

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1951-54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 24th, 1953.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. C. E. TALMA and Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

PRAYERS AND MINUTES

Prayers having been read, the Minutes of the Meetings of Tuesday, 20th January, 1953 and Tuesday, 27th January, 1953, were taken as read and were confirmed.

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

Financial Statement of the Accountant General for month ended 31st January, 1953.

Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill intituled an Act relating to Contributory Negligence and for purposes connected therewith with an amendment thereto.

PAPERS LAID

The following Papers were laid by command of His Excellency the Acting Governor:—

Mr. ADAMS: Message No. 3/1953 from His Excellency the Acting Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly presenting for the consideration of the Honourable House the draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the Financial Year 1953-54.

Mr. ADAMS for Dr. Cummins: Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies for the half year ended 31st December, 1950.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Bill intituled an Act to amend

the Chief Judge and Crown Law Officers (Additional Judge) Act, 1951.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill intituled an Act to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1953, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said Tax.

QUESTIONS

The following notices of Questions were given:

Mr. TALMA: To enquire of the Appropriate Member of the Executive Committee present at next meeting of this House:—

Is Government aware of the present plight of dozens of old and impecunious tenants of lands known as "DOVER", Maxwell Road, Christ Church, all of whom are being ejected from their respective holdings (or House spots) through the Courts?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government consider the advisability of acquiring appropriate lands in the vicinity of Maxwell Road or Maxwell Hill for the purpose of providing suitable House spots and/or a Housing Scheme for the parish of Christ Church in general and for such displaced tenants, in particular?

If the answer is in the negative, will Government please make the necessary investigations without undue delay with the view of alleviating such grave hardships, suffering and inconveniences now being experienced by such tenants as aforesaid?

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

Is Government aware of the economic hardships suffered by Public Employees who are employed by day's labour during a week when there is a Public holiday?

2. Will Government take appropriate action to ensure that the abovementioned employees are paid in full for the week in which are included the two Coronation Bank Holidays, provided such employees work during the remainder of such week?

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

Is Government aware that there is grave dissatisfaction existing among the several butchers of this Island in respect of the disposal of certain animals from Government Agricultural Stations, which animals have been found to be barren and/or otherwise unfit for breeding purposes?

2. Will Government, if the answer to the above is in the affirmative, cause such animals to be sold by Public Auction in order that equal opportunities may be afforded all butchers to purchase the same?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Chief Judge and Crown Law Officers (Additional Judge) Act, 1951 was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox the Bill intituled an Act to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1953, and to make provision for other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax was read a first time.

RESUMPTION OF FEDERATION DISCUSSION

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day is to resume consideration of the Interim and Final Reports on Federation.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee, Mr. SMITH in the Chair.

Mr. GODDARD, Mr. MAPP and Mr. BRYAN came into the Committee and took their seats.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—In view of the fact that as the daily newspaper puts it, things seem to happen quickly late at night, we seemed not to have discussed adequately last Tuesday night the later portions of Paragraph 4 now numbered 5, that is to say, the paragraph which deals with the number of seats that should be allocated to Barbados and the election of the Speaker. In view of that fact, sir, and in view of that fact that I have understood from a number of honourable members that in their view we should speak at greater length on this paragraph than we did last Tuesday, I am asking leave to move that we recommit Paragraph 5 which was passed last Tuesday.

There being no objection leave was granted to move the recommitment of Paragraph 5.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox Paragraph 5 was recommitted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The first part admits of very little argument, I take it. While it is true that in various parts of the world and not so far from Barbados the Speaker is sometimes selected from outside the membership, outside of the body, I can hardly imagine anything more undignifying, and a greater reflection on the ability or efficiency, or honesty of members of the Assembly than to say that you have to bring someone from outside of their body to preside over their deliberations. I cannot imagine a body like the House of Assembly of Barbados adopting such a fantastic procedure. Perhaps I should not use that word. One so often says things without any direct intention or any intention whatever to cast a reflection on other Assemblies but which do appear that way. But if you are starting a Federal Assembly and as a first step you say that you cannot trust one of your own members to preside over that Assesbly with fairness and efficiency, it does seem to be a confession of inferiority before you start.

I am therefore suggesting to the House that we should strongly insist that the Speaker of the Federal House of Assembly, like the President of the upper House should be chosen from among its members. If the committee prefers, we can perhaps discuss that part of the paragraph and get it out of the way before we tackle the question of the allocation of seats.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman,—I do not think that this point will need much discussion in a Cham-

ber such as this, which has always had the right to choose its Speaker from among its elected members. We will all be in entire agreement with that principle. I have only risen to say from this side of the table that there can be no objection whatever to our choosing our own Speaker. It is true that under the new constitution of Trinidad their Speaker has been appointed from outside; but they have only now begun to have constitutional rights that we have always enjoyed. If we are going into federation on the basis of being a people able to manage our own affairs we should have the right to choose our Speaker from among the elected members of the Federal Assembly.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman.—I would like to say that I appreciate the argument that the Federal Legislature should elect its own Speaker. I am at a loss to know why it should be otherwise. If the Federal Assembly has the right to elect a Speaker from among its members he must command more respect than a Speaker who is chosen and sent to preside over them. Another thing is that you should give a Speaker from among the elected members of the Assembly at least a casting vote, while a Speaker chosen from outside should not have a vote at all.

Mr. ADAMS: Inasmuch as there seems to be unanimity on the point I would like to pass on to the last part of the paragraph which deals with the allocation of seats. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be impossible for me, or for any other honourable member to say anything on this point without drawing down on his head the wrath of some of the other colonies. Therefore, I will go to any extent within parliamentary limits to soften anything which it is necessary for me to say. As I have pointed out to the House before, and I presume that honourable members can see it for themselves, the Leeward Islands have been a federation for a number of years, unlike the Windward Islands. The Windwards is only a geographical expression. They are separate colonies. They have not gone into the suggested federation, and they have no intention of doing so unless the rest of the area comes in.

Now it may be their misfortune and not because of inefficiency that they have been unable to balance their budgets. But Barbados — I am going to say this although Barbadians are always being accused of trying to be superior—Barbados in the three centuries of her history has never had to go to the British Government and ask for two cents by way of a grant to enable her to balance her budget. We have gone to ask for a greater price for our sugar; but that is quite a different thing from asking the British taxpayer to pull out £60,000 to enable us to balance our budget as other islands have had to do. Antigua has had a dry season for 19 years out of every century and there may be a cause for her not to be able to balance her budget. But it is a fact that she cannot, and yet they are asking for two seats. Nevis, St. Kitts and Montserrat are in the same position. Montserrat is a little more modest, although I notice that Mr. Bustamante has told them that they are too modest. But in the meantime they have been content to ask for one seat. The same thing applies to the Windward Islands. Islands that cannot balance their budgets and for whom provision is being made even when in the federal state for the British Government to give them financial aid and so keep control over them are asking for two seats; but it is suggested that Barbados should only have four. St. Lucia, St. Kitts etc. will number in all 13 seats. We could not possibly agree to that.

It is true that we have to get around the difficulties that have always confronted founding fathers of a federation. It is true that Prussia federated states with great difference in population. But you cannot go completely by population where the allocation of

seats is concerned. It is easy to say that Barbados only has 200,000 people while the Windward or Leeward Islands have more. But you cannot go purely by population. If you did, Jamaica with 1,300,000 would have to have seven times as many seats as Barbados, which is absurd. You must have some sort of compromise. Barbados with its political reputation; its sound financial standing over all these centuries; its sense of responsibility; is entitled to say that these are factors that should be taken into consideration when you are allocating seats. To give us four seats so that any three bankrupt islands can out-vote us must give us pause. I repeat that we are entitled to say that our position in the Caribbean area; our constitutional development; our ability to run our own affairs without having to go on our knees before the British taxpayer should count far more than mere population.

I have also to remind honourable members that when these seats were allocated, British Guiana was taken into consideration. We heard much of the potential wealth of British Guiana. If British Guiana has not clearly expressed a desire to come into the proposed federation, we should, in allocating seats to Barbados, take into consideration the possibility that even if we did not ask for, or did not deserve a greater percentage of seats than four when it was thought that British Guiana was coming in, now that she is not coming in the number of seats both in respect to the proportion which each bears to the other, and the percentage that it bears to the total number of seats should be re-considered, and Barbados should have a greater voice in the Federal Assembly by having increased the number of seats to which we are entitled.

At this stage although I do not wish to be drawn into any extra judicial row with any newspaper, and certainly I do not wish to say things which were supposed to be secret when they were done, I have never agreed to this allocation of seats. In view of the fact that the "Advocate" in its usual way, reckless of the truth, has chosen to say how often I have changed my views on Federation, I repeat with all the solemnity and sincerity of which I am capable that I have never changed my views on any aspect of federation from the time I have put those views on paper, except in respect of cutting out any suggestion of Financial Secretary or Attorney General and Treasurer being in a uni-cameral system. It is a wholly untrue suggestion that I have been altering my views from time to time. As it appears in this Report, neither the Hon'ble Mr. Cuke nor myself, who were the original delegates to the conference were present on the first occasion. I had to leave on the second occasion and on another occasion Mr. Cuke was not present. The position of Barbados has, it seems, to be more emphasised on the floor of our Assembly. I will say no more than that that is due to the fact that our delegates were not present at all those meetings.

I desire merely to draw to the attention of honourable members the fact that it is impossible to go purely by population, and the fact that the position has altered since the Rance Report by reason of the fact that we cannot now count on British Guiana coming in. It is true that many of us who have been studying the situation in British Guiana feel that a few months after their new elections they will be more willing to come in. But as the case is now, without a direct pronouncement by the Legislature of British Guiana, we are entitled to assume that they are not coming in, and there should be a re-allocation of these seats.

I will say, speaking for myself, that I see no reason why these smaller islands should have two

seats. I think that one is quite enough. We will have to go to the British Government and ask for grants and loans, and if our overheads are going to be great we may find that an obstacle. We may find that in our talks in London the Colonial Officer may suggest that 50 members are too many, and that these numbers could be cut down and given one seat each to Dominica, St. Vincent, Grenada, St. Kitts etc. and proportionately reducing the numbers for Trinidad, Jamaica and ourselves.

Honourable members will no doubt want to express their views on this aspect of the matter. We can say that we think that the numbers are too few or too great. But it is advisable for us to express our views on the allocation of seats in no uncertain terms. I hope that I have thrown some little light and not by my speech made the matter more confused than it is at the present moment.

Mr. Barrow, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. E. D. Mottley and Mr. E. K. Walcott came into the Committee and took their seats while Mr. Adams was speaking.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—It is very surprising to hear the type of speech that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made with regard to numbers in a democratic election. He owes his entire position in this colony to the principle of the majority. That is fundamental. Numbers are proposed to be the basis of election to the Federal Assembly. True democratic election is never based on property or quality of personality. The only thing it has ever been based on is numbers. Right here in this colony the honourable member who has just spoken has been the most outspoken critic and the foremost enemy of property qualifications when it came to election to the legislature and to local government. Yet he is suggesting that because Barbados is wealthy and the smaller colonies are poor and have not been able to balance their budgets we should be superior to them where the allocation of seats is concerned. The honourable member does not reflect that you can balance your budget at the cost of starvation which other colonies have refused to do. We on the other hand, throughout our history, have been content to balance our budget at the cost of great social hardship in this colony, and the honourable member is saying that one of the reasons why we should have more seats is because we have always balanced our budgets. I am very much taken back that the honourable member could be so opposite in his views on the principle of democratic election because he is now dealing with election to a Federal Government and not to the colonial legislature.

We have had a system of election to the local government and to the central government based on the property which a man owns in a parish or parishes. It happened that a man could have several votes. That has been completely abolished more through the instrumentality of the honourable member than any other person in this colony. Yet he does not want to apply that system when it comes to election of the Federal Legislature. Throughout all the centuries of democratic government the principle has been the greatest good for the greatest number. The majority decides the issue. What is the British Government doing now? Throughout the whole Colonial Empire it is giving the masses the vote; the right to elect their own representatives to the legislature; and yet the honourable member is denying this principle where election to the Federal Legislature is concerned. If you deny this principle of the majority where elections are concerned you will have to deny all that you have been preaching for years in this colony about the rights of certain groups in this colony.

It is only by the principle of Adult Suffrage that the honourable member has so many supporters around him here. Fortunately for me I was elected both before and after Adult Suffrage. But I am sure that if the principle of basing representation in this Chamber on property qualification had remained the honourable member would not have been the Leader of this House to-day; because the numbers that have made him the Leader would not have been elected here on a limited franchise. How is it that he is now denying the citizens of Antigua and St. Kitts and Montserrat the same principle of democratic election where the Federal Legislature is concerned? I warn members of the House that if they follow that view, instead of aiding the cause of Federation, they will be laying this colony open to the charge of trying to throw a monkey wrench in the works. Just because another colony is poorer we should have representatives in greater proportion to our population than they! Merely to say it is to see the absurdity of it. I ask the honourable member on what principle does he base his argument. If he bases it on wealth and economic stability the same argument can be applied to the local wealthy planters and merchants to whom the honourable member denied that sort of privilege where local elections were concerned. Why does he bring up that argument now? A principle is a principle regardless of what it applies to; whether it applies to the Federal Legislature or the local one. You cannot use one argument about election to this Chamber and another one as regards election to the Federal Legislature. Whatever superiority the honourable member imagines lies in the population of this colony it cannot be applied to the principle of democratic elections. Throughout the world, in all the countries that subscribe to the principles of democracy, numbers is the deciding factor. However much we try to fool ourselves no other colony is going to accept it otherwise.

Mr. ADAMS: I will ask the honourable member one question. Would he suggest that in the U.N.O. Russia should have twice as many votes as a country with twice less the population of Russia?

Mr. VAUGHAN: The U.N.O. is a world government. It is not a federal government.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable member who has just sat down does not seem to have fully grasped the principle involved in the allocation of seats. I thoroughly agree that seats should be allocated on the population basis. But that is not the course that has been adopted; because Barbados with 215,000 people has been allocated four seats, while if you put any three of the Windward or Leeward Islands together their population will be found to be less than that of Barbados. Take St. Vincent with a population of 68,000; St. Lucia has 81,000. Each of these islands will get two seats. St. Kitts has 49,000. Those three added together make 198,000 which is still less than that of Barbados. That means that on the population basis Barbados is entitled to at least five or six seats. That speaks for itself. It means that the argument of the hon. junior member for St. John falls to the ground. It shows that the allocation of seats recommended in the report is not made up on the population basis alone. The question of the importance of a colony would arise. And even on that score, Barbados being one of the oldest colonies, and having the most seasoned politicians and/or statesmen, should be allocated more than four seats.

I do not want to be lengthy, sir, but I must answer this point: In our local elections the question of population does not arise. When we have a popu-

lation of 190,000 electors to send 12 representatives to the House of Assembly, St. James with six or seven thousand people sends the same two representatives as St. Michael with almost 90,000. Of course I do not agree with that system. I say that that should be amended. I agree to the principle of membership on the population basis; but I repeat, that if you lump three of the Leeward or Windward Islands together their population will not be in excess of that of Barbados. That in itself is no decisive argument why an island like this, with a rising population should not be given full consideration and proper representation in the number of seats allocated to it.

There is another point which I wish to stress. I think that the people of this island are politically conscious and awakened, and if West Indian Federation is a political matter then we can look to no better place for members of a Federal Assembly.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I regret that I have not been able to attend some of the other debates. We are proposing in this report to say that the House does not agree with the proposed allocation of seats, and recommends that Barbados should have six seats. Where the Rance Report is concerned, were it not for the risk of tiring some who have already read it, I would read Para. 63, because I do not think that honourable members should go away with the impression that the Rance Report decided something which it did not really decide.

Now, sir, when you listen to the debate and to the speeches of certain honourable members you will imagine that they are of the opinion that the signatories were going to war, and therefore you had to count your troops on the one side as opposed to the troops on the other side. In other words, we seem to be approaching this question again and again from the entirely insular point of view. It is always what shall Barbados have, and what is best for Barbados, rather than what is best for the Federation. Do you think that we are paying a compliment to the ability of the Leader of this House when we suggest that if he is elected a member of the Federal Assembly he will only be able to count on the support of the four seats allocated to us? If he could only count on those four seats he would be a failure. Knowing the other islands as I do, and even being insular to that extent, I would even suggest that in any Assembly that was created in the West Indies you would find the Leeward and Windward Islands siding with you in any big dispute where some of the other islands were concerned. That would be almost a certainty. Members like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who attended at Montego Bay are well aware that the Windward and Leeward Islands were more than friendly in this matter. Their delegates even suggested in my hearing that they would be willing to form a federation with Barbados if we would take them in.

I am suggesting therefore, that we should not fight over this question of six seats, or four seats and taking away from their two seats. Bear in mind that you will have to have some representation coming from the different colonies and all these things have to be taken in account which were put down in the paragraph that I have quoted. I think you would be doing a dangerous thing to allow the colonies of the Windwards and Leewards only one seat each. It would be unfair in the sense that they are not going to the Federal Assembly to oppose you; they are going to try to do what is best for the economic and political welfare of the whole region. There is no reason therefore to take away from their two seats which as a matter of fact might come in very

valuable because they will be, in my opinion, friendly towards us.

I would like to suggest to the framers of this report that whereas they might strive to get better representation for Barbados they should not confine themselves to saying six seats; because it might give the impression that unless we can get six seats we are not prepared to enter the Federation, which I do not think is in the minds of any of us. I am sure that if we are sending four persons they will not stick *en bloc*, but deal with the matter of the West Indies and ourselves. There is no question that we must insist on six because another colony is having two. That whole outlook is parochial.

In addition to that I believe — I was not present when the final decision was made — I believe that we will have a second chamber, and as has been drawn to the attention of this House, a second chamber does have its value. In that respect it is usual to have in a second chamber an equal number of representatives so that no harm may be done to a unit because of an inequality of representatives. So I am suggesting that we merely say that the House would be happy for Barbados to have a greater number of seats in the proposed allocation or something to that effect. That would mean that we would be telling our delegates to the London Conference what I expect every other colony will say: that they would like more seats than proposed for them now. But do not let us insist on that unless we are prepared to admit to political bankruptcy in the West Indies; unless we are saying that the members we will send to the Federal Assembly will be unable to persuade and draw to our side other persons from other colonies; because we would have greater experience and political wisdom in dealing with the unit as a whole.

I am so afraid that what we say now, or the orders we give to our delegates may put them in an uncomfortable position when they attend the conference. So although we may desire more seats than the four allocated to us I am saying again that we should merely tell our delegates to request an increase in the allocation, making it clear that even if we get four only, we will still be prepared to enter the Federation.

Mrs. BOURNE came into the House and took her seat.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, — The honourable senior member for St. Joseph reminded me of two housewives shouting at each other from opposite sides of the street in that we are arguing from different premises; but the premises from which each is arguing cannot be supported by the recommendations and the reasons for those recommendations set out in Para. 63 of the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee. Had not the honourable junior member for St. James been seated opposite when he used the remarks that he did I would have sworn that he was looking over my shoulder and reading my notes. Because throughout this debate I gathered the impression that it is really a sharpening of knives to go up to London to cut the throats of the other people from other parts of the Caribbean, rather than preparing to come closer together.

I think that the arguments used by the honourable junior member for St. James are obviously without foundation when he deals with the proportion of representation on the basis of proportion of population. It is clear from Para. 63 of the Report, especially the part which says, "as a result of our proposed allocation...."

That shows that the premises on which the honourable member based his attack on the honourable senior member for St. Joseph are without foundation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as regards what the Leader of the House has proposed, I am no believer in the magic of numbers. If anyone in the House could convince me that the addition of two seats to the four proposed for Barbados would in some way improve the chances of federation and improve the economic or political position of Barbados I would be willing to be persuaded. But if we want more seats, it is not sufficient for us to say that the smaller islands being less developed educationally, politically and economically will have two against our four, and therefore we should have two more. That appears to me to be the sort of argument that I used to hear as a schoolboy at lunch time. If we want two more seats those two more seats must serve us some useful purpose. I can see no benefit inuring to this island, nor prestige to its politicians to say that we should have six instead of four seats.

Apart from that, if we in Barbados could afford to have six members elected to the Federal Legislature we would be in a very happy position indeed. If a country like Jamaica, with, I imagine, six or seven times the population of Barbados, and in my opinion more politically alive and advanced than Barbados should have 16 seats, we in Barbados would be starting a game in which we would ask for six seats, and Jamaica would then ask for 18 etc. and no one would be able to bring forward any arguments to show why this Alice in Wonderland game is taking place.

There is no magic in numbers, and the committee has obviously gone into this matter carefully; and contrarily to the impression gained by the honourable junior member for St. John, they have allocated seats more on the basis of the law of diminishing proportions in the increase of population, rather than on the direct population basis. I will say that the arguments brought forward by the Leader of the House are not becoming to a man of his political stature, and his general knowledge of human affairs; because they are mainly arguments which are more likely to wreck the cause of federation than to improve our chances of coming together as a unit and building a nation.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention—unless someone can persuade me of the efficacy of doing so—of supporting any motion that the allocation should be increased from four to six or any other number. At the same time I will not support any motion for a reduction below four. I regret that the honourable junior member for St. James weakened his case by arguing that a rider be put into the clause to the effect that when our delegates get to London they can say "we would not mind if you give us a couple more seats." I am dead against giving our delegates any such blank check on which they may write any clause when they get to London and wreck the cause of Federation. I say that we should be silent on the point; because we cannot justify an increase in seats on political grounds. We are not going to war. We are going to London to get together, and the argument that I have brought forward is that a mere increase in seats from four to six will not put Barbados in any better political position.

I think that the honourable junior member for St. James weakened his case by the phraseology which he proposes should be put in. Therefore, Mr. Chairman I beg to move the deletion of the last paragraph of what is now Section 5.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not want to be offensive; but for a moment I wondered if I was listening in on a Sunday School. Does the honourable junior member for St. James seriously think that any of these territories will go to London saying "I do not

mind how many seats I have; I only want the best for the area"? They are going to fight like cats. It has happened all over the world. Read what happened in the U.S.A. There can be no Sunday School talk now. We are dealing with human nature. Everyone of these colonies, especially now that British Guiana and British Honduras are out, are going to London to ask for a re-allocation of seats. Let us be realists.

It is alright, Mr. Chairman, to talk about building a West Indian nation; but you are far from that stage to-day. If we go there with that attitude we will only be Sunday School boys in a den of lions. If we go there and say that everything is alright; the Leeward and Windward Islands love us, and that kind of thing the others will wonder what has happened to Barbados. They will want to know if we have suddenly gone mad.

I found it difficult to believe that it was the honourable senior member for St. George who was speaking; because he must have read some constitutional law and flirted with some constitutional history. He said that there is nothing in numbers and asked what had we to gain from an increased allocation of seats. Of course there is no magic in numbers until you come to count heads. The honourable junior member for St. John says go on the population basis. The honourable senior member for St. George asks what are numbers. I invite the committee to be realists. I too want to see a West Indian nation. We are all so pleased with ourselves, perhaps with reason, as to feel that all the other colonies will look up to Barbados and want to join with Barbados. But we must remember at the same time that human beings are human beings.

I am going to quote a speech made earlier in these debates. The greatest fight to establish industries takes place at meetings of the Regional Economic Committee. Let us face reality. That is the position all the time. In the beginning we will be going as Barbadians, Trinidadians, Jamaicans etc. Later we will become West Indians. The Anglo Saxon people teach us that in the long run we will go by party. Do not let us shut our eyes to the lessons of the past. Until you reach a certain stage it will be a cutting across of islands. According to the lessons of history it is always a story of two or three or four big countries, provinces or states grabbing the little ones to their sides. Catching the agriculturally minded by promising them something. That will happen in the case of West Indian Federation, or West Indians have suddenly become saints and angels.

The honourable junior member for St. James and the honourable senior member for St. George are arguing that we should say, "we are all West Indians; give us whatever you like. It does not matter if St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenada can outvote us or have the same number of seats as we have." This is a political assembly; not a Sunday School.

As I said previously, everyone will go to London asking for a re-allocation of seats because we are going without British Guiana and British Honduras. Some people say that after the next elections British Guiana will come in, and British Honduras may come in later. But if you are giving seats to colonies and having to chop and change about and you find that two of the colonies are out, you must re-allocate.

I do not think it is necessary to reply specifically to the honourable junior member for St. John. I used to credit him with intelligence when he was first in the House. But he has been in the House for so long a time that I do not know what has happened to him. You give a country or a state or province some consideration in respect of its population; but you cannot go by population alone. The honourable member said that the U.N.O. is a world government. Jamaica has roughly half of the population

of the West Indies. Does the honourable member think that you can work a federal system merely on the basis of population? You must take into account other factors. I wish that honourable members would read again or read for the first time what happened in the U.S.A. It would open the eyes of many of them especially when they consider what the U.S.A. is today. They will see the difficulties of starting a federation. With the best will in the world a man is going to fight for his own province first. He has lived all his life in a unit and he will fight for it first although he realises that he must give something away. Mr. Chairman, the point that I wish to make is this: If we go to London with this indefinite "give us what you like" attitude we will be letting down ourselves; because in the beginning it is impossible not to have a repetition of what has happened in the beginning with other federal systems. Trinidad and Jamaica today are as far apart in outlook as in actual miles. Trinidad and Jamaica are going to battle over the votes of the small islands. I do not care what Trinidadian and Jamaican gets annoyed. I will ask him to prove that it is not so. Sir John Huggins in leaving Jamaica had to draw attention to the fact that every time Jamaica tried to do something in respect of secondary industries Trinidad went one better. The Trinidad member at the R.F.C. meetings is always in a state of tension when the Jamaican member is speaking, and vice versa.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the position of the West Indies today. Knowing that, let us do as the other nations have done, profiting as far as possible from the lessons of federal systems already established, and seeing if we can at least improve upon them.

MR. ALDER came into the Committee and took his seat while MR. ADAMS was speaking.

MR. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman, — The speech which I made was neither a criticism nor a recommendation as far as the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee is concerned. It was merely a reply to a challenge to a principle contained in the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

MR. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—As far as I am concerned, as I said at the beginning the most important question that I see is the question of freedom of movement in the area. As far as that is concerned this debate appears to me to be particularly a waste of time because it is very unlike the Leader of the House to ask us to pin him down to so slight a detail. I say slight, as compared with the importance of the whole question of federation. The more important things contained in this paragraph have already been dealt with—the question of an upper chamber, etc. I am inclined to agree that you cannot send a representative to London and pin him down to what is contained in this paragraph. I think that we should allow it to remain at four seats, and our representative who will know our feelings on the matter can fight for ten seats if he can get ten.

As night follows day, if British Guiana and British Honduras are not coming into the Federation Jamaica and Trinidad will ask for more seats. If Jamaica asks for more, ask for more for Barbados too. Now whether the honourable member agrees or not, I will say that reading the Rance Report I am convinced that this allocation of seats is on nothing but a population basis. How else can you arrive at it? At this stage it is on nothing but a population basis, and in my opinion it is obvious that the honourable Leader of this House is going to be the delegate recommended to represent Barbados at the London Conference. I am not

going to apologise. I say that this part of the debate is an absolute waste of time.

The principle of federation has been agreed upon. The honourable member knows that he will be the representative sent to London. The more important things in this paragraph have been dealt with. There are more important things to deal with. Are we going to wait until midnight to deal with them when half of the members are too hungry to stay in the House? If you have a comfortable place to live in you do not want to stay here until 2 o'clock in the morning.

I have the confidence that when it comes to attending this Conference and giving a historical background about Federation, the hon. Leader of the House with his educational ability can do that. What I feel is that you are bound to have the insular feeling; you are bound to have Mr. Bustamante putting one side and somebody else putting the other side. If the hon. senior member for St. Joseph is worth his salt, he should be capable of pulling the small islands with him. I am voting against this paragraph as to the allocation of seats; as far as we are concerned, the position is bound to be changed up there. I do not see why we should tie the hon. member down to what is set out here; he will think in terms of Barbados while he is in London. I beg to second the motion for the deletion of these two lines of paragraph 5. I do not think we should pin the hon. senior member for St. Joseph down to anything other than what we have said here, that is, unless there is freedom of movement we are not joining in any Federation.

Mr. ADAMS: I suggest that we should not leave out this matter completely, but merely state in general terms that the House considers that the matter of the allocation of seats should be re-considered, because that will cover the other point too. I know that the whole question as to whether the small islands should have two seats and not one will arise.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: It is either a question of Barbados agreeing to this allocation of seats or reducing the number of seats in respect of the Leeward and Windward Islands.

Mr. ADAMS: If you will permit me, Mr. CHAIRMAN, I will accept the suggestion that we phrase this paragraph differently; the whole question of the allocation of seats should be re-considered.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: We do not mean the seats in the Upper House; we mean the seats in the Lower House. The question of the allocation of seats in the Federal Assembly should be reconsidered.

Mr. LEWIS: The question is whether we agree to this entire paragraph including the question of the allocation of seats being reviewed. I would suggest that we put in some reason for suggesting that the question of the allocation of seats be reviewed; we should set out in the paragraph that with the possibility of British Guiana or British Honduras not coming into the Federation, the House feels that the allocation of seats should be reviewed. If we leave the paragraph as it is, it might mean that we do not want as many as four seats. I heard my colleague being corrected on the point of discussing some of the evils; but we are not debating whether we are asking the British Government for something; we are debating proposals which our delegates will put to a Conference at which the Leeward and Windward Islands and everybody who is coming into the Federation will have to give us their vote.

The next thing is that it has gone on record today that we have been able to balance our budget and these impecunious islands have to get pensions from Barbados. We are getting to the point when we may be left out of the Federation by the vote of

other islands; we should remember that as far as balancing our budget is concerned, we produce sugar and we have had a preference on the production of sugar, whereas some of the other islands do not produce sugar and the Mother Country does not even take exports from those islands; therefore we have to be very careful about telling people about not balancing their budget. The fact is that we are tackling this matter very late and the other people have got the impression that we do not want to come into the Federation at all; some of the things I have heard to-day could be taken as a confirmation of that impression. It is only comparatively recently that bauxite has been found in British Guiana, and its development has been so rapid that it was thought that bauxite had been found there before.

On this question of the allocation of seats to the Federal Assembly referred to at paragraph 63 of the Report of the Standing Closer Association Committee, we have to remember that bauxite has been found in British Guiana. When the Rance Report was written no bauxite was found in British Guiana. I would like to know what definitely are the reasons why we are asking that the question of the allocation of seats be re-considered. Is it because these two mainland countries are thought to be out of the Federation and then there will be a re-allocation when either of them comes in? Another point in connection with paragraph 63 of the Report is that an allocation of sugar has been given to British Honduras. All these factors will come to us as a basis for the allocation of seats; one place has been given an allocation for sugar and the other has found a valuable thing like bauxite. So far, we have not made any claims on the grounds laid down in the Report for additional representation; however, if we can get more seats by common consent, I say: let us get them by all means but let us give the reasons that these two countries have now signified their intention to remain out of the Federation, and that is the basis on which we are asking for the re-allocation of seats. I therefore beg to move that the last Clause of paragraph 5 read as follows: "The House of Assembly is of the opinion that since British Guiana and British Honduras have signified their intention not to come into the proposed Federation, there should be a review of the allocation of seats in the Federal Assembly." That would give the reason for asking for the re-allocation of seats and we can bargain for what we can get: we would not say that we are dissatisfied because we think we are very important and we can balance our budget when other people could have balanced their budget if they had produced sugar.

Mr. ADAMS: I cannot accept that: I agree with the compromise which the honourable senior member for the City has suggested. I know that because British Guiana and British Honduras are not coming into the Federation, the whole question will be gone into and we can consider the question of finance at the Conference in London. Do not let us put in one specific reason for the re-allocation of seats; the financial aspect has got something to do with the matter.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I am satisfied with the suggestion of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, that is, that you should get as many seats as you can. It is not that I am not prepared to agree with what has been put forward, but I would like to make this suggestion; I think we should use certain of the words in the Report itself and say that the House of Assembly agrees with the Report of the (increase) \$990.00; (iii) Engineers' Supervision Rance Committee that the allocation of seats to the Federal Assembly is not wholly satisfactory. If we consider that the whole question should be gone into

again we may be binding ourselves a little to the allocation of seats being made according to population, and it is satisfactory to us that the allocation should not be made proportionate to the populations.

Mr. LEWIS: I never suggested that the allocation of seats should be on any population basis.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I am not commenting on the honourable member's speech at all; I am commenting on the compromise which was agreed to. What I am saying is that, in my opinion, it would be more advisable to take some of the words in paragraph 63 at page 33 of the Report of the Rance Committee, and say that we do not consider the allocation of seats wholly satisfactory; we think that we should step up a bit. I agree with the Rance Report as a minimum; If I were a member of that Committee and they offered me five seats, I would jump at them. I merely rose to suggest that some of the words in the Report of the Rance Committee should be used, otherwise I will vote for the compromise.

Mr. WILLIAMS: As I can see it, the framers of the Rance Report admitted that they had some difficulty in arriving at the number of seats where Barbados is concerned. Being a good Barbadian I would like Barbados to get six seats in the Federal Assembly and therefore I would like our proportion to step up accordingly. Taking the three main territories in the Federation, there are, Trinidad and Tobago with an area of 1,980 square miles; population, 618,603; Government revenue, \$49,939,692 and exports, \$138,397,468; Jamaica with an area of 4,411 square miles; population, 1,375,317; Government revenue, 10 million sterling and exports, over 12 million sterling and Barbados with an area of 166 square miles; population, 211,000; Government revenue approximately 2 million sterling and exports, over 4 million sterling. Those are the 1949 figures. That broad picture shows the difficulty in arriving at the allocation of seats on the basis of population; if these figures are borne in mind, you will see the difficulty in arriving at any satisfactory solution in this matter.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I suggest that we should use some of the words in the Report of the Rance Committee. I therefore beg to move that the last two lines of paragraph 5 of the Address be deleted and the following words be inserted in their places: "The House is of the opinion that the proposed allocation of seats is not wholly satisfactory and considers that the allocation of seats should be re-considered."

Mr. ADAMS: I accept that amendment.

The question that paragraph 5 as amended stand part of the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported progress with leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the House was adjourned for half an hour.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee on the consideration of the Second Interim Report and the Final Report of the Select Committee on the subject of West Indian Federation.

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

Paragraph 5 now 6 was called as follows:—

The House feels that the Executive Body should be called, not a "Council of State," but a "Cabi-

net." This Cabinet should contain no officials and should be nominated by the Prime Minister.

Mr. ADAMS: The important part of this proposal is that the "Cabinet" should contain no officials and that it should be nominated by the Prime Minister. That is a great departure from the recommendation in the Rance Report, which appears to me to be illogical in the sense that although it is stated that the Prime Minister's choice would be greater in principle than the Governor-General's nomination, it appears to me to savour too much of the pure Crown Colony system of nominating people to your Executive Committee and not following the democratic practice whereby your Prime Minister makes a recommendation and the Governor-General accepts it. I beg to move that paragraph 6 stand part of the Address.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I know that this system of nomination by the Prime Minister is in England, but we have heard recently that the two-Chamber Legislature should be abolished, and they have a two-Chamber system. I am wondering whether you should not dispense with this nomination by the Prime Minister in the Federal Assembly. If you agree to this proposal you will have a Prime Minister chosen, say, from Jamaica, and he will select these members out of his 16. If you agree to this proposal and it works against you, you will have to be satisfied. I do not agree with officials being in this matter at all; at least the policy-making Body should be the elected representatives of the people however they are elected, but as to nomination by the Prime Minister, I hope I will not hear that that is done in England. I think that this one occasion on which we have to be careful about something which we do ourselves in a Federal Assembly; the Prime Minister will be faced with the difficulty of selecting people for the Cabinet when there are so many islands from which to choose, and he will choose a disproportionate number from the island he represents. I think it is a very dangerous principle that in a Federal Assembly we should have the Prime Minister selecting the Cabinet. I think that we should have a free vote so that we can read the debates and we will know how the Cabinet has been formed and who voted for who. It may be a nice thing for the Prime Minister to say: "I am capable of being Prime Minister", and then he puts a shock on you in that he leaves out some island entirely. He is given the power to do so, and that is not the best thing.

I throw out that suggestion for what it is worth; in Barbados we are doing some of the things which England is doing but I think it would be well for us to consider the possibilities of giving offence in the choice of the Cabinet by one particular person. I think the Federal Assembly should choose the Prime Minister and give him a team of people to work with him, inasmuch as you are dealing with a group of islands which will have to feel their way. Let us see how the proposal I have made will work before we go into the question of nomination by one particular person.

Mr. MILLER: In any modern democratic Assembly, when it comes to the question of the formation of the Cabinet, I feel that the Prime Minister should have absolute power—absolute as far as one can expect of it; he should select the Cabinet which is expected to work with him. If we put aside theory and deal with human nature as we know it, I feel that this matter should be left exclusively to the Prime Minister; he should be free to select his Cabinet. I have no reason to doubt that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will

be the first Prime Minister. I am very strong on this matter; I do not think that you should ask any Prime Minister to have his Cabinet selected by any other authority.

Mr. ADAMS: It may be a Trinidad precedent which made the Rance Committee put forward its suggestion. It seems to me to be worthy of consideration as to whether the onus should not lie on the Governor-General—as in the “Bushe Experiment”—summoning the person who is likely to get a majority in the Assembly, rather than having the Assembly making the choice. Frankly, I am not coming down on one side or the other, but the matter is one for consideration. Nobody could take the honourable junior member for the City seriously; what is responsible government but government by a Ministry which has the confidence of the House? All democratic systems have approved of selection by a Prime Minister who can command the confidence of the Assembly. If in the Ministry of Transport something goes wrong, the Minister resigns without the Government falling. You may have a clear-cut Socialist majority, and the only justification for suggesting that the Assembly should select the Prime Minister is that you may go in without the Party system; but you must look after attaining as quickly as possible, the system which has been successful in all democratic Assemblies. Why should we depart from a system which time has proved in British communities to be an admirable system? Every elector in Canada, Australia, Great Britain and in Barbados knows that we have developed to this stage; every elector knows that if he is voting for Labour, he is voting for Mr. Attlee or whoever happens to have the confidence of his Party. In turn, Mr. Churchill knows that he cannot ignore his colleagues in the Conservative Parliament, and Mr. Attlee knows that he cannot ignore his colleagues in the Labour Parliament. Let us follow what has been worded in the past; I see no great difficulty in the Governor-General sending for the person who is likely to form the Cabinet. We must either have the Assembly getting together or let the Governor-General send for the person whom he thinks can get a Cabinet to work with him. The Queen in England has no difficulty where the Party system is concerned when that system has grown up to the extent to which it has grown up in England; if the “Conservatives” win the election, She will send for Mr. Churchill; a king has to use his judgment, but he may make a mistake. I think it is better to let the Governor-General send for the person whom he thinks will command a majority rather than leave it to the members or unit from the West Indies to deal with this matter; I think that that is a matter which we should consider especially as we have the present system in Barbados, which is successful and which was started because it was proved to be a good system in Great Britain and it has worked admirably in Barbados.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: In connection with this matter, if you get Trinidad, Jamaica and Barbados together, there are in those colonies men who are in the public eye as far as the West Indies are concerned; but it must be obvious that Mr. Gomes will fight for the office of Prime Minister, Mr. Bustamante will fight for it and so will the honourable Leader of this House. Obviously, that is their ambition; you might come to the conclusion that with their various attainments and the work they have put in, one of these three persons would be most suitable for the office of Prime Minister. Knowing these three men as we do, it is safe to say that none of them will give way to the other; none of them will be able to form a Government.

There is the probability that in the first five years you might have to fight a deadlock; but it might be that somebody from Montserrat or Antigua is the person who could best form this Government. Socialism in Barbados may be different from what it is in Antigua, St. Kitts and other places where it may be considered as a mild form of Conservatism, and therefore you may not get in the first five years, any Government Party with a majority. I think that instead of saying that the Cabinet should be nominated by the Prime Minister, we should adopt the procedure in respect of the “Bushe Experiment”. I see the greatest difficulty in getting any of these three persons—Mr. Gomes, Mr. Bustamante and the honourable Leader of this House—to give way to the other; I can see all of them fighting for the office of Prime Minister. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has asked for an expression of opinion from this side of the Committee, and after listening to him I would suggest that it would be much better if we followed the procedure in respect of the “Bushe Experiment”, that is to say, let the Governor-General send for the person who is most likely to command a working majority and select the Cabinet in that way.

Mr. LEWIS: I think my colleague will realise that the nomination, election or appointment of the Prime Minister is not in this paragraph. He has been talking about that all along, but there is nothing in this paragraph to include it.

Mr. MAPP: The Rance Report itself does not differ in principle from what we are asking because in paragraph 86 of the Report we read this:

“We believe that our proposal effects a necessary concentration of authority in the hands of the Prime Minister. By this means, the Prime Minister owes his position to the Assembly; other State Councillors appointed on his nomination owe their position to the Prime Minister.”

The Rance Report itself is in favour of the Prime Minister nominating members to the Cabinet; the Select Committee of this House differed from the Rance Report in that the Committee feels that all the members of the Cabinet should be nominated by the Prime Minister, but, as I have stated, the principle of the nomination of members to the Cabinet by the Prime Minister is set out in the Report. The Select Committee says that there should be no officials in the Cabinet and if this House were to argue that the members of the Cabinet should not be nominated by the Prime Minister, but be appointed by the House of Assembly, we would be going back to the position which is uppermost in Trinidad. It has been suggested that you will never get the Party system in Trinidad until the Legislative Council elect a Prime Minister, who would, in turn, nominate members to the Executive Committee. That is quite true; Trinidad has no party system; there is no leading member of the Legislative Council who nominates members from that Body to the Executive Council. That is the chief drawback in Trinidad: I think we would be going backwards if we departed from the principle of the members of the Cabinet being nominated by the Prime Minister who has been elected by the House of Assembly. I think that this recommendation should meet with the approval of this Committee.

The only question would be; how many members you would have in the Cabinet? That is not mentioned here and it occurs to me that that is a question to which we should give some consideration. In the Rance Report it is recommended that the Cabinet should consist of eight members one being the Prime Minister appointed by the

Governor-General, and seven others should be appointed by the Governor-General on the nomination of the Prime Minister. The Report also states:

"The Governor-General should be empowered to appoint up to six other members, of whom not more than three should be officials, and the remainder members of the Legislature"

I am wondering if this Committee think that we should have no officials and then have a Cabinet of eleven. This is not a matter which we can easily decide because we cannot decide how many members will be in the General Assembly with British Guiana not being in the Federation.

Mr. ADAMS: As to the suggestion I made in respect of the Prime Minister making the nomination, perhaps it would be better for me to deal with that in a separate paragraph.

Mr. LEWIS: I take it that the Prime Minister would be at liberty to choose the Cabinet from both Houses of the Legislature. Mr. ADAMS: Of course). Should we then not make it clear that the Cabinet should be comprised of members of both Houses of the Legislature? I would not like that point to escape and then we are told that the House did not decide it; the great thing is that we will have put forward proposals though they may not be accepted. Perhaps none of them might be accepted, but if we agree that the second Chamber should not be elected but nominated, are we going to agree that the Cabinet be appointed from elected and nominated members? I would prefer to have all elected people; if the Prime Minister has to choose the Cabinet from both Houses of the Legislature, he may have to choose a nominated member. I think we should set out in this paragraph that the Cabinet should be nominated by the Prime Minister from among the members of both Houses of the Legislature.

Mr. ADAMS: You cannot have things too rigid. You should not tie the hands of the Prime Minister. He may have to go to the upper House. The Prime Minister always has to be careful. A lower House is always very jealous. When we have a Ministerial System it would be asking for trouble to allow the upper House to have the power of appointing one, let alone two out of four or five Ministers. But the time may come when at least Government's supporters will feel that they have no objection to so and so in the upper House being Prime Minister. No King or Queen of England would dream now of going into the House of Lords for a Prime Minister. The last person in whose case that seemed likely was Lord Curzon. No King or Queen would dream of going into the House of Lords and asking someone to form a Government. But do not have it so rigid that you make it impossible for a useful man to be selected.

Mr. BARROW: I would like to add something. I do not think that we should exclude the possibility of the Prime Minister coming from the upper House. As late as 1923, as the Hon'ble senior member for St. Joseph has just said, there was the danger of Lord Curzon, Viceroy, Plenipotentiary etc of India becoming Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. I think that that was a case where the personality of Lord Curzon made him generally unacceptable. The conclusion was reached that it was no longer desirable that the Prime Minister be a member of the upper House. Put diplomatically, it was said that Lord Curzon's personality was not suitable.

Since we have decided to elect members to the upper House, perhaps the personality of a member of the upper House might be such as to make him get the support of the majority in both Chambers. I do not think we should tie ourselves down by stipu-

lating that the Prime Minister should come either from one House or the other and despite the plausible arguments put forward by the Committee as to why some members of the Cabinet, at least in the interim, should be nominated by the Governor General himself, there is nothing to make us believe that officials will not be sent out from the Mother Country. Members of the Cabinet should hesitate in accepting government by a few officials. That is an insult to the political maturity of the West Indies as a whole. Therefore I do not think that anyone can dispute that the only solution at this stage of our political development is that there should be a Cabinet which includes nominated members and members responsible to the Prime Minister. But I should not like to see a stipulation as to which of the two Houses they should come from.

The question that Clause 6 stand part was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I am suggesting that a completely new paragraph be put in now. As the honourable senior member for St. George said, it would be impossible for us, having said that both Houses should be elected, to leave in the Rance Report recommendation.

I propose that the next clause should be this: "The House is of the opinion that immediately after the election of members of the Federal Legislature, including the first, Governor General shall send for the member who, in his opinion, is most likely to command a majority in the Federal Legislature and ask him to nominate members of the Cabinet." It will in fact be like our Bushe Experiment.

I do not want to repeat what I have said, but as the honourable senior member for St. George pointed out, we cannot confine it to the House because we have gone on record as saying that both Houses should be elected; and you do not want a joint meeting of the two Chambers to elect the Prime Minister.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It seems to me that nothing could be more calculated to make the proposed federation start off with something approximating what happens in France—the President sending in turn for members of Parliament to form a government. I think there is danger in putting this power in the beginning in the hands of the Governor General because it is very likely that he may send for someone whose personality appeals to him. The honourable member knows that if you did not have the Party System in Great Britain and you gave the Sovereign power to pick out someone *ad hoc* as Prime Minister—the last was in Queen Victoria's time—Gladstone would not have been Prime Minister. Queen Victoria did not like Gladstone, but he would still have been able to carry on by picking out some Liberal members to form a cabinet. You are giving the Governor General power to pick out anyone he likes, someone who may be most acceptable to him or to the Imperial Government, and to tell him to form a government.

It seems to me that it is far better in the initial stages to have your Assembly elect the Prime Minister. If as the Honourable member clearly stated the Prime Minister would not be able to carry on unless he has a majority backing in the elected Chamber, why not in the beginning let the elected Chamber, nominate the man who, in their opinion, has a majority following, and let him be called for by the Governor General, and the latter in turn will form a cabinet. There is of course another way of arriving at the same result by saying that your Governor General can nominate your Prime Minister with the approval of the elected House. It does

appear to me that in a new Constitution of this sort it is far better to allow the power to rest in the hands of the elected representatives of the West Indies.

It is obvious what type of man the Governor General would select at first. It would not be a man whom he honestly thinks has the confidence of the Assembly, but a man whom he finds most acceptable to himself, and whom he thinks will get the confidence of the Assembly. He will experiment three or four times with likely choices. Of course he will finally have to resort to the man with the majority following; but it is highly possible in matters of this sort for a man, who in the beginning does not have a following, by measures that are questionable to select a government and carry on a farce.

Mr. ADAMS: I will ask one question. Should we try to copy some of the best examples, or some of the worst? Even at the risk of being cursed by Trinidad I will ask how can it be democratic to leave Mr. Butler out of the Ministry? But he was kept out and kept out. Is that not an example of horse swapping staring us in the face? How can you run a democracy without the party system? The question is whether you will copy a system which has not produced good results or a system that has produced good results. In fact it will only be for the first five years, because it is reasonable to suppose that since the party system is spreading throughout the West Indies in five years there will be a clear socialist party system replacing the Chamber of Commerce system.

Now I will say that the Governor General, after all, like the constitutional monarch has to use his best ability to get something done that will work. We will have to assume that he will be honest in using his judgment. It is better to put on the Governor General the constitutional duty of using his judgment and selecting someone who will meet with approval than to leave it to a system which has failed to produce good results. If any honourable member can point to a system in any part of the world which has proved to be better than the British system let him point to it and we will follow it. I have made these suggestions, not because it happens to be Barbados, but because the system seems to me to be the best system for all the democratic governments of the world.

Mr. TALMA: I subscribe to the view just expressed by the honourable Leader of the House because I believe that it will be in the interest of the entire area to follow that system. It will probably rule out or obviate all the jealousy and envy which exists at present or is likely to exist as regards the election to seats, and the most experienced and valuable members will be given a chance of serving in the higher posts.

When it comes to the question of the Federal Assembly electing the Prime Minister, one also has to bear in mind the fact that the Upper Chamber is also elected. So you will have to say that both Chambers—the Upper House and the Lower House will have to hold a joint meeting so that both may elect the Prime Minister. You cannot give that right or privilege just to the Lower House because both the lower and the upper House will be elected.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman.—I do not see how it will be possible for the proposed system to work until there is a clear cut West Indian Party. It is obvious that if the Governor General is faced with difficulty and he can get all the people in Jamaica thinking alike, he can choose a Prime Minister from Jamaica which colony will have 18 members. That will mean, if we uphold as we must the system of the majority—that what the Prime Minister does

will probably be very unpopular. It is not an easy matter to settle. There is the question of the House being elected, and it seems to me that they will be running into difficulties when it comes to the election of the Prime Minister. It seems to me that if the Governor General is given this power the thing to do is to send for the man who dominated the Legislature in the first instance, and let him choose 16 members and go on as one of them. He himself will command a majority.

I think that honourable members have voiced this opinion before, but I will repeat it. In the beginning we should have it clearly understood that there should be some easy method of amending this Constitution. There are many fears and difficulties, and at one time we were told that you cannot change a Federal Constitution as you like, and therefore you should do so and so. But after hearing all the opinions expressed by honourable members it seems to me that there should be some easy manner of amending the Constitution for the first and second periods. We can tighten it up as we go on.

I do not see in any of the suggestions I have heard a way out of the difficulty where this matter is concerned. It is impossible in a system by which three or four islands can get together and get a clear majority each time. What is more conducive to horse swapping than to have the Governor General able to tell some particular person "I will accept you as Prime Minister if you can guarantee to me that you will get so and so with you." If we stick to some known system that has worked somewhere else that is as much as I will agree with. I do not see in any of the suggestions I have heard one way out of our difficulties. Horse swapping is going to be started the moment that the Governor General can send for the person he considers acceptable.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—I was always unhappy about too rigid a Constitution to begin with. If you look at the Rance Report you will see that Jamaica and Trinidad can dominate the whole area, including Barbados. Those two islands can dominate the Legislature. We may find ourselves relegated to a form of trusteeship.

Apart from that, I am wondering if the Leader of the House would be willing to accept a very simple amendment to the effect that the Cabinet should be nominated by the Prime Minister. On the point about the Constitution I am a bit unhappy. I am wondering if the Leader of the House would be willing to go so far as to think in terms of a loose Constitution which can be amended from time to time.

Mr. BARROW: I want to clear up something. The honourable junior member for the City and my colleague the honourable junior member for St. George seem to have the impression that making a Constitution rigid or loose makes it difficult or easy to be amended. The fact that a Constitution is written does not make it rigid or loose. Once you are making a Constitution my contention is that you should stipulate what you want and set it down. As regards easiness of amendment, the power of the amendment of a Constitution and how such power should be exercised is such a vital part of it that I regard as scandalous the cavalier manner in which that question was treated by the Committee. In writing a Constitution you should set down what you want. If you have doubts as to the efficacy of some of the terms that you are setting out, you should be very careful in making proper provision for the machinery of amendment. I think that everyone should agree with that.

The honourable junior member for Christ Church has already drawn to the attention of the

House a very material omission in the report. In our Address which we are framing tonight we have made no mention of the machinery of amendment. I hope that the Leader of the House has some suggestion to make on that point. We cannot make a loose Constitution. We have to stipulate what we want in the Constitution keeping in mind the building of a West Indian nation economically stable and which will have the respect of the other nations of the world. We must stipulate in our Constitution how we are going to achieve that. If we are doubtful of some of the measures because we cannot see ourselves in a sufficiently clear perspective, let us before the conference is convened in London decide how the Constitution will be amended.

I was only speaking, sir, on a question that arose in the debate on this particular clause. To go back to the question of the Cabinet and the Prime Minister, the committee to the best of my recollection advocated that the Prime Minister should be elected by the members of the House of Assembly. The question is whether the Prime Minister should be chosen by the Governor General as the person most likely to command a majority, or whether he should be elected by the members of the House. If you figure it out you will see that if he is elected by a majority of the House, *ipso facto* he will be in a position to command a majority in the House; but if he is chosen by the Governor General and the latter mistakenly chooses a man who does not command a majority he will not be elected. He will be thrown out. I think that it would save a lot of headaches if the Prime Minister were elected by the House in the first place. You would know that a majority of the House had decided that that is the man they want.

I am only saying simply something that must be obvious to all. The net result is the same—that is that you must have a man who is able to command a majority. I do not think that we need waste our time to quibble over the question of the particular phraseology.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I only want to say that it struck me at first when I was reading Section 84 of the Report which states that the House of Assembly should elect one of their number that that was putting it rather strongly. I agree with the principle enunciated by the Leader that the Governor General should send for the person whom he thinks can command a majority in the House; but I think that the honourable member should realise that until we build up a Federal Party System, as the last honourable member said, whether the House elects the Prime Minister or whether the Governor General chooses one is an infinitesimal point, because someone will have to be there who can command a majority in the House.

Whoever is appointed as Prime Minister should be able to appoint his Cabinet. That is a fundamental point. That is where we must differ from Trinidad where the Legislative Council elects the Executive Council. That to my mind is the chief drawback. That is what we want to get away from. I hope that the Leader will see that all we should do at the beginning is to say that the House of Assembly should elect one of its members, and the Federal Assembly to my mind is the best body to decide that they are going to select one of their members as Prime Minister, and then let the Prime Minister nominate his Cabinet. That is the most important part.

Mr. ADAMS: The last thing that I will do is to try to say anything offensive. Why should honourable members entertain ideas which they cannot prove have ever been successful in any system of democratic government? We have the experience of

the working of a system for years and years based on democratic government and with a constitutional monarchy standing aloof from party. If a proper Governor General is appointed he will no longer be a Trinidadian or Jamaican. He should be over and above all insular jealousies and prejudices and all parties. He should be able to sense the feeling and say "this man is likely to command a majority." He will not be infallible, and he may find that the man cannot get a party to work with him, and he will have to send for someone else etc. Compare that with the suggestion that the choice should be made by the Assembly? Where else do you find that system? Only in Trinidad, and it has not been successful there. When you select a Prime Minister he is only one of several ministers. Companies elect directors, and Assemblies elect someone to go into the Chair. But that is a different matter from electing someone who *ex hypothesi* must be able to bring together those elements that can work towards a democratic set up in a party system.

When you have only one example of a system — the Trinidad example — and that has not been successful my argument is strengthened. Why should we try something in which we do not think we can succeed? Why put completely to one side all the experience of France, Germany and the Commonwealth countries which have followed the European pattern and try to experiment with something which we know will lead to horse swapping? You cannot quote a system which is a precedent for this recommendation. That is my only reason for suggesting that we should stick to something that has been tried and is working rather than to run off with something new, and something that is more likely to lead to horse swapping than any other system.

Mr. BARROW: I want to be very sure. I am completely confused at least as regards some of the arguments put forward on the floor of this House. At one time we hear that we cannot trust the Accountant General to be impartial; we cannot trust our fellow West Indians to be impartial; and then we hear that we can leave such an important matter in the hands of the Governor General. The mere fact that we cannot think at the moment of a Constitution in which the Prime Minister is elected by one chamber or another is no argument against such a proposal. It would be far better if the Leader of the House could give us a list of all the proposals in the Rance Report to which he subscribes and with which he agreed rather than to give us the impression that he agrees in a general way with all the terms, with reservations.

In the Rance Report — and I take it that the majority of members must have subscribed to that view—there is the proposal that the Prime Minister should be elected by the House. I have pointed out already that whether he is nominated or elected, in the final analysis he must command the support of, and a following in, the House or in both Chambers. I do not think we need waste any more time over that. I would like to know how the Governor General can be deemed to be impartial in some instances and not in others. We must be consistent in our arguments. Either we believe that to give the Governor General certain powers is undemocratic or that he is a person in whose hands we can place these powers of political life and death.

Mr. ADAMS: The only thing that I can take seriously is the honourable member's statement that he is confused. What earthly connection is there between giving a Governor General power to nominate at his own discretion members of a House and following what is the constitutional practice in

England — the Governor General who for our purpose takes the place of the constitutional monarch sending for the person who in his opinion is best able to command a majority in the Assembly to form a government? You are merely saying that the Governor General is outside of politics; let him send for this person to form a government. What is wrong with that?

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to tell the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that it is *very* good to argue like that; but this is not the case of any King of England sending for someone to form a government. What I cannot understand is that when we were arguing the point about the bi-cameral legislature the honourable member's argument was that because other federations had a bi-cameral legislature it was no argument that we should have one. Now the opposite argument is being used.

I am inclined to agree that it does not matter really, because in any case the person appointed or elected as Prime Minister will have to be able to command a majority in the Legislature. But the important point about starting the Federation with this principle is this: If the Governor General cares to, he can form parties in the House by himself, because he can send for a particular man who can get a majority by linking up with other people whether socialists or otherwise.

The question that paragraph 7 stand part was put and agreed to.

Clause 6, now 8 was read.

Mr. ADAMS: I am wondering, Sir, if we should not have discussed this first of all; because while it is true that we should pass this as it is, and that detailed financial proposals should await the London Conference, honourable members might feel that we may have to reconsider some of our proposals when we come to think of the financial implications. If honourable members look at Section 53 dealing with the unicameral system they will see what I am hinting at. They will see that one of the arguments against the two-chamber system is the question of cost. To start the Federation, the British Government has got to find a substantial sum of money. If you have one chamber instead of two it will cost less. That is why I am saying that it might have been better if we had discussed generally the financial proposals.

For instance, Sir, we do not want to start the Federation with the Bar more clever than the Bench. The Supreme Court will have to be the interpreter of the constitution, and you will want some very clever men on the Bench; and the legal men in the West Indies who may be making five or seven thousand a year are not likely to give up their jobs and work for the Federal Government unless it be for a very substantial sum. I would like an expression of opinion from honourable members as to the sort of salaries federal officials should get, and whether those salaries should be free of income tax. Obviously travelling will be involved. If honourable members would give some sort of indication as to how they feel about these matters it will be of help when we get to the London Conference.

Section 50 deals with the proposed salary of the Governor-General. I do not know whether honourable members have had an opportunity of reading the Report on the Financial Aspects of Federation published recently by C.D. & W. If honourable members feel that they would like to give more indication of their opinions on these matters I would like them to do so, in spite of the fact that we have suggested that detailed discussion should await the London Conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I think it is generally agreed that as far as the financial aspects are concerned we can only go into them generally and leave specific details to the London Conference. Now I am of the opinion that the arguments contained in Para. 44 of the Report that if the Federation were to start off with a loan instead of a grant it would not help us are stupid. The argument is that if we are given a grant we would not be starting off on our own feet; and so would not be self-reliant. But I think it is safe to say that although it was felt at one time that C.D. & W. grants would have created a false sense of security in the area that has not been the case.

I am inclined to agree that in the initial stages we should get a grant. I feel that it was the opinion of the British Government, from the time that the first despatch on Federation was sent by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that they would have to underwrite the Federation. I feel that they should do it by way of a grant rather than by way of a loan.

Mr. ADAMS: We have already passed that, saying a grant and loans from time to time.

Mr. WILLIAMS: The point I am making, Sir, is that if the British Government makes us a loan it is obvious that they must maintain some sort of control over us. Obviously they are going to say that some sort of conditions must attach to the loan. That is why in the circumstances I agree with the Jamaican Legislature in asking for a grant rather than for a loan.

As regards some of the detailed provisions contained in the Report I certainly do not agree that we should have a judicial establishment to the tune of £22,000. You will have the same over-all agricultural set-up in the area. Personally I would like to see various provincial courts or lower courts brought up to provincial status, with a federal Attorney General etc., but to tell me to expend £22,000—when new posts will crop up like Financial Secretaries—seems to me to be barking up the wrong tree. I am of the opinion that some of the estimates put down there in the Report will be found to be too low now, and will have to be adjusted because of changing money values etc. I do not think that this expense of £22,000 can be justified.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—The honourable Leader talked about discussing the financial aspects of Federation. That is rather wide. There are many financial aspects of Federation as set out in the Rance Report with which I do not agree at all. For example, if we are to have a strong federal Legislature I think that the method proposed for financing the Federal Government is unsatisfactory. I will not say inadequate, because the question of how much it will cost will have to be arrived at.

As far as I can remember, the proposal is that the Federal Government should have control over the Customs, and then return to the individual Governments not less than 75 per cent. of the revenue which has accrued from each area. In other words, the Federal Government will have to subsist on 25 per cent of the total Customs Revenue accruing from the area. There is no indication that such a sum, judging from the present level of customs receipts from the area as a whole, will be adequate to support the Government in the manner in which we envisage that it should exist.

If we are going to increase salaries, and may be increase the number of members who will be in the House of Assembly, and may be as a result of Ministerial Government have fairly large and adequate secretaries for the public departments of Gov-

ernment there is no guarantee that the sum will be sufficient. It then means that we will have to go cap in hand to the British Government asking for subventions for the assistance of the area. We will have to look at what the colonies can afford. There is no indication then they can afford more than 25 per cent.

But that is only one aspect of the financial proposals as set out in the Committee's Report. If one of its main functions will be to carry out those measures which are most likely to ensure the economic stability of the area, more power should be given to the Federal Government to carry out economic planning at a federal level.

Another regrettable feature, sir, is that there seems to be envisaged that some sort of arrangement will exist between the Imperial Government and the Federal Government by which the latter will receive a block grant from the British Treasury in lieu of the grants-in-aid which are now made to the colonies which are not economically stable. Well, if a group of Socialists with the right ideas had sat down and formulated this Report I am sure that they would have put their aspirations a bit higher than the recommendations set out in this Report.

If they had kept their objectives in view, and understood the rationality of federation, and the necessity of making the area economically stable and improving the living standards of the people of the area, they would not have proposed to leave the Federal Government devoid of these very powers necessary to carry out comprehensive economic planning; and furthermore they would have aspired at the highest of subventions from the British Treasury.

As far as the initial cost of federation is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I was in Germany, and was intimately connected with the Government in the British Zone of Germany — a country which had devastated three quarters of Europe, and which was supported to the tune of £187,000,000 a year by the British Government. But we have to be grateful for small mercies. It is always thought that if we make a demand or request for as little as £200,000 for the whole area, or for five million pounds to be spent over a period of years we are impertinent, and that we are incapable of managing our own affairs and have to be supported by the British Taxpayer. But if we look at the true facts either from the point of view of the colonial area as a whole or the British West Indies in particular we will see that for the last five years Great Britain has not spent more on the colonies than she has spent on Germany in 1946 alone. If we had that amount to start off federation with we would be in an excellent position.

What are the true facts? The true facts are that any money which the U.K. Government gives us — I would like any such sum to be to the tune of £300,000,000 which is not exorbitant when we think of the money thrown away on the Ground Nuts Scheme — any such sum which the U.K. Government gives us I would regard as reparations. If they can spend £187,000,000 on Germany why cannot they spend £300,000,000 on the West Indies who have been the cornerstone in the building of the British Empire? No money which they spend on us can be anything but reparations. Look at it from the angle that we have called a truce and are getting an independent Federal system, and we are settling for £300,000,000 as a start.

Now Mr. Chairman, there is another aspect of the matter. They say that we are over-populated, and that we cannot provide employment for our

people. Who created the over-population? Not our forefathers. The people who created that over-population problem in the West Indies were the very people in the U.K. who brought their political problems to the West Indies by bringing in indentured labour from as far as China in order to cheapen the price of labour on the West Indian market. In order therefore to put us on the road to economic salvation they should recognise their debt to us. Therefore we should not go to them cap in hand. They make twenty million pounds a year out of us.

An argument used is that we cannot follow Puerto Rico which is part of the U.S.A. But what in the name of all that is good is there to prevent the British Government from giving us part of the twenty million pounds they collect every year in the same way that the Americans make a refund to the Puerto Rican people? We will only get the strong Federal Government that we deserve from the people who have lifted themselves up by our boot laces if we recognise our bargaining position. I am not ungrateful to Britain for anything she has done. I am not bitter towards her for any sins she has committed in the past. That is for history to record. But let us start off now with reparations, and with the assurance that we have the backing of the U.K. to carry on plans for the future of the area.

I do not think that there is any need for us to go into the question of salaries at this stage; but obviously the question will have to be threshed out because conditions have changed. It will have to be threshed out from the point of view of the revenue available. The most important points, however, are those which I have outlined. The Federal Government should be given power to carry out economic planning for the area. Secondly, as far as the initial cost of the Federation is concerned, we should not approach the British Government with any feeling that we are asking for charity. We are only asking for what we need, and for what we have earned.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—Before I say anything further I must congratulate the honourable member who has just spoken. I hope that his speech will be given the widest publicity. There should be absolutely no hesitation on the part of any delegate whom we may send to London in arguing strongly for a substantial financial grant for the Federation. The public reads all the time about the large sums given by C. D. & W., and to the public it may seem that the U.K. is being very generous. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, all these Colonial powers. —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Stick to paragraph 8.

Mr. VAUGHAN: All these colonial powers are much worse off than Puerto Rico from the point of view of development funds. Development funds given to Puerto Rico far exceed those given to these English colonies. With regard to the fact that we have been granted a preference for our own sugar and aided by Great Britain that is nothing compared with the preference granted Puerto Rico by the U.S. Government.

I cannot conceive how many Englishmen would answer the kind of argument which has been put forward by the honourable member who has just sat down; we have no excuse in thinking that we should not demand from England the financial support for this entire venture. We have nothing for which to pat ourselves on the back in the matter of Colonial Development grants as compared with the grants made by other Powers to their peoples. We can demand from England a new era in this financial assistance in respect of Federation.

The question that paragraph 8 stand part of the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the House was adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in 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, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Paragraph 7 now 9 of the Address was called as follows:

"The House is of the opinion that the question of the site of the Federal Capital should be re-considered at the coming Conference."

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, — In moving that this paragraph stand part of the Address I should like to say that perhaps some honourable members might feel diffident in speaking on this paragraph because a good case can be made out for Barbados and honourable members may not wish to press the claims of Barbados. It may be that the best solution would be to do like some of the larger Federations and choose a small place, not the most important, just like Washington and Ottawa have been chosen; but in any event, I believe it is true to say that Trinidad herself was surprised when the announcement was made that she was suggested as the site of the Federal Capital. It may be that the best solution may be Antigua, St. Lucia or one of the smaller islands so as to prevent any jealousy among the four larger units. I beg to move that paragraph 9 stand part of the Address.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that: the question of the site of the Federal Capital should be considered at the Conference. Because I have seconded the motion it does not mean that I view with disfavour the proposal that Trinidad be the site of the Federal Capital; I feel that apart from size and economic prosperity, there are several other considerations which are likely to be mooted as to the site of the Federal Capital. In the case of the United States of America, in order to obviate the jealousies which would arise from placing the Federal Capital in any particular one of the 48 states which form the Union, a completely neutral zone was set out in Columbia and that is a matter of history. In considering the site of the Federal Capital of the West Indies, it would be rather difficult to carve out a neutral zone out of any one of the individual territories due to the geographical features of the Caribbean area; but there is a lot to be said for placing the Federal Capital in one of the smaller islands of the Caribbean group in which local politics will not have any influence on the deliberations of the Federal Assembly.

It would be invidious for me at this stage to canvass for any one particular island, but I have given careful study to the geographical factors and the political factors of this problem. While I have no intention of speaking disparagingly of the relative obscurity of Antigua, at the same time I feel that a place which is roughly equidistant from a geographical point of view from the furthestmost corners of the Federation would be ideal for the

Federal Capital. Some people feel that it is vital that we should have all forms of wireless and cable communication at the site of the Federal Capital, but there are already existing in the Windward Islands facilities for cable and wireless, and in these days the problem of communication and routing of schooners is more a matter for the organisation concerned than for a Federal Government to consider. It is fatuous to say that Barbados is *ipso facto* a more suitable place for the site of the Federal Capital than Antigua. It is important that jealousies are not fostered by a misguided policy as to the site of the Federal Capital, and there is also a danger of local politics having a deleterious effect on the deliberations of the Federal Government.

If we can find a completely neutral area with adequate facilities for airlines and for shipping, wireless and cable communications, a place as good as Anguilla or the British Virgin Islands, it would be even more ideal for the Federal Capital; but we have to be practical in these matters. I feel that in an island such as Antigua, the overhead cost of Federation would be lower than in places like Trinidad, Barbados or Jamaica; Barbados is eminently unsuited as the seat of the Federal Government; we are isolated as the most easterly of the Caribbean Islands and with the social and economic atmosphere in Barbados, I feel, that is not conducive to the successful running of a Federal Government. There is still a hangover from the past pervading the social and economic atmosphere in this island, and the same reasons which prompted the placing of the University College in Jamaica as opposed to Barbados, are those which have been successfully urged against having the seat of the Federal Capital here. I think we tend to over-estimate our improvement in the West Indian scheme of things; just to say that you did not put the Federal Capital in Trinidad or in Barbados is not good enough. I am not convinced that Trinidad is the best place for the Federal Capital and I am equally unconvinced that Barbados would be a better place for it than Trinidad; we should approach this matter with all sanity and feel that we will not lose any prestige because we do not have the Federal Capital here. The consideration of distance, of communication, of neutrality and of atmosphere most likely to be conducive to the success of Federation—all these things will have to be taken into account in this matter.

Mr. TALMA: While I agree with most of the sentiments which have been expressed by the honourable member who has just sat down, yet I would say that in view of the fact that C.D. & W. has been functioning here for many years and can be regarded today, not as C.D. & W. in the true sense but as being more or less the nucleus of a federated Secretariat, one can well see that everything points to Barbados being the probable choice of the Federal Capital. I am not pressing the claims of Barbados; I am merely commenting on the situation as we find it. Another point which I would like to bring to the attention of the Committee is the question of travelling expenses; the question of finance governs the whole idea. If most of the members of the Federal Legislature will be called upon to travel, then travelling and hotel accommodation will entail a substantial outlay. If the essence of this matter is to reduce as much expense as possible, one has to bear that point in mind very carefully; as a matter of fact, all these points will have to be borne in mind. I fully agree that Barbados of all places does not carry the spirit of the typical West Indian in that there is too much discrimination being practised, and pressure groups can bring their pressure to bear.

The question that paragraph 9 stand part of the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Paragraph 8 now 10 was called as follows:—

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

Mr. ADAMS: In moving that this paragraph stand part of the Address, I should like to say that if honourable members will look at the Report of the Rance Committee they will see that this is one of the most important of the suggestions which the Select Committee has made. The honourable senior member for St. Philip tried to make a point of the Governor's Reserve Powers; it is perfectly true that the Governor today reserves legislation for the signification of the pleasure of the Crown, and nobody will ordinarily object to these matters. Inasmuch as we will not have complete jurisdiction over all our external affairs, we cannot object to them. Paragraph 40 (a) of the Consolidated Recommendations in the Report says this:

"Any Bill relating to defence, including the provision, construction, maintenance, security, staff, manning and use of such defences, equipment, establishments and communications as may be necessary for the naval, military or air security of any part of His Majesty's dominions (including the Federation) or affecting the discipline or control of His Majesty's naval military or air forces."

One easily understands that, and it is not necessary to waste any time on a matter of that sort; bills of that nature should be reserved for the signification of the pleasure of the Sovereign. Similarly with paragraph 40 (b) (i) and (ii) and (c) which are practically the same. As regards (b) and (c) we ought to make it clear that in matters like trade treaties, we have already more than 20 years ago, made an agreement with Canada, and that more and more we are saying that we have a right to present our point of view. As one honourable member, the honourable senior member for the City has said, in matters affecting sugar, we have to be careful that we do not, by agreeing on general terms, preclude ourselves from claiming the right to go in independently of the Colonial Office in trade discussions. We ought to see right at the beginning of the Federation that we have the right to go in as an independent unit, in trade treaties and that we do not just go in to fight a part of the sterling area as advisers to the Colonial Office and leave it to the Colonial Office to make a treaty for us. The language which we use to cover paragraph 40 (a), (b) and (c) will have to be clear; at the present moment the Ministry of Food agrees to buy our sugar, but we have to go and beg them to buy it.

When we come to paragraph 40 (d), the provision is wide. It says:

"Any Bill gravely imperilling the financial stability of the Federation."

There is no country barring the United States and Soviet Russia, which could feel that it need not go to the rest of the world to borrow money, and it just depends upon how far these words will be construed. Anything that looks like mortgaging the future must be one of these Bills which must be reserved for the signification of the pleasure of the Sovereign. If the House pass this paragraph stating that item (d) of paragraph 40 of these Consolidated Recommendations should be modified

it only means that we call attention the fact that it should be made very clear in the Constitution as to what is meant by "gravely imperilling" and who is to say what gravely imperils the financial stability of the Federation. The whole idea of reserving a bill for the consideration of the Queen is anathema to any idea of getting away from the Crown Colony system; if we say that in purely internal matters there should be complete self-government, it is against the spirit of even limited self-government to say that certain bills should be reserved for the pleasure of the Crown. All bills affecting external affairs should be reserved for the pleasure of the Crown, but bills which are really referable to purely internal affairs should not be put in the category of reserved bills.

We have also suggested that paragraph 40 (h) is unnecessary, that seems to be a hangover from the old days. To-day you have divorce bills in practically every colony in the Empire except St. Lucia; it seems to be quite unnecessary to say that "any bill for the divorce of married persons" should be one of those bills to be reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure, because no longer do you pass a specific bill to divorce two people.

Those are the suggestions we have made, and I propose that this paragraph of the Address be broken into two parts. The second part of the paragraph deals with legislation by Order-in-Council; the Queen cannot legislate for Barbados. Paragraph 42 of the Consolidated Recommendations is vastly different from paragraph 40; paragraph 42 is in respect of legislation made by a Privy Council and binding on all the units of the Federation. That has never been possible in Barbados; at least I cannot conceive of any period in the history of Barbados when it was possible. If honourable members prefer it, we could divide paragraph 8 into two parts; what is in paragraph 40 is not as important as what is in paragraph 42. We do not say that the Queen in Council cannot make an Order-in-Council for any part of her dominions; we cannot provide our own Army and Navy and therefore paragraph 42 (a) is all right and (b) is all right provided you make it clear that this item is not to be construed into the Queen in Council making a trade treaty for the Caribbean area; but when it comes to item (c), that is asking us to swallow too much because, in effect, that is saying that the Secretary of State for the Colonies can put before the Queen in Council an Order for her to pass securing and maintaining the financial stability of the Federation. That is wide and I do not think we can agree to that. Item (d) says:

"For securing and maintaining public safety and order and supplies and services if a Secretary of State is satisfied that a public emergency exists."

That is the old thing; we have a sufficiently strong Act on the Statute Book already—the Emergency Powers Act—whereby if the Governor fears a threatened insurrection or riot, the Governor-in-Executive Committee may make Orders which have the force of law, but within five days he must get the approval of the Legislature for their continuance. If a riot is taking place, certain powers are vested in the Governor or the Governor-in-Executive Committee to provide a period for which those enactments are made and you make quick reference to the Legislature. I suggest to honourable members that we can pass this paragraph of the Address as it is, but we must be aware of the fact that while paragraph 40 of the Consolidated Recommendations in the Report of the Rance Committee savours of Crown Colony legislation, it is not as bad as paragraph 42 which gives positive power to the Queen in Council to legislate. That would mean, in effect, that the

Queen could make an Order-in-Council saying that the Governors of every unit could do this and that and the instance I have mentioned is just one of the instances which may easily take place. The Queen in Council may make an Order affecting Barbados when it is some other part of the Caribbean area in which a riot has taken place; she can make an Order-in-Council saying that no person shall be permitted to move into that particular area for a certain period. In short, just as to-day—it may be because British Guiana is on the eve of an election—there are certain persons who have been prevented from going to British Guiana, so in case there is a disturbance in any one of the units of the Federation, an Order-in-Council may be made preventing any person from going into that particular area. I therefore invite this Committee to say that they will never agree to items (c) and (d) of this paragraph 42 being incorporated in a Constitution, which will give the Sovereign power for ever to sit down in Privy Council and make a law over which we have no control, but which may affect even the right to hold a public meeting. I beg to move that paragraph 10 stand part of the Address.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What the honourable member has said has constitutional technicalities which he would understand and appreciate. We feel that anything which is taking power out of our hands we are bound to try and curb.

The question that paragraph 10 stand part of the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Paragraph 9 now 11 was called as follows:

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

Mr. ADAMS: As regards this paragraph, I am asking leave to insert the words "in general" after the word "Constitution." If we put in those words, it will be made clear that in purely internal affairs we have the last word.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that paragraph 11 as amended stand part of the Address.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: As regards paragraph 12. I had drafted a paragraph to the effect that the House is of the opinion that unless such and such a thing forms part of the Constitution, Barbados will not enter into the Federation, but if honourable members feel that that is unnecessary, I will not put it in. However, I am suggesting that paragraph 12 of the Address be as follows:

"The House while emphasising all the above-mentioned points specifically goes on record that unless its views on the questions of emigration, immigration, deportation and the movement of population are incorporated in the terms of the Constitution Barbados should not enter in the proposed Federation."

We are making it clear that if our views on these questions are not agreed to, we are not coming into the Federation. I beg to move that that proposed paragraph be paragraph 12 of the Address.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: I cannot say that I like that last proposal at all. I feel the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should bear in mind the fact that it might appear that while we thought we should be very strong on the other changes which we thought necessary to make in so far as the Rance Con-

stitution is concerned, we now think it necessary to confine ourselves to free movement of population in this paragraph. I am putting it to the Committee that if we agree to this paragraph, it would seem as if we do not feel as strongly on the other items set out in the Address as we do on these questions of emigration, immigration, deportation and the free movement of peoples among the various units. I am suggesting that this is not the feeling of the Committee at all; although the honourable senior member for the City was much more emphatic in his opposition to the restriction of the free movement of peoples among these units than he was in his opposition to the other proposals in the Rance Report, this Committee as a whole still feels just as strongly about the Constitution as a whole as set out in the Rance Report. It would be wise, therefore, if we sent up this Address and let it appear that we are very strong about everything. As we say that we are not entering into the Federation unless these things are agreed to, it looks as if we are laying much stress on one point and not on the others. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph will obviously be our delegate to the proposed Conference and he knows the feeling of the Select Committee, of the House and of the people of Barbados as a whole. He knows that Barbadians on the whole are not going to accept any backward Constitution; they are tired of hearing about self-government and I feel that we do not have to pick out any particular point and say that if we do not have it we will not enter into the Federation. We should fight strongly and see that all the proposals are carried into effect; in this proposed paragraph we are laying over-emphasis on one point to the detriment of the other changes we are proposing in this Address to the Acting Governor. We do not want to over-emphasize one point and thereby under-emphasize other points; I therefore suggest in all sincerity to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that he should withdraw this paragraph.

Mr. ADAMS: The mere fact that I had this paragraph written out and then I put it aside and had to remove it from memory shows that I have the same view about it; on the other hand, I think there is a lot to be gained by letting delegates know how strongly we feel about the matter, and they would not know that if we do not put it on paper. We either agree to this last paragraph or let us re-commit paragraph 2 and strengthen that portion of the paragraph which deals with this matter. If every Government sees that Barbados says that it is no good entering into the Federation unless they agree to the movement of population, then they will go to London knowing exactly where Barbados stands. In that case I ask leave to withdraw my motion in order to have paragraph 2 re-committed.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that paragraph 2 be re-committed.

Mr. MAPP seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that after the word "House" occurring in line 4, the word "feels" be deleted and the words "records its determination that Barbados should not enter into a Federation unless" be inserted.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that paragraph 2 as amended stand part of the Address was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that you do now report the passing of this Address in Committee with amendments.

Mr. BARROW: Before you report progress, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks as to the question of the amendment of the Constitution. As I indicated before, the rigidity or flexibility of the Constitution does not depend upon what is being written or underwritten; the ease with which the Constitution may be amended will, in the final analysis, determine the rigidity or the flexibility of the Constitution. I feel that our progress towards a successful solution to our problems on a federal basis must necessarily be of an empirical nature. We do not want the Constitution to be amended at the mere whim and fancy of any individual pressure group or of any Parliament without adequate safeguards; but at the same time I feel it is a question of whether these things which we now deem to be requisite and necessary will in the light of history, turn out to be so necessary for the survival of the Federal Government, or whether these provisions which we now retain, will not in the cold light of reason at some later date turn out to be a stumbling-block to the progress which we very much desire. Therefore I feel that we should state in our Resolution that we view the question of the amendment of the Constitution as being a very fundamental one; I have no specific proposals at this juncture to put forward, but I feel that we should include in our Resolution some proposals on the question of amendment of the Constitution, around which our discussion on this issue could revolve. I hope that the Conference in London does not leave it to some administrator or official or draughtsman to throw in what he considers adequate machinery for an amendment of the Constitution. We may not make any specific proposal because the problem is a very delicate one; but on this question of amendment, the whole Constitution may be wrecked, or you may have a travesty of a Federal Government. I feel that we should pass some Resolution here to-night to the effect that very close attention and weighty consideration be given to this matter; in the light of all the other constitutional proposals such as a bi-cameral Legislature, the balance of power between the Federal and the original Government, the financial provisions and all these other considerations, due weight should be given to the consideration of Constitutional amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have the examples of history to guide us and we know that democratic government in the United States has been on the verge of collapse due to the rather difficult machinery which was set out in the Constitution of the United States as to the question of amendment. We know that the democratic forces in the United States have found great difficulty in carrying out the measures necessary for the economic survival of the country, and we know today in the light of history that there are many forces which would even alter the laws relating to racial discrimination and so on. It was only with the greatest difficulty that some of these measures ever came about in the United States, and some of them have not yet seen the light of the Statute Book. We do not want any of the things which happened in the United States to take place in the West Indies and therefore I feel that we should put forward some kind of Resolution in this matter of amendment of the Constitution. We should make it clear that this is a matter for a Conference of West Indian politicians to decide themselves and not leave it to any outside authority to devise methods of Constitutional amendment.

Mr. ADAMS: I quite appreciate all that the honourable member has said. Although 14 years ago I did select for myself the method of amendment which I thought best at the time, yet as one reads more and more, one realises the difficulty of amend-

ing Constitutions. The American Civil War was due to the rigidity of the Constitution where the Southern States had the right to act by themselves and so on. We have left out the question of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; we have to remember what happened in President Roosevelt's time where a Supreme Court could regard itself out of politics and give decisions some of them political. This question of the amendment of the Constitution is one of very great difficulty, but I do agree that we should not be completely silent on it. Perhaps a paragraph along this line should be added to the proposed Address:

"The House being fully aware of the difficulties of the proposals for amendments of the Constitution suggests that before the London Conference takes place there should be an exchange of views between the several Governments on this question."

At the present moment everybody is going to London with nothing to follow in this matter; the Standing Closer Association Committee did not make any recommendation. I feel that this is a very important matter as the honourable member has said; it is perhaps the most important matter. As you come to writing a Federal Constitution, it is almost a treaty between States and it is extremely difficult to amend your Constitution. So far, no Legislature has really given any consideration to this question and I think if we go on record as saying that we are aware of the difficulties of proposals for amendment of the Constitution and show our readiness to everybody else who is aware of them, and possibly discuss them before we go to London, we will have done some good. We do not want to go there with any vague views about something which is put forward and which we have to start discussing all over again. I promise the House that I will discuss the matter with honourable members and we may approve a memorandum to be put forward as our views; I promise to read out the different forms which exist and we can see which of them appeals to us most. The system of referendum is an excellent thing in Switzerland and maybe, it has worked beneficially in Australia, but I believe that a referendum is no part of the democratic system although it may seem strange to say so. In grave legislative matters the people at large are not always the best judges because they may be swayed by the particular speakers who go to them without having studied the subject. While a real democracy means that you must state the principles for which you stand and ask your electors to support you, on broad principles it will not work by referendum as to whether the country as a whole would like to see the Constitution altered. I do not believe in a referendum on a highly important matter; we will come back to the House with proposals which can also be forwarded to the Colonial Office and to other Governments. I beg to move that the paragraph I have proposed be paragraph 12 of the Address.

Mr. BARROW: I beg to second that. I really consider that we should make some recommendation to the Conference itself and not delegate that duty to any official. That is what I want to get over: I think we should set out that we do not want our Constitution amended by Her Majesty in Council. I think that in a negative sort of way paragraph 78 of the Report of the Rance Committee contemplates that our Constitution should be amendable by Her Majesty in Council.

Mr. MAPP: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph seemed to have missed the point that the Standing Closer Association Committee did make some recommendation as to constitutional

amendment. I heard the honourable member say *sotto voce* that they only referred to it in a vague way; this is what the Report of that Committee says:

"We make no recommendations for any special procedure for constitutional amendment. That is to say, the Constitution, which we anticipate will be embodied in an Order in Council, should be amendable by His Majesty in Council. . . ." Although the Committee began in a vague way, they go on to recommend that the Constitution should be amendable by Her Majesty in Council. I am suggesting to the honourable member that we should refer to that and say whether we agree with it or not. I beg to move that paragraph 12 as proposed be amended by the addition of the following words:

"In any event the House does not agree that the Constitution should be amendable by Her Majesty in Council."

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—I would rather that we did not complete discussion of the Address now but deal with this point next Tuesday.

Mr. ADAMS: I have given an assurance to the honourable member. Before next Tuesday a small sub-committee can meet and put up recommendations. We do not want to hold up the work we have to do before next Tuesday. I accept the addition suggested by the honourable member.

The question that paragraph 12 be passed as part of the Address was put and agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Chairman reported the passing of the Address in Committee with amendments. Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accord.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Address as amended in Committee was then passed.

Mr. Speaker asked Mr. Adams to present the Address, and the honourable member agreed to do so.

RESOLUTIONS *Re* LEASE OF PROBYN STREET LAND

Dr. CUMMINS asked for and obtained leave to take Orders Nos. 8 and 9.

On the Order being called for Dr. CUMMINS to move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to make it lawful for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to lease to the Vestry of St. Michael a parcel of land at Probyn Street containing by admeasurement 714 square feet for the purpose of erecting sanitary conveniences thereon.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—There is a small plot of land at the Bus Stand near Bethel Church which land belongs to the Government. It is not being used, and the Vestry of St. Michael is seeking a lease of that land for the purpose of erecting sanitary conveniences thereon. This Resolution seeks to make it lawful for the Government to lease the land.

I move, Sir, that the Resolution do now pass.

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

On the Order being called for Dr. CUMMINS to move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to make it lawful for the Vestry of St. Michael to lease from the Governor-in-Executive Committee a parcel of land at Probyn Street containing by admeasurement 714 square feet for the purpose of erecting sanitary conveniences thereon.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker.—This Resolution now seeks to make it lawful for the Vestry of St. Michael to lease the land which is the subject of the Resolution just passed by the House.

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

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

BILL TO AMEND ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT

Mr. ADAMS asked for and obtained leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day.

On the Order being called for Mr. ADAMS to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—The purpose of this Bill is merely to make the Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties a Justice of the Peace *ex officio*. The Objects and Reasons of the Bill set out the matter clearly. They state:—

Section 5 of the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941, provides that oaths and affirmations required for the purposes of the Act may be taken before a Justice of the Peace. In the course of administering the Act, the services of a Justice of the Peace are frequently required for taking oaths and affirmations. In the past, the Government in order to assist the public, has appointed the Commissioner a Justice of the Peace personally. However, when the Commissioner is absent on leave, or goes on retirement, the officer performing his duties has not been a Justice of the Peace.

The object of this Bill is to provide for a Justice of the Peace being available continuously and this is sought to be done by adding to the principal Act a provision that the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner and any person acting for either of these officers, while so acting, is to be a Justice of the Peace *ex officio*.

The Governor, Sir, can make anyone a Justice of the Peace; but he does not normally do so, and I do not think he can make anyone a Justice of the Peace *ex officio*.

I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I think that there is a crying need for more Justices of the Peace in Barbados. The people of St. Thomas find it difficult to get the services of one when they require such services. I think that the Government would be well advised to create more Justices of the Peace.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—While I agree with the principle of this Bill I am hoping that it will not be extended to the case of Police Officers who will be in a position to sign a warrant to prosecute and who can then decide to take a statement on the same warrant.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I agree with the honourable member that the extension of this principle to police officers should be much deprecated.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to *nem. con.*

Mr. ADAMS moved seconded by Mr. Cox that Mr. BRYAN be appointed Chairman of Committees for the balance of this sitting and the motion was carried on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER that the *Ayes* have it.

On motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

The two Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. Chairman reported and Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox, the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title read and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until this day week

at 3 o'clock p.m. I propose to start the consideration of the Estimates next Tuesday. I do not feel that the Government is doing anything unreasonable in asking honourable members to deal with the Estimates a week after they have been laid, because it is so soon after discussion of the Five Year Plan. It is not like in the old days when honourable members had no idea of Government's plans as regards revenue and expenditure.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was put and agreed to, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.