I defend my first sentence by saying that the two-chamber system is a historical accident. I believe that all 24 of us members of the House of Assembly are Democrats, although the ideas of the honourable senior member for the City and those of the honourable junior member for Christ Church about democracy may differ from ours. But the will of the majority is expressed as freely as possible by the secret ballot. It is democracy reduced to simple terms. If we believe in that, how in the name of all that is good and gracious can you perpetuate any theory of a nominated chamber unless the nomination principle is so integrated into the democratic principle that the democratic principle is being voiced and the will of the majority shall ultimately prevail and not that the minority should be silenced. I like to hear those three honourable members; but God forbid that they should prevail over the voice of the majority. But we should hear them whether they talk sense or not. They even make us sometimes modify some of our views. But the majority must ultimately prevail. It would be tyranny, apart from the fact that we would be materially deprived of a treat, it would be tyranny to prevent the honourable member for St. John from peeling forth on the taxing of domestic cats and dogs.

We have always to remember that we are in a British set up, and that is the only reason why we have heard some of the speeches that we have heard this evening from some democrats. We are beginning to get out of it in a democratic way, but not all of the old beliefs are yet dead. That is why I used the words "historical accident." For historical reasons they had to set up Crown Colonies. You have people under the rule of the sword. You go to the Gold Coast and to Sierra Leone etc. You get what you allege to be inferior and superior races. You get a lot of—from your angle—primitive natives, and you have to make rules to govern them. Whom do you choose? To-day there is at least one British territory in which the Governor alone makes laws. We still have such a condition existing in the British Empire. Then you get to a stage where the Governor gets into the Executive Council and nominates whom? The Admiral, the Bishop, the leading planters and merchants etc. And because such a system exists some honourable members are saying we should perpetuate it. It might have been excellent in 1830. Anyone who defends the nomination system is living 100 years behind the times.

In the old days when the two-chamber system started the old men were supposed to be the wise men. The Witemagemott was supposed to be a body of wise people. The upper Houses were supposed

to have in them all the wisdom of the ages, and we are asked to perpetuate that belief. No democrat should be heard to say that. This is not Barbadian vanity; but we have an opportunity of showing to future generations the best form of federal government. The old saying that we stand on the shoulders of our fathers and therefore see further than they is true. All the mistakes made in the Australian, Canadian and American federal systems are there staring us in the face. I am asking honourable members not to make a mistake. In a democratic society the system of nomination is wrong unless it is integrated in the democratic system. If a Prime Minister who ex hypothesi has the confidence of the Assembly—and the Assembly ex hypothesi has the confidence of the electors—says put so and so in the upper House that is the only way you can defend the system of nomination. As soon as you do that you fall back into what is obvious all over the world—that the upper House must be a reflection of the lower House, or you will get to a stage where—it may happen in this island if we get more Maude Bills chucked out—as soon as you get a perpetual conflict between the two chambers the Upper House will be abolished.

Why make the mistake again? It is not vanity to say that we can profit by the mistakes of a federal system already in existence. Members of the upper House who are nominated often say that they do not have to please anyone. Only a few years ago a member of the Other Place boasted that he did not have to look electors in the face and please them. Therefore I suggest to honourable members that if they feel that the dangers of the two-chamber system are great, and they do not want another federal parliament repeating the mistakes of former ones—the Americans saw the danger. Some Americans even wanted a king. They tried to get out of the danger by electing and appointing two bodies with equal authority from the electors. How can one say, "I represent the people?" Each represents the people. As I was saying, Sir, do not let us repeat that mistake by saying election. Who in this world will say that because Great Britain from 1066 has had hereditary members in the House of Lords the West Indies should have the same system? Some members here, like the honourable junior member for St. John are not married. When you have 16 Peers and a half dozen of the 15 do not worry to get married the system will break down.

I repeat, Sir, that the principle of the upper House cannot be defended unless it is established by democratic elections, and then you fall back into the danger that the upper House becomes a reflection of the lower House. If that will happen why worry with it at all? Take the argument that you can restrain the powers of the upper House for six months. That is even worse. The honourable senior member for St. Philip used that argument. He also said that unlike the case of Rhode Island and New York, which have equal representation in the Senate, Jamaica with its large population might control the West Indian Senate. If that is so what will be the value of imposing restrictive powers on the Senate for six months only? The House of Lords has the same power. The Labour Government had so many things to do that they did not abolish the House of Lords. But if the Labour Government did not have to keep their heads above water over the question of nationalisation they would have abolished the House of Lords, at least as a policy-making body. It is one thing to use the wisdom of old and experienced men to tell how best to carry out your views; but it is another matter to have them tell you what your views should be.

I do not intend, Sir, to monopolise, or seemingly to monopolise the time of the Committee. I suggest to the Committee to try and erase from their minds the argument which has been used—I think the honourable senior member for St. Philip used it not so long ago—that other people have done so and so. That is one of the worst arguments that one can use when it comes to federation. I agree with federation but a federal government can be one of the worst forms of government in the world. Imagine this; we believe that the judiciary should be free to express their opinions. In order to get the Supreme Court of America not to be conservative the President had to threaten to pack it with democratic judges, and that threat made by Roosevelt caused the judges to give the decision that the President wanted. That is because the Supreme Court of America has to say what is constitutional and what is not. If we passed a law tomorrow saying that members of this House be free from the necessity of wearing clothes, it would be stupid, but not unconstitutional. But if you pass a law to decide what relates to the Federal Constitution the Supreme Court can say that it is constitutional or not constitutional. What has Malan done? Because the Supreme Court said that a law was unconstitutional he said that the High Court of Parliament shall be the Court. The U.S.A. can do it too. When you are up against the rigidity of a federal constitution these extraordinary and anomalous things take place.

I really have spoken longer than I intended to speak. I do suggest that we might go on like this indefinitely unless we point out clearly whether we agree to two Houses or not.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I do not intend to speak. I move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. TALMA seconded.

The question was put and agreed to without division and Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

TEA ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT the House adjourned for half an hour.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling:—

Mr. Speaker said that on the adjournment the House was in Committee. The House resumed Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment the honourable senior member for the City was speaking, but he is not in his seat.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, —I too am in favour of a one-chamber system, the reason being the memory which should still be recent in our minds of the treatment meted out to this Chamber by the Other Place not long ago with reference to the rejection of the Maude Bill. When members of a chamber are nominated and not elected they do not have to account to anyone and they can do as they like, at times without even giving the matter any proper consideration. That is quite unlike the action of a mature statesman. When we think of the treatment meted out to the Maude Bill by members of our second chamber who are supposed to be statesmanlike and experienced and things of that sort, that in itself does not cause one to have much hope or confidence in an upper Chamber which will be there to put a check on legislation. In keeping a check on legislation a chamber should give proper grounds or reasons

for their actions. When you reject something merely because it will not serve the interests of the class to which you belong you are really flouting the wishes of the members of the elected chamber and acting in a manner which will please your own class. That is the danger of having a nominated chamber, and all nominated chambers act in accordance with the wishes of the ones who appointed them. In this case it will be the Governor-General, and I do feel, sir, that although a second chamber may serve some useful purpose if its powers are limited, the very idea of a second chamber at this stage is contrary to the wishes of the people generally. It is for that reason and many others that I shall support the motion for one chamber. This Assembly and all others which are constituted under the bi-cameral system can prove very conclusively that a second chamber does not work in these days. It does not represent the wishes of the people, and for that reason alone I cannot see my way to support a nominated second chamber.

On the other hand I would be inclined to vote for a bi-cameral chamber provided that as stated here the senators are elected by the local legislatures. But even then, the powers of the Upper House should be clearly defined and limited. But in the final analysis an upper Chamber does not serve the interests of the people. Second chambers are comprised of members of the class with vested interests. You must be wealthy, and only the wealthy man is considered as successful. Only wealthy people are considered as experts in various branches. To be wealthy is a condition precedent, because of your greater ability to acquire wealth. But that is contrary to the feelings of the masses of the people generally; and Barbados of all places can speak with authority on a matter such as this because it is owing to the existence of a second chamber that the progress of the working people in this country has been retarded to some extent. When the honourable junior member for St. John argued strongly in favour of a second chamber he was expressing the sentiments of certain members of the Other Place. He stated their case very strongly, and one should also bear in mind that that honourable member was opposed to Adult Suffrage in the Maude Bill.

Mr. VAUGHAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—I challenge the honourable member to mention one occasion on which I was opposed to Adult Suffrage on any issue.

Mr. TALMA: You know within yourself, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable junior member for St. John was opposed to Adult Suffrage in the Maude Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything to do with the Maude Bill. That is not before the House today.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I did not oppose Adult Suffrage. I opposed the method proposed.

Mr. TALMA: I can well understand the arguments by the honourable junior member for St. John in this debate when I bear in mind that the honourable member was opposed to Adult Suffrage in the Maude Bill issue. Other honourable members here are fully aware of that and can substantiate what I am saying.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I will not allow any misrepresentations of my political views. I will say here and now as I said just now that I am in favour of a second chamber whether it is elected or nominated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask honourable members not to go on any further on the Maude Bill.

Mr. TALMA: I am entirely opposed to a nominated second chamber, bearing in mind the abuse of power which they generally exercise. I think

that an Assembly such as ours, constituted of a majority of members who are either Labourites or are labour-inclined or progressively inclined, whatever, they may choose to call themselves, should not sit here this afternoon and attempt to create a Federal Assembly which would just be a joke eventually and which would not carry out the wishes of the people of these islands in actual practice. I will not subscribe to that. There are many other reasons why I oppose a nominated second chamber, but I feel that the majority of us are convinced that a nominated second chamber will be merely a repetition of what Barbados has experienced for 300 years. I leave it for honourable members to exercise their judgment. Again I say that if the second chamber is elected by the local legislatures I will agree with it; but I can never agree to the establishment of a senate whose members are nominated by the Governor-General, and I do not think that many members of the House would agree with that.

Mr. COX: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to say that I am as progressive as any other member of this House, and perhaps, more so than many. As a matter of fact from 1932 I have been assisting in the progressive cause. But now I find difficulty, great difficulty, in agreeing to the amendment proposed by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. I am glad that this is a free vote because there can be no question of voting against one's party. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas was a member of the Select Committee who made this report. Also on the committee were His Honour the Speaker, and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. This is the report that they have made. I see no minority report, and therefore I must conclude that no member of that committee was against the report. Paragraph 4 speaks in favour of the establishment of a bi-cameral legislature, but feels that the members of the senate should be elected for a period of five years by the elected members of the respective local legislatures. It continues to say that the House feels that there should be no time limit as regards residence as a qualification for election to the House of Assembly as recommended in the Report.

So we see that the report of the committee in the first place agreed to the bi-cameral legislature. Of course it can be argued that we agreed to that, but since then, on sober reflection, we have decided to abolish the first part which deals with the bi-cameral legislature. But up to now I have not heard any argument which has more or less satisfied me that we would be doing wrong, or that we would not be progressive as regards the proposed Federal Parliament if we failed to recommend that there should not be a bi-cameral legislature.

As I said on the last occasion, in so far as it applies to the five-year period I am in whole hearted agreement with that. I feel that the life of the senate should be no longer than the life of the Federal Parliament. Therefore, if the Federal Parliament is to be for five years I feel that the Senate should be for a period of five years also. The honourable senior member for St. Philip also moved an amendment, and at the end of it he suggested that the senators be chosen from a panel of names recommended by the legislature. I do not agree with that either. If we are prepared to have a two-chamber legislature I am strongly in favour of the Governor-General nominating the members of the Senate. As I have said already, in England there is the protection that after legislation is passed by the House of Commons and the House of Lords throws it out, and the House of Commons passes it a second time the year after, it becomes law. In Jamaica the provision says six

months instead of a year. While I am not supporting the old order for the sake of supporting it I do feel that it is good at times to give people of different views an opportunity to express themselves even though you are not prepared to give them power to carry that expression into operation. I think that we should have a second chamber, because, as some honourable members have said, inasmuch as it will be a Federal Parliament it would be wise for the various constituent assemblies to have the same number of representatives in the Senate, so that the senators will have an opportunity to express the points of view which may be considered reasonable by the various assemblies which they represent.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph referred to a British Colony which is run by the Governor. I think that he means Somaliland. But we have passed that stage a long time ago. The Senate in our case will not, in my opinion, be exercising the function of putting a brake on the first chamber, but will exercise a more or less revisionary function. It is true that in the Rance Report it is said that there are people who would not like the hurly burly of trying to get into the House of Assembly; and therefore one might conclude that the intention of nominating these people to the Senate is to give those who might never have a chance of getting into the House an opportunity to put a brake on progressive legislation. But I do not look at it in that light; but in the light of giving those individuals an opportunity more or less of expressing the point of view of a minority group; and more often than not there is something in the point of view of a minority group which causes the majority group to modify their own views to some extent.

I am expressing my point of view, sir, as I am prepared to vote on this question. I am prepared to support the view that we should have a second chamber nominated by the Governor-General and that the Legislatures of the various colonies should have no right to present any panel of names from which the Governor-General should appoint the Senate. The Governor-General should appoint the members of the upper House and the powers of delay should be limited so that legislation can be got through in a year or half year as the case may be.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—When I moved that you report progress I said that I did not intend to speak on this matter. I said that because I had in a way already expressed my feelings, and I did not want to waste any time. I think, sir, that we are flogging a dead horse. I intended, without speaking, to sit and vote for the second chamber. There were things in paragraph 4 which I said on the last occasion that I did not agree with, but I did not anticipate that there would be a further amendment today. I have studied my politics so carefully that I can see hypocritical views when they come around a corner.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of order, sir, is the honourable member referring to the members of this House as hypocrites? Perhaps I got the word wrong.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not know if my colleague associates himself with those hypocrites.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member is now asking if I associate myself with those hypocrites. I think, sir, that you should ask him to state exactly what he means.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not know if my colleague can be associated with them. I do not see any objection to what I have said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable junior member for the City has drawn my attention to the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City.

I did not take it at first that he meant that the members of the House were hypocrites; but his last remarks do make me feel that way.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not mean to say that I do not know if my colleague can be associated with them. I meant to say that I do not think he can be associated with any hypocrites, knowing him as I do. I was going to say that after listening to, and reading the various debates on Federation, and after reading the newspaper articles etc., as well as the Rance Report I know that Federation will come whether Barbados likes it or not. I am not making any second reading speech; I will deal straight with paragraph 4.

If it is for the sake of a compromise I am prepared to second the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Philip; that is if I believe that the original wording for the second chamber cannot go through or the suggestion in the Rance Report cannot go through. Sir, I cannot boast of having the academic education of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in dealing with this matter; but it must be galling at times to the average socialist or students of socialistic theory when they realise that other people too have an opportunity of reading and digesting these things. It is such a nice thing to listen to these socialist speeches or speeches from so-called socialists. I feel, sir, that among the many things which have caused British democracy to survive is the existence of a second chamber, and that has shown itself clearly after and during the time that the Socialist Party wielded power in England. It has shown itself very clearly in their attempt to curtail the powers of the second chamber.

Let us come back to Barbados. Surely, sir, the Leader said that he wanted us to express our views and take a strong stand. He wanted us to say definitely that Barbados will not enter federation unless so and so. I have expressed the view that freedom of movement is one thing which I think we should agree upon. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said let us get out of the way the question of a second chamber. But he went on to give reasons why we should not have a second chamber. Surely he has not justified the establishment of a one-chamber system. I am going to address myself first of all to this point. Would the honourable member have to carry in his crowd? The strongest argument for the second chamber is the reason he has given. When the honourable member signed the Rance Report it was only for the sake of discussion. But one must think that the question of a second chamber must have been of great importance to the West Indian delegates. I do not think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should take third place to any of the representatives at Montego Bay. But it only goes to show that time must be given and opportunity must be given to persons in an upper chamber—I am going to be strong. When I began I talked about hypocrites and I still talk about hypocrites in this matter. I am not saying that there are hypocrites in the House, although there may be. We are still in a capitalist state. You exist under a capitalist state still. You may not like to hear that, but it is true. You pride yourself on being a unit of a capitalist government. So what can be your argument against capitalists whether they are from St. Kitts, Barbados or England having a voice in your senate?

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, particularly why I have decided on this whole question. We are a grown up people. That will be agreed upon by every sane Barbadian who thinks in terms of Barbados and the West Indies. We are a grown up people. Interests must clash in a purely agricultural community. The interests of the West Indies

or Barbados must clash at times with those of the Colonial Office who buy our sugar. The day is long past when an Englishman from the Colonial Office should be sent to any Commonwealth Conference to represent West Indians as West Indians; because however well meaning he may be, the interests of the U.K. will come first. So as a West Indian nation how much better it will be in the future to have, at a Commonwealth Conference, the West Indian point of view being put by a West Indian whether he is from the Senate or not.

But I am definitely in favour of the second chamber. I go as far as this: I am in favour of a second chamber nominated. When I started out I used the word "hypocritical" for this reason: We in Barbados have been fortunate in this sense—I speak from this side of the table, and am expressing the view of the party to which I belong—we have been fortunate in that although we have disagreed violently with members of the Socialist or Progressive Party or whatever you may call them, we have always still been sane men; men who were prepared to put the interests of the island first. That is no flattery. We have fought on political platforms. We have tried to stop reckless expenditure. But we in Barbados have always been fortunate in having men with political sanity. In all my political career I have never allowed my political views to prevent me from meeting pleasantly with members of other schools of thought, whether socially or otherwise. But that does not change my view as a Conservative.

Sir, you hear all this talk about communists. What is a communist? Imagine accusing the honourable senior member for St. Philip of being a communist! I am quite serious about this. Let no one fool you. Any talk about communists or suggestion of communists having any power in a West Indian colony constitutes a danger for any capitalist investment in this area. I am pro-American and anti-communist. Americans have been accused of witch hunting where the communists are concerned. They may be. I do not know. But I am with them 100 per cent. Communism is a danger to the social structure and the economic structure that we know. We have always been men of political sanity in this island. The same thing is true of Great Britain; but I do not know that we can say the same thing of the neighbouring colony of Trinidad where you have a cosmopolitan community; and the same thing, I am afraid, cannot be said of some of the smaller islands.

The West Indians are at the beginning of nationhood. They got Adult Suffrage yesterday. It must be obvious that you must maintain the democratic form of Government. You hear all this talk about industrial development. You are in a capitalist state because you are part of a capitalist set up. It is necessary to maintain the British form of democracy, and as I have said, one of the chief reasons for the survival of that form of democracy is the existence of the second chamber. Speaking of the United States that constitution has always been very near to my heart for the simple reason that I saw even in my youthful days, in spite of the racial line drawn, there is an opportunity for a man to rise from the gutter. It has always been dear to me, sir, because it has done much for the West Indies. Think of it, sir, that all two or three members of the New York State Legislature were born in the West Indies one in Trinidad, one in Antigua and I think one in St. Kitts.

On this question of Federation, however dogmatic the honourable Leader of the House might be, I still prefer to go along with something which has worked for over 100 years and has caused a nation to progress and be respected and considered as among the leaders of the world. To err is human,

but the honourable member has not satisfied me that the form of Constitution in the United States with two Chambers is incorrect. The legal luminaries have not convinced me that having a single Chamber would be better than having two Chambers which system has been worked and proved to be satisfactory. The honourable member tells us that a second Chamber has come about by accident; many other things have come about by accident and if a second Chamber has come about by accident, it has served a useful purpose. I am prepared to go on with the form of government in the United States.

I have not got the feeling of the Committee, but I must again say that my honest view is that if you are going to have a federated West Indies I should like to see a bi-cameral Legislature because we have an example standing before us. We have seen that for generations a second Chamber in the United Kingdom has survived with all the turmoil we have had in Europe, and, above all, we have seen that the second Chamber form of government has survived in the United States; and all the argument which might be used against that to-day cannot justify that having one Chamber would be better than having two Chambers. I am therefore persuaded to vote for a second Chamber under any circumstances. There is no point in being hypocritical over this matter. I am glad to hear that there will not be any powers plenipotentiary, but I still maintain and contend that, looking at the matter from the point of view of the man in the street, we should have two Chambers.

There is one last point. We are still in a capitalist community and instead of electing to the Upper Chamber all the people like the honourable junior member for Christ Church, you must elect some of the people like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who is the same capitalist. I have a real sense of pride but I have not got that sense of pride in fooling people that I am a socialist when deep down in my heart I am a capitalist. However you progress you still have to progress economically; I am voting for a second Chamber government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I shall be very brief although I have a strong temptation to reply at some length to some of the points which have been made during this debate. However, I propose only to say a few things in reference to the speech made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. The honourable member spoke at some length and I think we will all readily admit that his remarks constituted an excellent exercise in dialectics and they possibly had some merit as the beginning of an essay on the historical development of second Chambers; but what I want honourable members to devote some consideration to is whether or not the question of the development of the second Chamber, generally speaking, is not to some extent, fundamentally different from the question of the necessity for a second Chamber at certain stages in a special system of Federation. Let us take a simple example; there is the British House of Lords and the American Senate. The powers of the British House of Lords are almost non-existent; by comparison the American Senate has considerable power. The President of the United States cannot make a treaty with a foreign State except with the consent of the American Senate for obvious reasons; a treaty which might easily be acceptable to New York may not be acceptable to Texas. Furthermore, on such an important question as the appointment of officials, the President of the United States cannot appoint a single official except with the consent of the American Senate. I would have liked to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, after he had finished speaking on the historical development of the second Chamber, speak

on the development of the necessity for a second Chamber in a federal system of Government. I submit that if he had paid as much attention to the latter as he paid to the former, he would have come to a different conclusion. He had an exercise in the art of logic, an excellent exercise in dealing with the historical development of the second Chamber, but he completely omitted all direct reference to the particular aspect of the matter.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph argued as to what was the point of giving a second Chamber power to delay legislation for six months because the Lower House will be predominant; I am surprised at that argument coming from him. There is the question of the Parliament Act; during the time of the suspension by the Other Place you can get public opinion clarified in one way or the other and eventually by the time that public opinion is centralised either the Lower or the Upper House has to give way. It is highly possible that in the majority of instances in which the suspension may be exercised, you might have a dissolution of Parliament intervening. It means a lot to any country to have a period of delay so that a matter can be clarified. I am submitting that no harm can be done, at least in the earlier stages of the Federation, if we start off by having two Chambers. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has himself laid down certain proposals with which the entire group must agree or we cannot have any Federation, Barbados must have six seats in the Federal Assembly and we must have this, that and the other. There must be these conflicting opinions for some time among the insular groups of the Federation; as the honourable senior member for St. George has said, it is highly possible for the entire Federation to founder on insular prejudices. If Barbados is going to insist on certain things, Trinidad and Jamaica may do the same thing and how are we to protect ourselves from danger or bloodshed unless we have some Body to dissolve these happenings?

From the argument of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, one would have thought that he would be a strong supporter for State rights for the Constitution; if each colony is assuming privileges and rights which must be cherished, the only way to safeguard them constitutionally is by having a second Chamber. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made a sudden change of mind and, in my opinion, it is almost inexplicable. On January 26 he signed this Report of the Select Committee agreeing to a second Chamber, in the following week he said that Barbados must lay down conditions for the Federation or there will not be any Federation and before the ink has dried on the Report, he is telling us that there should not be any second Chamber, no safeguard for State rights but we must determine the entire fate of Federation! All that the honourable senior member for St. George has said today is excellent in theory and would probably be endorsed by all the members sitting around here in different circumstances; but under the special conditions of this West Indian Federation I do not think it is defensible. The proponents of the unicameral system could give excellent reasons why the House of Lords in England or the Legislative Council in Barbados should be abolished, but the arguments that would apply in other circumstances do not necessarily apply here. In about 15 or 20 years from now, it is very likely that what the honourable member said today will more readily win approbation than what I am saying. After some time has elapsed and we have experimented and are welded into a common fold and everything is working harmoniously, then it would be worth while to adopt the suggestions as posed by the honourable senior member for St.

Joseph; but at this stage, with all the issues in doubt, with the danger confronting us and with the obstacles real and otherwise, it is politic to adopt the course we are adopting at present.

Mr. GODDARD: We ought to decide now whether we should have a single Chamber or two Chambers; we do not know as yet how easy or how difficult it will be to amend the Constitution. The Senate or Upper House is generally put there for the protection of regional interests. Until we know how difficult or how easy it will be to amend that Constitution, I do not know how we can decide not to have a second Chamber; as a matter of fact, as one honourable member has suggested to me, the amendment of the Constitution should have been a subject in this Report. In certain countries they have safeguards other than the Senate; in Australia, if there is a deadlock you have a referendum and you go back to the country. In America the Senate is elected to protect regional interests which are so important and so necessary to be protected. Barbados is an agricultural community, Jamaica is becoming industrialised and if we happen to clash, what is going to be the result? Jamaica has 16 seats in the Federal Assembly, and although some honourable members feel that that is not the approach to Federation, yet I feel it is inevitable and most important to protect the interests of the smaller units. A second Chamber will provide all these safeguards which we will need; we are not offering everything to the Federal Government; we are retaining something for ourselves. A second Chamber is necessary and I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to be persuaded in that direction because, inevitably, he will be representing this Chamber or Barbados at these talks. This is no Party matter; the argument for a second Chamber is that it will protect regional interests especially when we do not know how easy or how difficult it will be to change the Constitution which we will have.

Mr. LEWIS: I have not had the opportunity of entering in this debate before and I have been listening and learning a lot. I would like to say that Barbados has been most unfortunate from the beginning of the sittings of the Standing Closer Association Committee; from the very first sitting of the Committee we had nominated members representing us. The elected representatives could not be there and the Head of this Administration undertook to nominate people to represent us. I suppose our dislike of nomination would come from there; however, the fact remains that we did not elect those representatives and I do not think that they had any status at all. The present proposed representation in the Federal House of Assembly means that Jamaica can out-vote any four islands together. As far as a second Chamber is concerned, that would depend upon how many islands voted for a particular measure in the Lower House; if a majority of islands voted for a measure in the Lower House, it is a foregone conclusion that such a measure would be passed in the Upper House, unless it is something affecting the people in the Lower House and those in the Upper House. I do not think we will have much to complain about; we have got to enter the Federation with the best safeguards we can devise and hope for the best.

I would like to remind this Committee that the persons constituting the Standing Closer Association Committee started off in paragraph 53 of the Report by saying that this matter as to whether there should be one or two Chambers had given them the greatest amount of trouble. They said this:

"Many of us began with a definite predisposition in favour of a single Chamber, as advocated by

the Caribbean Labour Congress, which also we understood to have been favoured by the Secretary of State."

After studying the matter, and it appears from what they have said that they gave this question more consideration than any other, they came to the conclusion that the best thing to do would be to follow precedent and have two Chambers. At the moment I am against a bi-cameral Legislature because it does not appeal to reason or logic, but there is a great deal in the argument of having a vote in one place for people and a vote in the other place for islands. As we know our West Indies, there is a great deal of jealousy; those places which have gone ahead industrially will win markets, and they will promise certain things and a certain situation is bound to be created. What is worrying me is that it is most regrettable that at this period in the history of Federation Talks we are only now debating these fundamental points. As to all the things which we have been saying here today and previously, I will say it is good to think that Barbadians hold these independent views and we have had no Reserve Powers, and so on. It is the people who have lived under Reserve Powers with nominated Bodies and so on, who would lend us support in views of this nature; they have had the bitter experience of vetos and so on. It is regrettable, however, that we have only reached the stage where we are putting forward these things.

If there is one thing which must be stated it is that there must not be any more secrecy surrounding these Federation Talks. We should realise how absolutely insignificant our voice in this colony is, and how we are regarded in the other islands; there was a time when we were looked to for political guidance, but today it is not so. I do not know if it is a question of the behaviour of the people who were sent to represent us or not; so far, we have not got any reply from the Governor to whom we sent an Address about having a Conference in the West Indies. Let us see to it that whenever we send people to represent us at these Conferences, the Press is invited and no member will be able to sign a report and say that he does not agree with it and then say what he agrees or disagrees with. The people in the other islands have lost confidence in us long ago, and all that we may say now has no weight. We could have been leading the Federation in the West Indies, we could have been the seat of the Federal Government if we had gone ahead in the proper way. We have a man in the West Indies who is supposed to have drafted the Constitution for the West Indies; it is the usual way of drafting, copying from somebody else. We copied from the Australian model: Barbados is the one place which could say: "This is what we seek" and we should have been able to say where we disagreed with the Rance Report; but it appears that certain people were afraid to say certain things and now they can say them. We are now taking the stand which we should have taken in 1949; there might have been secret meetings and I know that in respect of the views I have heard expressed here recently, every representative would have backed us up, but some of them were saying that through this colony they were being let down.

I feel that Barbados should have been in the forefront and the people should have had our views before them when they were discussing this question of Federation. I cannot see how other people have said that they are willing to go on with the Rance Report and why Barbados could not come out with these beautiful ideas before. Our chief representative at the Closer Union Association Talks was the first person to sign the Report. I should like to say that on the first occasion when we discussed Federation

in this House, we should have told the other people what our views were. When the representatives go to London now we will be sold down the drain with secrecy; everybody will agree with what the Imperial Parliament wants and you will have to get things out by a method of trial and error, and the errors will be like millstones around your neck. Think of Barbados with 300 years of representative Institution without any Reserve Powers and we cannot lead a single person to agree with us and bring about sanity in these matters! What has happened? The position is a most deplorable one; I say it does not matter what we put in this Address at this stage; we can only be out of the Federation; we are now saying that we are not joining the Federation. This is not the time for any latitude; this is the time when the delegates must assume the role of delegates and understand that they have no choice. Whatever we say now they must do; they must be real delegates, not representatives.

From paragraph 49 to paragraph 60 of their Report the Standing Closer Association Committee have devoted a considerable amount of thought to the question of the Federal Legislature and in their collective wisdom they have decided to have a two-Chamber Legislature. We are not hearing today what the other people have said; we are not in a position to know that. There might be arguments in favour of one or two Chambers, which have not been brought out here today, and we are placed in a very awkward position indeed. It has been said that we are against Federation and we have been stumbling-blocks in the way; we sent two representatives to the first Federation Conference in Jamaica, and we are now in a position where we will be forced into views with which we are not agreeing. Trinidad has gone ahead and developed its industries; that colony wants markets and it will federate with the Leeward and Windward Islands so as to get markets. Barbados will be out of that with an overpopulation; it seems that we will be faced with Hobson's choice. I would like to solicit the information as to why this House should be debating Federation without any reply from the Head of the Administration as to what the other islands think of our suggestion of holding a meeting in the West Indian area.

Since this Report was written the whole elective system has been changed. British Guiana is the only place to have adult suffrage and they feel themselves big enough to stay out of the Federation and they may regret it or they may change their minds after the next election. I cannot see how it can be possible for us to go to a final meeting in London without having a meeting of representatives elected under universal suffrage and discussing these points and settling them once and for all. A uni-cameral Legislature is the best thing in the world, but it is of no use saying that because you will not get it; if you insist on a uni-cameral Legislature you will have to stay out of Federation. The Australian system might suit Australia; you cannot say it suits the islands of the North and not those of the South. What is becoming more important to me is that it is not a case of one island having to fight the other; it is the case of the Imperial Parliament wishing to have a nominated Body so that the representative Body can nominate people to it. The Lower House will be the representatives of the people and the Upper House will be the representatives of the Home Government. That is what they want and they will get it no matter what Barbados says, and we are in a very unfortunate position indeed to be arguing against a bi-cameral Legislature when our Constitution for 300 years provided for it. In my opinion,

we should have a single-Chamber Legislature and the safeguards that we are talking about should be in the method of dealing with the things which come before it; there is no reason why the Federal Legislature should pass anything until it has been advertised in the islands and everybody has had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on it, and they would get these points of view which would be put in an Upper House. Time would be given for reflection, not bringing up legislation in the morning and passing it at the night.

For the benefit of the honourable junior member for St. John, I will say that I have heard that Mr. Laski said that a second Chamber can only be of use if it has power, and if it has power it is undemocratic; if it has not got any power, then it is useless. It would be elected on a restricted franchise or it will be nominated; if it has no power it is useless and if you give it power over the elected representatives of the people, that is undemocratic. Therefore I do not know where I am.

In counting up this representation which the various islands will have in the Federal House of Assembly, it seems to me as if Jamaica will have as much power as any five islands put together, and if Barbados has two more seats I do not know on what should we base them. We must have a unit representation or population representation. I would suggest that the Federal Assembly should be constituted on an island basis, that is, irrespective of population; here we have two representatives for every constituency irrespective of the number of people who live in it.

I am against a second Chamber because I do not see the use of it. I am somewhat in a dilemma because if the Barbadian has not taken any steps to alter his own Constitution which is bi-cameral, it would be rather awkward to argue against what has been operating for a number of years. I may be asked; "Why are you arguing against a system when you have had it for 300 years?" Are we going to get a single one of these points in this Address carried? If we decide on these things, we had better pass an Address saying that we are not entering the Federation at all; it is too late in the day for us to persuade people that these things are right. There is too much argument in this Report; however, those are my views.

Mr. ADAMS: If I were like the honourable junior member for the City on the brink of political extinction. I would pull this debate down to the level of the gutter as he has done. It appeared as if the honourable senior member for St. Philip would have argued on the same lines but he has avoided that to some extent. The honourable junior member for the City has said things which he knows are not true; he knows what my attitude has always been and he has chosen deliberately to say untrue things about me. He purports to say that I let down the small islands, but I was not present when the decisions were taken. The honourable member knows that when honourable Mr. Cuke and I tried to get some things re-opened we were refused. I have not put forward anything about a single Chamber; I have not changed one atom from the Constitution I proposed. I have not flirted with two sides or stopped anybody in debate; what I did, I did openly.

As regards the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee, paragraph 7 was put there so that it should not be thought that everybody agreed with everything. The honourable member knows that I wrote an editorial in the *Beacon* after the Report came out, saying that the Report could only serve as a basis for discussion. My attitude has been absolute-

ly consistent and it is not an exaggeration to say that if I had written a Minority Report the Committee would have been broken up. Was it better to break up the Committee than sign the Report and reserve to myself the right to say what I am saying today? I hate to think I have to follow the honourable member in what seems to be casting a reflection on some other delegates; some other delegates were there all along and I say nothing more on that point. Not all of the delegates agreed with the Report; they asked to record it in the notes that they had differed on some points. We had gone through the draft Constitution which was put up to the Labour Conference of 1947 and it was not to be expected that we who were Socialists would suddenly change because other people were there.

I have my own views about a Federal Government, but I am a member of the Barbados Legislature, and if the Legislature says anything, no delegate can act other than what the Legislature wants; but it is the duty of a delegate if he is a member of a Legislature and has some knowledge of the working of Federal Governments, to attempt to persuade the Legislature out of what knowledge he possesses. I have made a very profound study of this subject and if I stress any particular point of view, it is because I am convinced from a historical point of view that there are many dangers in Federation and it is my duty to point out those dangers. When the honourable junior member for Christ Church was speaking, I thought he was making some useful points and I asked two honourable members to stop speaking and listen to him; his point is that small places should be given equal representation in the Upper House because history shows that the Upper House benefits regions which may be swamped in the Lower House. If there is the argument that a number of small places might be ganging up to defeat us in the Lower House — Jamaica and Trinidad could defeat everybody — the ganging up could take place in the Senate too. The one Upper House in this world which is said to be successful is the United States Senate, and that is elected. The American Senate has been said to be more powerful than the House of Representatives. Do we want that? What surprises me in this debate is that anybody calling himself a democrat could fail to see the inherent evil in the system of nomination. There are four big Federations—Switzerland, Australia, Canada and the United States—and in three of them the allocation of seats in the Upper House so as to prevent any complaints between the big and small States in the Lower House has failed; it has not succeeded in Switzerland, Australia or Canada.

It is a question of looking at the mistakes which have been made in history and trying to avoid them. We started with a mistake, but let us not go further and repeat a worse mistake. There is the question of people who do not like the idea of standing for election being put in the Upper House. Do you want anything more undemocratic than that? Whether we had something for 300 years or not, let us not repeat any mistake. Let us say to ourselves tonight what every country has said to itself; there has never been a Federation where every State did not fight because it had to consider its rights. It is true that civilisation cannot work unless you give up some of your rights for the general good; everybody restrains himself to some extent for the general good of the community.

As to the excellent point made by the honourable junior member for Christ Church, the honourable member could have made it stronger. There is no Federal Constitution which provides for a cessa-

tion; once you are in, you are in for life. When Barbados comes in the Federation it is staying there whether it gets hit hard or not. The Imperial Parliament is not going to thrust anything down our throats as the honourable junior member for the City has said, nobody can force us into Federation; we either go in it or we do not go in it. I cannot see any Government in Great Britain saying; "The Leeward Islands want Federation; Barbados does not want it, but let us pass the Bill." That cannot happen; the objection of Barbados will be taken into account.

There is one other point to which I will reply. It is perfectly true that we asked for a Conference first; some of us still feel that we should have a Conference in the West Indies first. When the Message to that effect was sent to the Acting Governor, the Secretary of State for the Colonies had already decided to hold a meeting in London and he said so. If we have not got any reply, it is because a decision has already been taken; but there would be nothing, except a lack of time, to prevent the Legislatures from exchanging their views informally in the West Indies and getting together. I would not like it to be thought that Barbados has been ignored; I strongly deprecate that statement by the honourable junior member for the City; that might give the impression that we feel that we are not a voice to be listened to. I say again that some colonies are looking at their own individual and material interests and are jumping as fast as possible on the Federation waggon; we are entitled to do the same. (Mr. ALLDER: We have missed the boat) It is not a bad thing to miss some boats; no form of Government is perfect; it is a good thing for scattered islands to federate, but let them have all their safeguards. We are going to have some things of which our grandfathers have not heard if we are going into Federation without safeguards. Federation is the best thing for Barbados; we want to have West Indian nationhood and freedom of movement, but when other colonies insist on not having freedom of movement, it is our duty to say that we are not going in for Federation on such terms.

I apologize for having spoken on more subjects than the one in issue, but the only reason for having two Chambers is the historical reason. In the case of the United States, the Senate is more powerful than the Lower House, and the reason might be that the members are elected. I ask honourable members on the whole, if they feel that we should have only one Chamber, to say so, and if the vote is not carried they should put such strong ties to the system of nomination that it will be, in fact, a democratic nomination.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph knows more about stabbing in the back than I would know. (Mr. ADAMS: I stab people openly in Queen's Park, not in the back). The honourable member knows the positions for stabbing and I leave that to him. If he feels that all the remarks I made were pointing to him, then he must have a purely guilty conscience. I said that Barbados let the islands down and others said so. This House appointed a Committee to consider the question of Federation and the honourable member fixed a meeting and then did not turn up. The Committee would fix a particular hour for him and he would not come.

Mr. ADAMS: I must deny that. I have never deliberately kept away from any meeting to start with, or kept away from any meeting fixed for me; I have always insisted that if I happened to be out of the island, they could go on without me.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member has asked for a meeting on Friday or Monday and he was the only member who would not come to it. I

say that from the point of time, all that we are doing is unfortunate; that is the burden of my complaint. If the honourable member was our representative, why should we not wait until he is there? But if honourable members had waited on him we would not have had an Interim Report. The honourable member knows that he made the Select Committee meet at hours when he could not come; he knows he was the representative of this House on the Standing Closer Association Committee. I am not talking about the times when the honourable member was out of the island. I am saying that in point of time we are really flogging a dead horse and singing a solo and doing everything that is hopeless.

If the honourable member had attended to this matter as he should have attended to it, we, in this Assembly would have expressed ourselves when the other people were expressing themselves and we could have said that we have many islands with us. But if we could not influence those islands then, how can we influence them now? All they have to do is to ask: "Why do you now come to talk to us?" If you have good reason why a Conference cannot take place in the West Indies all you had to do was to send and tell the House of Assembly. No reply has come down to the House since we sent that Message to the Head of the Administration on the question of Federation. If we are not taken notice of in this matter, are we asking other people to take notice of us? I say that we have let the people down; there are people in London who will agree with the Rance Report and we will give our delegates instructions and they will do otherwise; they will go in for Federation without the safeguards for which we are asking. I want to say that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph could not be half as intense and sincere about some things he has said as some of the representatives from the other islands; he could not hold those views with half the enthusiasm which those people have. Something must have gone wrong at the sittings of the Committee and we did not take the first opportunity of correcting it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The main point under discussion is the question of the two chambers. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said during his lengthy remarks just now that there was the fear of Trinidad and Jamaica dominating the Legislature because they would have half of the number of seats. Those two colonies would have 25 seats out of 50. But the honourable member chose to forget that in the Senate they would only have four seats out of 28. They might dominate the lower House; but what they do there cannot become law until the Senate agrees with it.

There is one other point. Without your second chamber, at least in the beginning and you apply the closure to the Lower House, the small islands will not be heard at all. Trinidad will talk and Jamaica will talk, and the debate will end, you will not get the point of view of Barbados expressed at all unless you have a second chamber in which the representatives of the Senate can have a free and full discussion of the matter. In the early stages you should have a second chamber.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I want to say from the outset that I feel that if Barbados puts up a strong case so far as the Rance Report is concerned we will have very good backing at least as far as the Jamaican delegates are concerned. I say that because the Jamaica report in many respects differs fundamentally from the Rance Report. Although I have not seen whether the other territories have agreed with them, in many respects they are along the same lines as ours. Trinidad will stick to the Rance Report. I do not know what the other

colonies will decide. I think we will be doing a good job if we can put our views strongly and sincerely.

I have never benefited so much as I did a few minutes ago when I crossed the floor of this House and sat, temporarily, by the side of a member of the Opposition. There I was referred to a useful book on Federation by Professor Weir. In that book I saw the point of view strongly expressed that a federal senate would be useful where there is equal representation from the various States. But in a later paragraph Professor Weir says it was an absolute failure.

Take Australia and Canada. They think strictly along party lines but it does not boil down to equal representation in the Senate. In Canada the Governor of the Dominion nominates members to the Senate. Those members are also inclined to agree with the Party in power or they may not get back in. When it comes to the West Indies I do feel that it would be better not to have a Senate at all.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—In my view it is better to follow the example of history than the proposed precedent of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. It is very significant that despite all that the honourable member has to say about second chambers in federal systems, they have endured, despite social revolutions. They have endured under Conservative regimes and under Socialist regimes. They have endured under progressive and reactionary Prime Ministers. So, there must be some inherent value in them.

If in the history of the federal system any of these second chambers had been abolished, we would have a reasonable precedent to follow. But here it is that despite everything said against second chambers in federal systems, despite the change in social outlook, these second chambers have endured. Australia has had very powerful Labour Governments. Canada has had strongly Liberal Governments; but none of them has thought of abolishing the second chamber. If second chambers had been a hindrance to the progress of federal communities they would have been abolished. There must be some fallacy in the honourable member's arguments. It seems to me that he is more against the method of nomination to the second chamber than against the second chamber itself. If it is the method of nomination that he is against let him accept the principle that universal suffrage for the second chamber is necessary; but he must make his position clear.

Mr. ADAMS: I have said over and over again that I am opposed to the second chamber in principle. If having two chambers improves the constitutional set-up you may as well say have three and make it still better. The answer to the honourable member's question is easy. If it were easy to abolish second chambers it would have been done, but sometimes it needs a civil war to bring about such a change. The honourable senior member for St. Philip says let us try it in the beginning. But when you create a certain federal structure it is almost impossible to change it except by war. The honourable junior member for St. John asked why in all history second chambers have not been abolished. The reason is that it is better to have them than to have a war. If it were something like the Expiring Laws Continuing Act it would be different; but a constitution is rigid.

Mr. GODDARD: The honourable senior member for St. Thomas looked at the book to which he referred, but he read it wrong. As I read it the author says that for a federal government to work well there should be a second chamber.

Mr. MAPP: It is the honourable member who read the book wrong. Professor Weir says it was a failure.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted in Paragraph 4 stand part was put and decided in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mr. COX, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. GODDARD and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—(11).

Noes: Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. MAPP, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN and Mr. ADAMS.—(8).

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I turn now to the election of the Senate. I suggest that we should first get out of the way the question of whether senators should become such by election or nomination. I move that the members of the Senate should be elected and not nominated.

Mr. BRANCKER seconded the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to clarify that a bit. If you just say that the senators should be elected and leave it blank like that, there may be some difficulty later on.

Mr. ADAMS: If you say now elected by whom it will make the motion too complex. My idea is to get out of the way first the question of whether it shall be election or nomination. Then we can decide by whom.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable member has suggested that we should settle the question of election or nomination. I am of the opinion that if I sit here and vote for either election or nomination I will be doing wrong. In my view the question should be election by whom or nomination. I would say election rather than nomination from a panel presented by any local legislature. Another school of thought favours nomination by the Governor General. If you recall it, the honourable senior member for St. Philip seemed to be offering a compromise—nomination, but only from a panel presented by the local legislatures.

Mr. ADAMS: Does not the honourable member see that we must start off with the simple and then go to the complex? I can see at least five alternatives where this matter is concerned. My idea is that we should first decide whether it should be nomination or election pure and simple and then turn to the complexities.

The question that the Senate be elected was put and agreed to, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. ALLDER.—(11).

Noes: Mr. COX, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. GODDARD and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—(4).

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman,—I move that the Senate be elected by the elected local legislators.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not think that that makes it sufficiently clear. I would move that the senators from each territory be elected by the elected members of the Legislature of that territory. Where you have a two-chamber system in a colony only the elected chamber will do the election of the senators. Officials like the Colonial Secretary and the Financial Secretary would not have to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER seconded the motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman,—In territories that have the unicameral system neither offi-

ials nor nominated members should have a vote. I beg to move that the members of the Senate be elected on the basis of adult suffrage.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY seconded.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The motion made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph cuts both ways. If the local legislature elects the Senate it becomes a mere rubber stamp of the lower House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If you say that your federal parliament must be elected by popular vote, how can you say now that your Senate should not be elected by popular vote? The only argument that might possibly be used is that election of the Senate by popular vote would be expensive. But that argument cannot hold water for the simple reason that there will only be election once every five years. The expense will not be in the same category as that attending a general election.

In thinking of a federal government you cannot just sit and think of what the position of Barbados will be. All the other colonies do not enjoy a similar constitution to ours. We have been fighting to preserve the democratic set-up as far as possible. I do not see how you can argue now that you must not elect the Senate—the highest legislative authority in the federal system. I am amused to think that honourable members who would argue “let us get away from the Crown Colony system, and who would say “hands off, Governor General,” and “no nominated senate,” would turn around and say that to elect the Senate by popular vote would be wrong. I was surprised that His Honour the Speaker should make the motion that he made.

The honourable Leader was just a few moments ago trying to force his views about the single-chamber system upon us. The whole argument was how can you have a second chamber nominated by someone; we heard that people who could not face an election would still get into the Legislature because they would be nominated by someone. I therefore cannot see why, in the matter of the election of the Senate we cannot go to the people. It is my considered opinion that if democracy is to survive that is what we must do.

I anticipate that the honourable member will reply; but in doing so he cannot shake the views of those of us who believe that democracy must be preserved.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman,—With your permission I would like to inform the honourable member who expressed surprise at a particular motion coming from me that I will never subscribe to any parliamentary system in which both Houses go to the people seeking election. It is my view that as long as both Chambers seek in a similar way the vote of the people both chambers will have equal rights. I represent an intelligent electorate, and I am able to go to them and say what I have said previously. Sir, I will oppose any motion that will give two chambers in a legislature the same power. When it comes to the question of the proposed federation I believe strongly that the senators should be elected by the elected representatives of the local legislatures.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—There is one point that I would like to get clear. I would like to know if the two Barbados members of the Senate must be members of this chamber.

On the motion being put that the Senators from each territory be elected by the elected Members of that territory the question was decided in the negative on the casting vote of the Chairman, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. COX.—(7).

Noes: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. GODDARD, and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—(7) (Cheers).

The motion being put that the Senators be elected on the Basis of Adult Suffrage the question was decided in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows :—

Ayes: Mr. TALMA, Mr. COX, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. GODDARD and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—(9).

Noes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN and Mr. ADAMS.—(5).

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Mr. COX that the Chairman do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again and the motion being put and carried *nem. con.* the Chairman reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Mr. COX that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour and the motion being put and carried *nem. con.* Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

On the re-assembling :—

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in committee on the Reports of the Select Committee on British West Indian Federation.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the Committee reported progress Paragraph 4 of the Report was under discussion.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I propose that the next item to be discussed in this paragraph be the life of the Senate. I beg to move that the life of the Senate should be five years.

Mr. COX seconded the motion which was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. BRYAN entered the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Dr. CUMMINS that Paragraph 4 as amended stand part except for the balance of the paragraph commencing "The House is of opinion" to the end of the paragraph.

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS moved, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS that the balance of the paragraph stand part of the Address as paragraph 5.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—Here again I cannot agree with this, although the honourable senior member for St. Joseph spoke on the last occasion about the difficulty of finding suitable people to fill these places. But I am saying, Sir, that if after a period of five or six years a man who is the Leader of this House has not been able to train such suitable people as would be able to take over, his leadership would be very poor.

I am thinking of the other colonies which would come in. I cannot see it working. It has not worked in other constitutions. I think that our best people should go to the Federal Parliament. In one's sober moments, one is bound to reflect that time marches on, and whether one is Conservative, Labour or anything else one must realise that no one can take the West Indian people back to where they were after the 1914—18 War. If I pass out tonight or in the next five years my own son may be sharing different views. Anyone who thinks he can put the clock back to where we were in 1918 is living in a fool's paradise.

The point I am making is that members should be allowed to sit in both parliaments. I have not heard that any of the smaller islands want what we are proposing here. It should be our duty to guide

the smaller islands. I do not want to delay any more time, but I am bound to say that I do not see the necessity of putting this in at all. I say now that I am prepared to vote against it; and no other member of this House will vote for a thing like this except for party reasons.

What reasons could be given for this except that there may be difficulty in finding people? And the implication is that even if you find people they may be the wrong ones. If we adopt the method of sending people to the Senate by popular vote what nitwit could be elected unless the honourable senior member for St. Joseph says he must be elected? To be really serious, how could we vote this thing? We have some youngsters in this island of 17 and 18 years old. The only difficulty with them is that they seem a bit too fearless. The people of this country read. Do not think for a moment that you will have to look for university graduates to send to the Senate. They are not the people who run the world today. They can teach you, and enlighten you. Do not make the mistake of thinking that there will be any difficulty in finding the right men. I have listened with wonderment to men who have never had the opportunity to go to a college or university. I am getting on in age, but I am still a mixer. I still meet the people in rum shops; I still meet them at pond side debating clubs. If you are in public life you can learn something every time you go out and start to talk with someone. What we are proposing to do, Sir, is saying, as far as Barbados is concerned, that the standard of political intelligence is so low, that it is nearly as low as the standard of political morality in some of the other places. That does not speak well for our young men.

The honourable senior member for St. Michael hinted that this is a free vote. If it is a free vote, or even a semi-free vote, every member can vote according to his feelings and not because of party conditions. However, I notice that Mr. Speaker is out taking part in the debate, which I find very strange.

I am saying, Sir, that this thing is not practicable, and I am prepared to vote against it, and I counsel other honourable members to do the same.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman,—I have sat and listened very carefully to the speech made by the honourable senior member for the City. He has spoken as if what has been proposed in this paragraph of the Report is a measure that would last for a long time. If anyone looks carefully around the political horizon of the West Indies he will see that within the last decade there has been a new political consciousness among West Indians living in the West Indies. There has been an obvious political awakening in each of the islands.

It may seem a specious argument to say that we are belittling our own genius to say that we want people to serve in the Federal Parliament and in the local legislatures of each territory at the same time. It is known in every federal set-up that when the natural leaders in local legislatures have to leave and sit in the Federal Parliament alone the local legislatures stand to lose. But the select committee came to its decision after careful reasoning, and knowing that this is only a temporary measure. The honourable member need not become unduly disturbed.

Now, Sir, I for one—and I did not notice that any other honourable member did—did not vote on this matter for any party reasons.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I never said that.

Mr. SPEAKER: What the honourable member said struck me as meaning that. It distinctly struck me that way.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What I said was that an honourable member said it was a free vote. I can assure the honourable member that no such implication was intended.

Mr. SPEAKER: I repeat, Sir, that anyone who looks around the West Indies will see that there has been an obvious political awakening. If any honourable member takes the trouble to look around he will really appreciate what the position is.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I was a member of the Select Committee and this was inserted because of the fear that the local legislatures would be robbed of men of experience and robbed of leadership. That is especially true of a lot of the smaller islands. That, as I have said, is the reason why this was put in, but it is a thing with which I do not agree. What with the increase in the volume of legislation handled by the local legislature today I cannot for the life of me see a member of this House being also a member of the Federal Parliament. It would be a full-time job—because they certainly could not treat federal matters with the lightness with which certain local matters are treated now. I personally do not like it for the reasons that I have given.

Mr. VAUGHAN: It is difficult to understand how any Body of supposedly intelligent politicians could suggest anything like that. Can't they see the absolute impracticability of it? What is behind this proposal is that certain politicians in this island want to be at Church and at Chapel at the same time; they entirely forget the possible change of public sentiment and that one-half of them may not be here by the next election. They must remember that the electorate is growing in political wisdom and is not entirely ruled and controlled by primitive democracy and worship of personalities. They imagine that they will be here for all time and if they are elected to the other Chamber they do not want to leave this Chamber because they think some other people will take their places. Because something has happened for 10 years must it continue for the next 10 years? Some of the most popular politicians in this island for the last 10 years may be surprised at the next election; it is not a rational suggestion that members of the Federal Assembly should also be members of the local Chambers. The other colonies will say that the things proposed are such that you must consider them as obstructing the Federation. This little island is entirely controlled by a primitive democracy, entirely controlled by personalities; the time is coming, however, when the elections will be determined on issues and not on personalities.

Mr. ADAMS: I still have the letter which the honourable member wrote asking me to push him as a candidate of the Labour Party last year. After some of us have made sacrifices and fought for the last 12 years to kill the rule of privilege and wealth in the Caribbean area, we would be destroying all we did if we did not keep killing wealth and influence. The honourable senior member for the City is one of the cleverest men in Barbados, but he has not been so clever in this debate; everything he said springs from his being a Conservative. At this stage with universal suffrage, he cannot get in the Federal Parliament. I apologise for referring to the honourable member, but if honourable members do not see that it is easy to throw personal feeling at somebody, over and above that is the consideration that it is the same spirit which makes us say that we do not want Reserve Powers. It is not in the interest of Socialists in the West Indies to deprive their local Parliament of Socialists; with adult suffrage hardly anybody will get in the Fed-

eral Assembly except some of Mr. Bustamante's group, but Socialists. It is no wonder that the hon. senior member for the City pressed so hard for a Senate to break the deluge which will take place in a Socialist Assembly. I am suggesting to all true Labourites who are looking at the movement rather than the individual—I am suggesting to honourable members that this recommendation of the Select Committee will find approval right and left among the delegates who are going to London. There is no reason why true Labourites in this House who do not want to see the movement suffer, should be unwilling to vote for the retention of seats in the local Assembly by members who may be elected to the Federal Assembly. It is more insular to press that than to press that Barbados is not going into the Federation without free movement of the people; it is in our interest to have that provision. I appeal to honourable members not to be led away by the extremely ingenious manner in which the honourable member has used his argument tonight.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am wondering if the honourable senior member for the City would suggest that no members of the St. Michael's Vestry should be members of this House. What is to prevent any Barbadian or Trinidadian from serving his own country in his own territory? Let us get down to practical politics; are you telling me that you are making a superstructure and I have nothing to say in the country in which I live? If you take the example of the honourable senior member for the City in the St. Michael's Vestry, you dominate the scene in your local politics and when you run for the House of Assembly nobody can do you anything because you have already consolidated yourself in a particular area. When you go to the Federal Parliament do you say that you do not represent us any more, that you have gone upstairs? I am not one of those politicians who keep their heads on Mars; there is only one member of this Chamber who would have the chance of being elected to the Federal Assembly; the honourable Leader of the House will be elected to the Federal Parliament first and anybody else after. When you talk about personalities, Churchill or Eisenhower will be considered in any part of the world.

I do not take the view that we do not have sufficient people to serve in the territory because that would be a reflection on the people who are now serving; twenty years ago people thought that this island could not be served by those who are serving it now. I feel that a person who is serving in the Federal Parliament should not be precluded from serving his own territory. I feel that charity begins at home; I do not think that there is any Federal Constitution which will mean more to a person than the territory he represents. Mr. Chairman, you know that in the final analysis, it is the people of St. Joseph who have put you in that seat. Let us regard ourselves in that position; why should we vote today to preclude a Barbadian from serving in his own Assembly if he happens to be elected as a member of the Federal Parliament? Can honourable members show that the Federal Parliament will absorb too much of a man's time continuously? I say that a man who is elected to serve in the Federal Assembly should also be allowed to serve in the local Assembly.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I knew when I was writing that letter I was writing a public document; the only thing the honourable member could do was to publish it in the "Beacon".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything relative to the "Beacon".

Mr. VAUGHAN: The very reason that they have a time limit in respect of members of the Fed-

eral Assembly remaining as members of local Legislatures shows that there is a doubt in their own minds as to whether it is a right principle. The Federal Assembly will be meeting at the same time as this House is meeting and how are you going to serve both places at the same time? That is a principle which cannot be justified on reason.

Mr. TALMA: There will be a separate and distinct election for the Federal Assembly. It is not that you must be a member of the local Assembly so as to be a member of the Federal Assembly; you can be a member of the Federal Assembly without being a member of the local Assembly. I feel that there should not be any bar to a person being a member of both Assemblies provided that it is possible for him to serve in both. I see no reason why a person should be debarred from being a member of the Federal Assembly and also being a member of the local Assembly as long as his duties will not be conflict.

Mr. ALLDER: Never in my life have I heard more selfishness than I have been hearing for the last half hour. This idea of holding on is causing the destruction of nations; because for the last to justify the perpetuity of his political existence in this colony? I can imagine the argument which the honourable member and his Party would put up if this suggestion had been made by any other political Party in this House. The honourable member is Leader of this House and whenever he has to go away, the House is adjourned for four weeks until he comes back; no important matter is allowed to be discussed until he returns. If the honourable member must continue to be at the head of the Trade Union he represents and as a member of the Executive Committee plus being the Leader of this House and a member of the Federal set-up, is that not impossible? Must we pass legislation in this colony to suit the selfishness of a few individuals? That is definitely a waste of time; you cannot be at the top and the bottom of the tree at the same time; you must either be satisfied with being at the top of the tree or remain at the bottom of it where the substance is obtained. I have refrained from saying anything during the discussion of this matter because I feel that we have nothing to gain at this late hour from Federation. Any political Federation which has not got industrial stability from its foundation must mean nothing to the colonies which federate, so that we must not miss the industrial train. When all the other colonies were trying to get industries we have been making it difficult to get them. Personally, I have no hope in federation at this time because opportunities have left us already. To saddle people with dual responsibility as individuals—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I appeal to the honourable member to keep to the Clause before us.

Mr. ALLDER: I am speaking of the duties which would fall on members of the Federal Government. I see that honourable members on my right are now trotting out something different from what they once trotted out to the people: "We are going to make you masters in your own house." They want to say that only the Labour Party members have brains and they must be put in every responsible position. The honourable junior member for St. Peter says that he saw something which would cause him to hold a seat in the local Legislature even if he holds one in the Federal Assembly: that argument might have been more acceptable 60 or 70 years ago when illiteracy was more rampant, but today the children who leave the schools are more literate than before. When we give our assent to Federation and say that those who are left behind are less capable than ourselves—it is just slapping people in their faces if we say that it would be diffi-

cult to find suitable candidates for the local Legislature. We have a few smart men who would be at the top all the time and others would be kept in ignorance.

Some honourable member has said—I think it was the honourable junior member for St. Peter—that 20 years ago it would be considered *infra dig* for the House to have the kind of members it has now, but time marches on and you cannot prevent it. It is nothing but selfishness to say that a member who has been elected to the Federal Assembly should continue to be a member of the local Legislature. I hope that honourable members do not agree to make such a thing possible. When the honourable member compares a Vestry with this Chamber, that is a waste of time; he could more compare this Chamber with the Other Place.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I think that this is a matter to which we need not devote much more time; we can leave it to the rational people who will meet in London next month. As to the suggestion advanced that a member would not be re-elected to the Federal Parliament after five years because he was not a member of the local Legislature and people would say that they do not know him, it might as well be said that if you do not serve on the Vestry you cannot get a seat in this House. If a person goes to the Federal Parliament and represents the people, he will be re-elected. Nobody would suggest that if you do not serve your municipal Body you cannot get into the House of Assembly.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I did not say that if a man has not served in the local Legislature he cannot get in the Federal Parliament.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The argument has been advanced that unless you are beating the home drum you cannot have a chance in the Federal Legislature. If a person serves efficiently in the Federal Parliament, he will be returned to the Federal Parliament. If we cannot find a sufficiently large number of men efficiently to represent the local Legislature and the Federal Legislature without duplication, then we are not ready for self-government: in that case it would be sheer nonsense to talk about self-government and we could shut down all the schools and say that we are back where we were before we left Africa. Are we going to remain on the threshold of Dominion Status in that way? Are we saying that we only have a handful of men with ability and they must serve right through as members of the Federal Legislature, the local Legislature and as Vestrymen? That is creating a wrong impression abroad: to put it on record that we have not got a sufficiently large number of efficient people to occupy a few seats in the Federal Parliament and we can simultaneously conduct our own affairs locally, is saying that we are still very backward.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I want to re-emphasize what I said. Because a person is already a member of the local Legislature, that does not deprive another person who is not a member of the local Legislature, from offering himself to be a member of the Federal Parliament: but could any honourable member tell me that a person who is already a member of the local Legislature should be deprived of serving in the Federal Parliament? Could any man reasonably say that that is a reflection on Barbados. In Jamaica they are even now allowing a member of the local Parliament to be automatically a member of the local Government—something with which I do not agree. Are you telling me that in Barbados today any honourable member who serves in this Assembly should be precluded from serving here if he wants to serve in the Federal Legislature? It does not prevent Federation from working if he serves in

the Federal Legislature and also in the local Legislature. If matters overlap you could say that a person has been taken from the Barbados House of Assembly and placed in the Federal Parliament and he is reflecting the views of this Assembly; but when you consider that he has been elected along with others who may be members of the House of Assembly, why should he be excluded from serving Barbados? I am not advancing the argument that there are not other people who could serve in the local Assembly, but those who are in the local Assembly should not be deprived of serving the colony if they are elected to the Federal Parliament. It would be a reflection on self-government to say that as long as a person is serving as a member of a Vestry he cannot represent the people in the House of Assembly. As long as a man can serve his local Legislature and also the Federal Parliament, there is nothing wrong with that; but a man who is serving his local Legislature may be beaten by another man at the election.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I want to say that I have listened to the honourable junior member for St. Peter and the honourable Leader of the House and I am not convinced. His Honour the Speaker has pointed out that this proposal is only for five years; we are passing an Address now and by the natural process of things, we will hardly see Federation within five years. I am not convinced by any of the arguments at all that it is necessary to give the right to people to sit as members of both Chambers; I am more settled in my opinion after listening to the honourable Leader of the House, even when he suggested that I represent the Conservative view. I have never fooled myself that I got elected here because I was a Conservative or a Labourite, just as I do not want anybody to fool himself that he will never see the day when there is a majority of the Aubrey Williams and Graham Yearwood type of people. Time was when the Socialist Party seemed to have been in the wilderness and there was a time when middle-class intellectual persons had to stand in the corner and wait for other people to go forward. I see two honourable members who were willing to sacrifice their positions and throw in their lot. I personally feel that with my limitations I could not give the same service in the Federal Parliament as I could give in the local Assembly; I have not had the advantage of the education. I am prepared to serve where I can be of the best service.

The assumption is that only Socialist members hope to be elected, but it is not that only Socialist members hope to be elected. It is my considered opinion that the Federal Parliament would be more suitable to the type of people we have than the local Parliament, because in the local Parliament you have to fight and it will be in a different atmosphere from the Federal Parliament. I do not think that this matter should be considered purely in the light in which the honourable Leader of the House would have us consider it; according to the honourable member, he has fought for all this social improvement. You give the right to members to go to the Federal Parliament and if you do not give them the right to go there they will probably have to remain in the local Parliament. I really do not think that the honourable junior member for St. Peter could be serious in his views; I am not voting for this proposal; I will vote against it if I vote alone.

Mr. BARROW: I am of the opinion that this paradox of having arguments brought forward in respect of members sitting both in territorial Legislatures and in the Federal Legislature has been the

result of the fact that the members of the Standing Closer Association Committee themselves seem, at several points, to lose sight of the problem which confronted them and the objects of Federation. From the course of this debate we seem to regard the Federal Government as a sort of *ad hoc* agency to which we send delegates periodically in the same manner as in respect of the Regional Economic Committee, to carry out the wishes and desires of the local Legislatures. On the other side of the paradox we have the honourable Leader of the House voicing the sentiment to which I heartily subscribe, that Federation is the next best thing to unitary Government. You have it stated quite clearly in the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee that they have come irresistibly to the conclusion that the problem of the economic stability of the West Indies can only be solved by Federation and we want to restrict the Federal Government in its powers to legislate and provide those safeguards against economic stability which the Committee themselves have set out as the rationality of Federation. We have reached the stage where we regard the Federal Government not as an Authority for the whole area which will legislate in the interests of the West Indian peoples, but as a sort of *ad hoc* organization which will act in a very restricted field, and therefore we have lost sight of the very object of Federation — the building of a nation with a certain amount of economic stability—and we have lost sight of the very purpose for which the Standing Closer Association Committee fought—that we should federate in order to survive. I would like to quote two passages from the Report; at paragraph 16 the Committee state:—

“The next question is to consider whether there are possibilities that the economic weaknesses of the region can be remedied within the existing political framework—i.e. on a “territorial” rather than a “regional” basis. In other words, can the existing units, or any of them, hope to achieve a sufficient degree of economic stability to enable them to attain a real and permanent independence of outside aid and so the possibility of real as distinct from formal political independence?”

The Committee go on to state:

“We are satisfied the region will not achieve economic stability while it consists of a large number of quite separate political units, and consequently that the hopes of such units of achieving real political independence, as such, are slight.”

Finally at the end of Chapter I of the Report, the Committee state:—

“We believe that the attainment of independence within the British Commonwealth is the legitimate political objective of the region. Since a state” and I underline the word ‘state’, “has a real as distinct from a purely formal independence only to the extent of its independence of external financial assistance. It is clear that the economic stability of the region must be improved as rapidly as possible. It is our considered judgment that this can only be done by setting up a federal government and entrusting to it the important powers and responsibilities particularly, though not exclusively, in the economic field”

Having enunciated these fundamental principles in such clear language, the Committee went on and in every proposal they put forward they sought to restrict the field of operation of the Federal Government, so that it is not strange that we should lose sight of the object of Federation and think of the Federal Government as some *ad hoc* organisation to which we send delegates. Since the Committee themselves have circumscribed the field and the powers

of the Federal Government have been restricted and we have the Australian model it is not strange that we regard the Federal Government as being slight.

We cannot conceive that a man can serve the Federal Government and the local Government at the same time; we can perhaps elect people to the Senate or send members of the Legislature to take part in the Federal discussions. I can only conceive of a man sitting in the Federal Government and serving the West Indies and in the local Government if the people have elected him to carry out those duties. That will entail a great deal of travelling; the deliberations of the Federal Government especially for the first five years should be of such magnitude and gravity, having regard to the destiny of the whole area, that I cannot see how one representative can sit in two places at one time. When we consider all the points, we have to change the whole structure of Federation; the Federal Government is circumscribed and is a strong antithesis of what the Standing Closer Association Committee themselves and all West Indians of goodwill expect to achieve by the Federal structure. By the time that the Conference meets in London and this particular matter is referred to, West Indians will have reviewed their whole attitude to it, and in anticipation of that, I cannot support the idea that members of the local Legislature should divide their loyalties between the two legislative Chambers; that will only entrench still deeper in the minds of people that when they take part in the deliberations of the Federal Legislature they will be acting as delegates to a territory and not as West Indian citizens. For those and other reasons I would have to oppose this idea; I will not subscribe to the proposal that loyalty should be divided and that a member should regard himself as a delegate from one House to another.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member has used an argument which has a little too much of the academic in it. I agree that there are points in his argument, but he forgets what the position in the West Indies is. You cannot get unity in the West Indies at present and the best thing you can get is a weak Federal Government because of the rivalries which exist. The Rance Report says that you cannot have economic stability let alone economic independence; that is because we are aware of the difficulties of getting together a Federal Parliament. This House has based its voting for two chambers on the argument that each separate unit has to be safeguarded; what is that but divided loyalty? I am yet to hear an answer to the argument of the honourable junior member for St. Peter as to why you should deprive a man who has a chance of doing good things for his country, of having that chance? Why should we not try the experiment for five years and see if it is leading us away from West Indian unity or if there is a lot to be lost and very little to be gained? We realize the conflict existing among the various islands and we insisted that for the initial period members of Local Legislatures should have as much say as they can have.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am moving at this stage, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and

ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. You can not go to the Conference in London and say that after 12 o'clock a.m. the majority of the House spoke against this matter and could not wait to have the vote taken; this is nothing on which the Government of Barbados depends. I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

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 negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. WILLIAMS, E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—3.

Noes: Mr. SPEAKER, Messrs. MAPP, BARROW, TALMA, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, Cox and Dr. CUMMINS—8.

The question that paragraph 5 as moved stand part of the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Messrs. MAPP, TALMA.

ADAMS, Cox, F. L. WALCOTT and Dr. CUMMINS—7.

Noes: Messrs. E. D. MOTTLEY and GODDARD—2.

On the motion being put that Paragraph 5 as moved stand part of the Address, the question was decided in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. TALMA, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. Cox and Mr. F. L. WALCOTT—(7).

Noes: Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. F. C. GODDARD—(2).

On motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. SPEAKER Paragraph 4 was recommitted.

On motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox the words "or the Senate" were inserted in this Paragraph after the words "House of Assembly" in the last line but one.

Paragraph 4 as amended was then passed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The question of the Governor-General's reserve powers is so important that I do not think we should try to finish it tonight. I move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am in a bit of a difficulty. The Princess Royal, as far as I remember is leaving on Tuesday next; I cannot remember at what hour. I am going to move that House do now adjourn until 3 p.m. next Tuesday. If Your Honour considers that some other hour should be fixed Your Honour can notify the House. There is a rule providing for that to be done.

I move, Sir, that the House do now adjourn until 3 o'clock p.m. next Tuesday.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion.

The question was put and agreed to *nem. con.* and His Honour the SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.