

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953-54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15th June, 1954.

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

Present:

His Honour, Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., B.A., Q.C., (*Premier*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*), Hon. M. E. COX (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*), Hon. C. E. TALMA (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*), Hon. R. G. MAPP (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. G. F. ALLDER, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 4th May, 1954, having been printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. SMITH and Mr. GODDARD, entered the House and took their seats.

DOCUMENTS

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Report of the Accountant General for the month ended 30th April, 1954.

Also, the Report of the Director of Barbados Electric Supply Corporation for the year ended 30th June, 1953.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following paper: Sugar Industry (Irrigation Board) Regulations, 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am commanded to lay the following:—

Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1954.

Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1954.

Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1954.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am commanded to lay the following reply to Question No. 45 asked by Mr. J. E. F. BRANCKER regarding the employment of the staff of the British Caribbean Currency Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am commanded to lay the following reply to Question No. 58 asked by Mr. L. E. SMITH regarding the construction of the East Coast Road.

MESSAGE FROM GOVERNOR

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following Message No. 17/1954 from His Excellency the Governor regarding emigration to Canada.

The Message reads as follows:—

His Excellency The Governor
To

The Honourable The House of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to a message presented by the Honourable House of Assembly on the 1st June, 1954, on the subject of Emigration to Canada, and to say that he has caused inquiries to be made. These, however, reveal that there is in Canada no such shortage of labour as would, in the opinion of the Canadian authorities concerned, justify bringing workers from Barbados. There is some temporary increase in demand for harvest workers in Ontario and the Prairies during the Summer, but this is met by bringing workers from other parts of Canada.

2. His Excellency is satisfied that no good purpose is to be served by pursuing the matter in the manner proposed. He has however arranged for any change in the situation to be reported to him without delay. Other outlets for surplus population are continually being sought.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
St. Michael.
15th June, 1954.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 5 Order, 1954.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1954.

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1954.

ORDER NO. 1 POSTPONED TEMPORARILY

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 1 is to resume debate on the consideration of the Report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation. In view of the fact that certain honourable members who want to take part in the debate are not in their places at the moment, I am asking that Order No. 1 be postponed temporarily and that Order No. 2 be the next order of the day.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Minister of Social Services: To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1954-55, No. 8

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this resolution is for the sum of \$737 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1954-55, Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1954-55, No. 8, which forms the schedule to this resolution.

As the addendum sets it out, an amount of \$81,000, which included legal expenses, was provided in Supplementary Estimate 1953-54, No. 20, for the purchase of Admiralty property at Six Cross Roads. The purchase price of \$80,088 was paid before the end of the financial year but it was not possible to pay the legal expenses amounting to \$736.03 before that date. The whole provision of this amount for legal expenses is for Stamp Duty and Fees. The breakdown is as follows:—

Stamp Duty			\$403.20
Fees			332.83
			\$736.03

I hardly think there is anything further for me to add. This is purely a question of paying the out-of-pocket expenses in connection with the purchase by Government of the 48 acres of land which was formerly the property of the Admiralty. I beg to move that this resolution do now pass.

Hon. R. G. MAPPE seconded the motion.

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Chairman reported the passing of one resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

BILL TO MAKE PROVISION FOR RELIEF OF POOR IN THE ISLAND

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day is to resume Committee on the Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the relief of the poor in this island.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—On the last occasion, when we were discussing this Bill in Committee, we were uncertain of the fate of the Maude Bill and certain sections of it were postponed. Now that the Maude Bill has been passed by the Other Place—it is true with some amendments which have not yet been decided by us but of which we have an understanding—I think we can continue with this Bill and finish it.

The clauses which are postponed were clauses 2, 13, 18, 20, 22, 27 and 28. We will take them in order. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Clause 2 deals with areas. At the time when we dealt with this clause in Committee, we did not know what would be done by the Other Place about areas in the Maude Bill and this Clause was therefore postponed. I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 13 was called.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Clause 13 is of a similar nature as Clause 2. I beg to move that Clause 13 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 18 was called.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Sir, Clause 18 deals with Guardian Committees to be appointed for each ward and parish. There again, that was a matter dealing with districts as were set out in the Maude Bill. I beg to move that Clause 18 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 20 was called.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Clause 20 deals with the duties of Guardians Committee. I beg to move that Clause 20 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 22 was called and passed.

Clause 27 was called.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Clause 27 makes provision for officers and servants appointed under the Local Government Act, 1953. This Clause too could not be passed before the outcome of the Maude Bill was known. I beg to move that Clause 27 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clause 28 was called.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Sir, the duties of Public Assistance Officers are set out in this Clause. I beg to move that Clause 28 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. M. E. Cox seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Dr. Cummins, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND CUSTOMS TARIFF ACT, 1921

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a simple matter. As honourable members will see from the objects and reasons, the Regional Economic Committee has asked the Government and other West Indian Governments to grant exemption from duty on goods imported into this Island for the sole use of the Committee. Government considers this to be a reasonable request and therefore, has sent this Bill down to the Legislature to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, so that office stores and equipment which the Comptroller of Customs is satisfied are for the sole use of the Regional Economic Committee should be exempted from Customs duty. Such things as typewriters and stationery would be exempted from Customs duty. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion.

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

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND RUM DUTY ACT, 1906

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Rum Duty Act, 1906. As is well known, the Government is responsible for the storage of rum in various bonds in this island. It is considered necessary to tighten up on existing regulations with regard to the storage of this rum but before these regulations can be made, it is necessary to amend the Act. Subsection I of Section 60 of the Act restricts the authority of rum bonds to the City of Bridgetown but since the Act was passed, Government has acquired rum bonds in other parishes. It is proposed to amend Section 60 so as to make provision for other parts of the island where rum is stored. It is also proposed to amend sub-section I of Section 59 so that regulations can be made for the receipt and warehousing of rum as well as the delivery of it. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded the motion.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The three clauses of the Bill were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND THE MERCHANDISE MARKS ACT, 1949.

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour: Second reading of the Bill to amend the Merchandise Marks Act, 1949.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, this Bill as the Objects and Reasons point out, is to amend the Merchandise Marks Act, 1947. This Act provides for the register of Trade Marks to be kept under the Merchandise Marks Act, 1896, to be continued to be kept, but that the register be divided into two parts, Part A and Part B. No provision, however, was made for including the trade marks registered under the earlier Act in Part A, which is the proper part in which such marks should be placed.

A further financial difficulty has arisen in that the registration of marks under the Act of 1949 is for a period of seven years but is renewable for a further period of fourteen years, while under the Act of 1896, once a mark was registered, it remained so unless expunged on certain grounds. Doubts arose as to whether the intention of the Act of 1949 is to the effect that all marks, whether prior to or after the Act of 1949 should be registered for a period of seven years and renewed accordingly. It is considered that the intention of the Act of 1949 is to put all trade marks on the same basis, thereby making the duration of the registration of a mark for a period of seven years in the first instance, but renewable for a further period of fourteen years and this Bill amends the Act accordingly. Sir, because of doubt in the drafting of the Act of 1949 and so as to make it very clear are the reasons that this Bill is now before this House. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded the motion.

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

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The five clauses of the Bill were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. R. G. MAPP, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER NO. 11

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No 11 as the next order of the day.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT, 1941

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day stands in the name of the honourable Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as the law of estate and succession of duties stands, estate duty is paid on an estate which is left for a tenant for life and then at the death of the tenant passes on by a legal instrument to the eventual beneficiary. For a number of years, although this has been the reading of the law, the Commissioners of Income Tax and Death Duties have not collected death duties on these estates.

The late Commissioner of Income Tax drew to the attention of the Government that this was not done by his predecessor but which according to the law should be done and the Crown Law Officer has acquiesced with the late Income Tax Commissioner. However, the question, then arose as to what concessions should be given in respect of those estates which had not paid duty on the conclusion of the life interest; whether they should be made to pay or whether you should regularise the position exempting those estates from duty or whether you should amend the Act. Government does not consider that the Act should be amended as it considers that in future people should be made to pay this duty, but inasmuch as several estates have changed hands, Government considers that the persons into whose hands those estates have fallen should not be liable to pay, except those persons who have taken up estates as from January last year when the matter was taken up by Mr. Finch, the then Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties and certain solicitors in Bridgetown on behalf of certain clients.

This Bill therefore proposes to regularise the position by exempting from duty all estates governed by such an instrument, provided that the death causing the estate to pass occurred prior to the 1st January, 1953. If honourable members look up the 1941 Act in front of them, they will see what I am talking about and they need not be lawyers to follow what I am saying. Honourable members will see that the proviso is necessary in order that the estates of persons who died between 1941 when the Act came into operation and the 1st January, 1953, will not now have to pay estate duty. Suppose there was an estate bequeathed in 1942 to a life tenant who died before 1st January, 1953, that estate would be levied on for duty but Government is now saying that it is not collecting from the person who should have paid that duty; but if a life tenant of that estate died subsequent to 1st January, 1953, that estate is liable for payment.

I may say that although there was some difference of opinion between the solicitors and the Crown Law Officers as well as some barristers too, the Government is advised that the law is clear and that the estate duty should have been collected, but inasmuch as the Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties of that day did not collect and told solicitors he would not collect, it would be very hard for this same Government which did not collect then from those people to call on them now to pay, particularly in view of

the fact that in some cases, estates passed on from one beneficiary to another. I want to make it abundantly clear that the Government has no intention of amending the Act so that these estates would not be liable for this duty; it is merely saying that those persons to whom estates were passed on between 1941 and 1st January, 1953, will not be called on to pay. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion.

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill were called separately and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

LEAVE TO TAKE ORDER No. 1.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to go back to Order No. 1.

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

DEBATE ON REPORT OF LONDON CONFERENCE ON W. I. FEDERATION RESUMED

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day is to resume debate on the consideration of the Report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, one would have thought that the question of whether or not the West Indies as a whole and particularly the Governments of those islands which sent representatives to London recently to discuss how the Closer Association should take place had decided finally that there should be a federation and that there was only the question of what the terms should be to be finally decided. The honourable Premier in addressing the House on the question which is before us started off on that basis but after slight reference to the point left it alone and has used no argument to question our going back to the whole question whether or not federation is advantageous to us. But since he has spoken, the honourable senior member for St. John with his usual obvious sincerity and undoubted ability to put well good points as well as bad points, has treated all of us to a speech which if allowed to go out to the rest of the West Indian world without objection by this Chamber would represent a retreat from the original position adopted by us; therefore, whether or not we should have a federation of the West Indies does seem, even at this late hour, to call for some remarks as to the necessity for it. I go as high as saying that the necessity of our having federation is more evident today than it was in 1947 when there was a conference on the Closer Association of the British West Indian Colonies at Montego Bay and without repeating what has already been said, I should like to refresh the memories of those who were there and to draw to those who were not lucky enough to be there to the remarks of Mr. N. W. Manley, Q.C., who was one of the speakers at

that conference. The honourable Premier himself spoke as I happen to know — I was a legal adviser present—with great force, not merely on the necessity of federation but on the urgency of federation; therefore, he must forgive anyone who begins to doubt the sincerity of the present Government of Barbados in a West Indian Federation if he does not force the pace more than he is forcing it today. Undoubtedly, the honourable Premier claims much greater political wisdom and greater political experience for ourselves in this island than in the rest of the West Indies. (I do not use the word 'colony'; I dislike it for fear of going on with colonialism as distinct from the independence which we in this island always managed to obtain, even when we were in truth and fact a colony.) Nevertheless, the public and those who believe that federation is in the interest of the West Indies as a whole and Barbados in particular are bound to feel that the Government that is in power, and in power with an overwhelming majority, must be failing in its duty if it is not forcing the pace of a West Indian federation and giving us what we regard as a good thing.

In addition to that, there is no doubt about it either, as you walk and as you creep, you still find many persons some of whom are even among the statesmen of these islands, who are opposing federation and seem to be questioning the advisability of it for this island. It is for that reason, as I have said before, I would suggest that those who are wavering on this question, should borrow a copy of the proceedings which are contained in Part II. on the Conference of the Closer Association of the British West Indian Colonies which took place at Montego Bay in September 1947, and read it thoroughly. I just would like, Mr. Speaker, as I have said earlier, to refer to parts of the speech by Mr. N. W. Manley, Q.C., who at that time was not a representative at that Conference but was a member of the British section of the Caribbean Commission. At the beginning of his speech, he said that he was grateful of being afforded the privilege of addressing the Conference although he was not a member of the official delegation. In the early part of his speech, he said: "I distrust, Sir, the use of analogies." He said so because Mr. Bustamante who spoke on behalf of Jamaica, had referred to the analogy of when some colonies were able to walk, some were only able to creep, and as a result, he (Mr. Bustamante) doubted the possibility of being able to associate himself with members of those colonies which were not then on the stage to maturity. These are the words of Mr. Manley:—

"I distrust, Sir, the use of analogies. When people talk about the unseemly and slow progress that is involved in creeping, I can't help but feel that, slow though it may be, you may get somewhere by creeping if you know where you wish to go. On the other hand, mounting the horse of power and galloping in every direction is an unpredictable mode of progress. And I distrust, too, these references to building foundations before you create an edifice worthy to live in. It seems to suppose that, by recognising the need for federation, you may proceed to do so many things, as to make it, if you succeed, wholly unnecessary to have federation at all. Federations are not born out of anything else except necessity, economic, social and moral necessity, and if federations are to be real, they must come out of processes of planning for the real needs rather than by supposing that, by satisfying all those needs, you will then discover, by some magic which I do not comprehend, that federation will arrive by falling from a tree into your outstretched hands. There is no record

"in history in which it has ever taken place in that way and I address myself to West Indian needs as they point to federation and the super-abundant evidence which shows that the necessity for closer collaboration is already manifest in the trend of Caribbean opinion and Caribbean action today."

"His Excellency the Governor spoke briefly of some of the evidences of the necessity for collaboration which the Caribbean area presents today. You will pardon me, Sir, if I review this matter shortly, because it is there, I think, to deal with the manifest needs. Not everyone realises that your office (he is referring to Mr. Creech Jones) has for decades acted as an overriding authority imposing upon the Caribbean area as a whole a policy such as the federal government would build for itself, constantly regarding the Caribbean territory as one area suffering from common disabilities and requiring in the close relationship between its economic circumstances, a generalised policy. It is in fact, a pre-federation structure in itself. But where do we of the Caribbean want this federalised power to be? It must be somewhere! Do we feel the necessity to have it here in our own hands and to use it for our own policies or do we wish to leave it where it is with all that that implies? So much is it true that the Colonial Office acts in this way that when in 1938 the Caribbean area made manifest to the world the wrongs that it suffered, the inflictions of poverty and the degradation of human material, and when the new fact emerged in the historical process of the Caribbean people that the common man, alive to those conditions, would no longer endure them and was prepared — and rightly — to raise hell in his own way to call attention to his wrongs—when your Office came to deal with these matters (he was referring to the Colonial Development Committee) it found itself compelled to set up a Caribbean structure in your Colonial Development and Welfare Committee for the precise purpose of doing what we should be doing had we the power in our hands. Aside from and in addition to what you have, working as it were in a parallel field, another structure, the one of which I am an element here today, which sees the whole Caribbean area as a problem requiring a great deal of unified consideration and action."

And this is how Mr. Manley, Q.C., goes on:—

"But what is the fate of advisory and consultative bodies? They come to be regarded with scorn and condemned by those for whom they are doing their best. They find, however good their thinking and planning may be, that each little country begins by resenting interference in its own affairs. If after infinite labour and an infinitude of tact, they succeed in persuading the local areas that they are something better than mere busy bodies and mischief makers, they find local administrations so burdened with local problems and so immersed in their own troubles that it is impossible for them to give the fullest consideration to larger aspects of their own problems. And, as a result, what is happening in this area? The people themselves are beginning on a voluntary level to associate closer and closer in every department of life. The outstanding fact in West Indian life in the last ten years has been the development, by voluntary action, of that closer collaboration of the people of the different islands."

"You can turn to whatever department of affairs you like. The Caribbean area, for example, accepts the necessity for common educational services. The University proposal is evidence of the

"fact that a vital structure of this sort cannot be set up except on Caribbean basis. We have considerable system of inter-Colonial training of personnel for a variety of services in the various territories. The producers of the West Indies are coming to feel more and more that if they do not get together external and agricultural problems of the area cannot be adequately taken care of. A body like the Sugar Manufacturers' Association of the various islands has led the way; it is a product of the sheer logic and necessity of the situation. Other producers are contemplating a similar policy and are now looking for some centre of authority to which they can eventually direct themselves. They know that when they come to you and say, 'We want production for export to be expended and we want the assurance of stability for agriculture, and would act to that, a demand for guaranteed prices subject to review based on cost of production related to decent wage and working conditions for labour, you may be sympathetic. Many know that you are, many know that you yourself would say this is an elementary right. Jamaica, or any other Caribbean territory, is only asking for the same protection that the British agriculturalists are asking for, and which the American agriculturalists have got. We know that we cannot get it through you alone, and that if we were able to press our claims by our own representatives acting on authority vested in ourselves we would have a far better chance of securing for these claims the consideration they deserve. We know the necessity for all our external and economic affairs to rest on an authority to be found in these territories and to be created and maintained by ourselves. It is all very well to say that we believe that Colonial policy will remain the same whatever government remains in office. I do not share so naive a view. I believe that your Government has a real Colonial Policy, and one of which we should take advantage. Whatever Government is in power, I believe the quicker we put ourselves on our own feet, so that we can talk as equals in status though we are not equal in size, the sooner we will assure a future which may prove not entirely uncertain."

"I cannot imagine how anyone can believe that all these facts do not indicate that the time for political federation is now; (he was referring to 1947) and, if I may say so, Sir, anxiety about it must spring from some misconception as to the purpose of political institutions. Consultative bodies, voluntary representation, voluntary associations — none of these things can give you the assurance that political independence alone can give because it is in itself the symbol and expression of your power and your collective will to maintain your own affairs and to bargain over your own rights. No substitute of any description can do for us on practical levels what can be done if we had political unity and the authority that can only derive from that source. Any other thinking, Sir, misunderstands entirely the function and the purpose of politics as crystallising the power of the people and creating a means whereby it can be made effective. If you pass from the simple question of external trade to the dire need in these territories for unifying the services in a vast variety of fields you will find again that what can be done by voluntary action could be done ten times as effectively and speedily by a central machinery expressing the will of the territory as a whole. It is impossible to suppose that every single one of these territories, or perhaps even the largest of us can ever achieve alone

"the basic human services which is the whole aim of politics to create and make possible for the common man."

"I ask myself what are the real reasons for opposition. There is undoubtedly and I think we should confess it, sincere fear about our financial ability to maintain federal structures, and there is a fear that if we ask for something resembling dominion status, if we ask for really responsible government, we will find ourselves at once isolated in the world and bereft even of the friendly assistance of Great Britain itself. But I have two answers to make to that, and the first is that, while it would be very difficult for separate West Indian territories to undertake a radical overhaul of their financial machinery, the possibility of its being done by the area as a whole, with its vast and untapped resources, is a very real one. I believe that so far from our feeling that we should be financially weaker, we should realise that there would be a gain in our credit potentiality and in our ability to organise our whole financial machinery, if we were united together, which would be almost impossible for any unit to attempt. I have never shared the view that one would be, as it were, punished by refusal to help because one dared to aspire to manhood. I cannot believe that if the West Indies as a self-governing unit were to ask for financial help in the establishment of our new life it would be denied because we accepted what is virtually an offer made by your office. I have never believed that there has ever been such an intention. I would rather believe that there would be a greater opportunity of asking for some initial assistance so that we might plan rapidly for the development of this area. If I am wrong then I altogether misread the signs which have been in many other directions made manifest by your Government and by you as its representative in your Office."

Mr. Manley Q.C., goes on to say:—

"What are the other causes of opposition? There is the inevitable fear of change, and those who sincerely say, 'Go slowly,' may be affected by that human and understandable dread of what may happen if you take a large step at one time. I sympathise with them but I remind them that in the most unfavourable auspices, if you consider our history and all the surrounding circumstances, Jamaica has recently taken a large step forward; and diverting or confusing as the local scene may be we do not yet regard it as disastrous—indeed, we have every confidence that we know how to solve our problems here among ourselves."

"There is a third root of opposition, and that is the opposition that springs from vested interest. A large number of people always have a vested interest in the *status quo*. You cannot blame them for being alarmed at anything that troubles the pond in which they swim about in amiable security. But that is not the most dangerous of the vested interests. The vested interest of ambition in power is the most dangerous of all vested interests. It is in the history of every federation that there have always been found men who were unwilling to give up any local root of power for the creation of a large centre of power itself and I think we should warn ourselves of that danger and here I say that we should search our own breasts to discover if there lurks underneath the rationalisation that may be paraded for public consumption that malady which would be, and may yet prove to be, the greatest obstacle to our common ambitions. I do not say so, I will emphasise, I do not say so in a spirit of criticism."

"These things are inevitable, but whenever this historic situation has arisen, those who have had the vision, or—may I say?—the good sense, to lift themselves above it, have found that they had nothing to lose and much to gain. And I make the most powerful appeal of which I am capable for all here to drop out of their minds the remainders of their own security, real or apparent, and the years of power and tradition in their own lands and see that this larger objective opens our horizons and gives a wider opportunity for all."

"I, Sir, share in the ambition which I believe the vast majority of men of the Caribbean area of goodwill share together, and that is the ambition to see the Caribbean area united in a federal government that gives us full and absolute responsibility in our own affairs. And I couple that ambition with the belief that it is impossible to support a real federal structure unless the component units have local autonomy in those matters where the residue of power belongs to them exclusively. It is a large ambition, but it is a poor man who would not venture upon it to-day. It is a large ambition because, admittedly there are difficulties, but those very difficulties have a chance of being overcome if that ambition is realised. The whole idea that we must wait until our economic resources have been developed in each of the territories, until our social machinery has been enlarged in each of the territories, the whole idea of that fails to realise that one of the main reasons for federation is the necessity to be able to move at all, let alone more speedily, to the solution of these problems which are common among us. If we are to wait until each one has achieved for himself this millenium condition of improvement, then indeed we are condemned to wait for all time."

"You have been asked how will federation bring prosperity. Federation by itself will not bring prosperity, but federation will enlarge the area of action and enlarge the possibilities of winning that prosperity which we West Indians alone can, and certainly must, create for ourselves. If the West Indies cannot produce a team of men in a federal cabinet that can see these lands of ours, and in some of them these teeming populations, and work out the beginnings of some regional plan of development which will give us the hope of being able to tackle the problem of unemployment, give us the hope of being able to find what sort of civilisation is possible for us and how it may be achieved, and set to work to make that plan effective, then all we deserve, each and all, is to be reduced back to the status of Crown Colonies. If that were the case, then no man should be allowed to meddle in the affairs of his own Colony, because if he cannot see those larger possibilities he evidences himself as unfit even to tackle the problems of his own unit."

There is more to the same effect, Mr. Speaker, but this is tiresome reading and it is very tiresome to listen to. As I have said earlier, there is undoubtedly still at large the idea that we are still considering the question of setting up a West Indian Federation, whereas in truth and in fact, as the terms of what we are giving consideration to express, we are finished with the idea of federation, or no federation, and we are merely going on to the phase as to exactly what the structure should be; therefore, I make these remarks in answer to the speech of one honourable member and in answer to the letters which sometimes appear in the newspapers and the comments which you hear from side to side as to why, or why not, we should have federation.

The Hon. Premier has drawn certain things to our attention in his speech. Sometimes I wondered when he was making his speech if he were shadow boxing; sometimes I wondered if he were trying to satisfy himself all over again as to the urgent necessity for immediate federation. I do know that in the speech which the honourable Premier made at the Montego Bay Conference, he said that what we wanted was the equivalent of dominion status or the position in which we would be able to reach that stage soon after federation. With our experience in this island, moving from the Bushe Experiment to Ministerial Status, that should be a satisfactory answer to any person as to whether or not there is any danger in taking the lesser beginning so that you would have the basic power to demand the greater thing later on after you have accepted the lesser. I remember quite well at the time when our representatives were going to the further talks in London that I counselled them, though at the time I did not expect my counsel would be taken, and therefore it is a credit to those who went that they did not allow the fact that they did not get all that Barbados would have liked, to have to stay in the way of their getting agreement; there is no necessity for them to apologise to us if they had to give up some to take some in order that they could come to some agreement. Sir, you either believe in federation or you do not believe in it at all.

I again want to counsel those who are against the limitation of freedom of movement in the federation to accept the Preamble in the spirit in which it is given. Whether it appears on the Exclusive or the Concurrent Legislative Lists, it would still be a question that the Federation itself would be able to overrule the units because in every federation—and in the suggestions for a West Indian Federation—it is laid down that where a subject has within the power of the federation to pass laws, those laws which are passed if different from the laws of the federation, that the laws of the federation must take precedence. Because of that, while I agree that we should aim at the highest for ourselves, I hope that we will not allow the question of certain restrictions in the movement of people to prevent us from entering federation. As the honourable Premier has said, undoubtedly, each unit is going to claim the right that those who are of bad characters and those who are likely to affect the health of the community should not be allowed to enter; but, on the other hand, we have got to realise that we should enter federation not doubting those who are going in the federation itself, or with the belief that they are going to be hostile to our own ideas, but we should enter with the full belief that not merely by force of arguments but by our ability as statesmen to persuade others that what is for the good of a unit is for the good of the federation; we must try to persuade others that if one part of the body is suffering from a malady that the whole part of the federation would be suffering from the equivalent disease. I have no fear of the ability of those whom we will send to be able to bargain and get for us what we desire. We have done well already and it should not be difficult for us to do even better later. For some reason or other, Trinidad is not wishful for the freedom of movement of persons within the area. Cannot you see that our position would possibly be worse by our remaining aloof of federation? It would be better for us to join in the federation where we would have the right and the privilege to sit around the horseshoe table in the House of Representatives and force issues for the good of the units as a whole. At present, our posi-

tion as small units is almost hopeless but when we can sit together and do things for the benefit of the units as a whole, we would be in a far better position than any small unit which makes its own laws. What should prevent us from entering a federation where we might be more competent and efficient than the rest and would be in the position where we would not merely have the right to the highest communications one with the other but to argue with and persuade and eventually get a law passed. I do not want to use words which are less impressive than those of Mr. Manley whom I cited; therefore I shall avoid going over the arguments which he has given in his memorable speech, but I do hope that some day people both outside and in this Chamber will come to see that we cannot carry on as we are carrying on now. The greatest product which we have to export is the ability of our people. They are not merely politically wise, but they also have the ability to work and work hard. I therefore am of the opinion that federation means more to us than it means to almost any other unit in the West Indies.

Now, Sir, the question has been raised as to the financing of federation and that is really the main reason why I rose to speak. I have been able to borrow from the honourable Leader of the Opposition who I believe borrowed from one of the Ministers a document which I did not have the privilege of seeing before the last meeting of the House. It is a document which was issued by Colonial Development and Welfare and is dated 27th January, 1953 and entitled "The Financial Aspects of Federation of the British West Indian Territories." The honourable Premier in his speech mentioned that originally it had been decided that we would be giving up 25 per cent of our customs duty for financing federation but that at the London Conference it was agreed to reduce the percentage to 15 per cent of the customs duty. In this document you will find in Annexe 2 on page 26 the cost of the federal headquarters in the initial period. The comments on the categories of federal expenditure are to be found in paragraph 5 at page 2 of the said document. This is what the Annexe says:—

"The Rance Report (paragraph 110) gave a very tentative "order of magnitude" estimate of the recurrent annual cost of federal headquarters staff in the initial period of federation."

"The estimate covered:—

Governor General and Staff	\$101,000	(£21,000)
Council of State	48,000	(£10,000)
Senate	153,000	(£32,000)
House of Assembly	322,000	(£67,000)
Judiciary	106,000	(£22,000)
Secretariat, Financial and		
Legal Offices	148,000	(£31,000)
Total	\$878,000	(£183,000)

It goes on as follows:—

"These figures were estimated four years ago. (This document was dated 27th January, 1953.) Although some slight reduction may be allowed for the non-participation of British Guiana and British Honduras, it would not now be safe to put the total below \$1,100,000 (£229,000) owing to the rise in prices and allowances since 1948."

"Some services which were not listed in the Rance Report need to be added to this estimate,—for example the audit staff; the economic and statistical sections; a printing establishment, which will almost certainly be required from the inception of the federal government; and the cost of federal elections. The average annual recurrent expenditure on these services may be put roughly at \$200,000 (£42,000).

"3. The one major service to be taken over by the federal government in its first years is likely to be the Customs, the recurrent cost of which in the unit budgets in 1951 totalled \$842,000 (£175,000). This figure included the cost of collecting not only import duties, of which the federal government would retain a share, but also export and excise duties, which would continue to accrue in total to unit governments. To allow for the expense of the unified customs headquarters and for some increase in costs since 1951 one may raise the figure to \$1,000,000 (£210,000)."

"4. Two other existing services will naturally fall to be taken on to the federal budget from its inception,—the Trade Commissioners in the United Kingdom and Canada costing \$120,000 (£25,000) annually, and the University College of the West Indies, costing during its forthcoming quinquennium some \$1,340,000 (£280,000) annually."

I would like to call the attention of the honourable senior member for St. John to this paragraph:—

"5. There remains one important matter which lies within the exclusive legislative list and which may involve federal expenditure — Defence. It is not possible to budget even approximately for Defence, but in any case, if new expenditure were to be called for, it would be required equally whether or not federation were in being."

Honourable members will remember that the honourable senior member for St. John made much point of the fact of our raising an army and navy and things like that, and he remarked: "where will we be?" when we do that. Well, it is here outlined in this paragraph.

Paragraph 6 reads as follows:—

"6. No allowance is made here for the cost of taking over and maintaining a unified postal service, which seems unlikely to come into being until the federation has been established for some time. (See Annexe III)."

Sir, I do not need to read that, Paragraph 7 reads as follows:—

"7. There remains the question of financing the capital costs of the federal headquarters."

Here again, Sir, I do not need to read what these would be comprised of, but they come to \$2,000,000 (£415,000). The next paragraph reads as follows:—

"At a rough estimate, therefore, it may be expected that capital expenditure of the order of \$2,500,000 (£520,000) will be required to establish federal headquarters. Eventually some of this should be recoverable from land sales. In the short run also it may be possible to save much of this cost by renting existing premises. Nevertheless on the least favourable view, that the whole cost will be met from a federal loan, the annual recurrent liability at 4½ per cent. interest and 1 per cent. sinking fund would work out at about \$140,000 (£29,000).

"9. On these rough calculations the recurrent budget of the federal government in its initial period might be somewhat as follows:—

"NEW EXPENDITURE"

1. Services detailed in the Rance Report, ...	\$ 1,100,000
2. Services detailed in paragraph 2, such as the printing press	200,000
3. Loan service charges for federal headquarters, para. 8 above	140,000
Total expenditure	\$ 1,440,000

Expenditure taken over from Unit Governments

4. Customs Service para 3 above	\$ 1,000,000
5. Trade Commissioner Service, para. 4, above	120,000
6. University College of the West Indies, para. 4 above	1,340,000

Total expenditure taken over from units	\$ 2,460,000
Total budget	\$ 3,900,000

Let us say \$4,000,000 (£830,000).

This is his comment:—

"10. The "new" expenditure of \$1,440,000 (£300,000), when set against the total import duties which should have been collected in 1951 if the McLagan Report tariff had been in effect, say \$49,000,000 (i.e. \$45,000,000 actually collected plus \$4,000,000 additional, see Annexe V) amounts to almost exactly 3 per cent of net import duty revenue. On the other hand the total budget, including expenditure taken over, works out at just over 8 per cent."

Now, therefore, the true amount which we have to look for is 3 per cent. of our Customs import duties at the outset and even if you add 5 per cent it would be only 8 per cent. The amount in this report is \$49,000,000 but if you check it up with the latest report, you will find that is something like \$38 million, \$39 million, \$40 million to a little something over; therefore, the most it can be will be 4 per cent; and if you translate that into terms of what Barbados will have to find, if our Customs revenue is estimated at \$6,145,000 of which \$1,440,000 is Excise (and that does not come into the calculation); therefore, what we have to pay on is \$4,700,000, and 3 per cent. on that is \$141,000; and even if you put it at 8 per cent. it would only be \$376,000, but you must remember that the other 5 per cent. is paid by means of taxation; therefore, when you hear this talk about we would not be able to go into federation because it will take too much money to superimpose the structure, you will see that the estimate worked out here will only be approximately 3 per cent. Undoubtedly it would rise, but at the outset, you can see that we are limiting ourselves by the motion of the agreement which was made in London, that is, that we would not go above 15 per cent. Therefore, even if we do not take it at 3 per cent. but 8 per cent. bearing in mind at the same time that we have limited ourselves to five times 3 per cent. we would have to find at the beginning, on this 1953 scale, the sum of \$440,000 or without the Excise \$376,000.

As against that, you will have to weigh the points which I have made and which have been made from time to time as to the value of it, and it is of no use talking to a cynic. To talk about raising a budget of over \$12 million and refusing to spend \$141,000.00 to come into Federation, is just trying to find some form of opposition which you cannot translate either into figures or any reasonable argument. You hear

people say "Look at the money it will cost", but they do not know or they do not mean to calculate it because the opponents to Federation will always have an argument against it. There are those who are opposed to Federation or those who would draw back because they do not see what is in it for us. I have myself heard people express one thing and behind the door something entirely different was said. Let us examine the \$13 million which we are raising; look at what we pay for our own services! We are spending what we think is worth while spending on these services. We have gone into millions in our expenditure on education; we are spending \$2,335,000 in that direction but we deny spending the necessary amount so as to be able to give ourselves the right to look after ourselves! I have never disagreed with the idea that I would not like to see some of the limitations which may be imposed on the early Federal Parliament put there at all, but that was in the evolution of the Federation. We moved on almost automatically to Ministerial Status the moment we proved that we were able to look after our own affairs; we know that it would be better if we could have a Parliament without having people here and some there but we have perhaps to use that if it were an argument to prevent us from going on.

People are against Federation by saying that the financial outlay will cost us too much. I will advise people to take this document and study it. Some of us have had to educate our children without having a scholarship which is always worth twice its value because it is free from income tax. It is not yet seen fit to give relief to those who have to pay for higher education; but that is a matter for the Government. Even those of us who are sweating under that burden would not be against Federation; but we just talk, talk, talk and we do not seem to be getting any nearer to Federation. I am sorry that we have only been asked to agree just to the general principles of these proposals, which principles are set out in the Plan for the Federation. I would sooner leave this matter to the Draftsman because they will eventually come back to us; I would sooner say that we agree to all the proposals and proceed to draft the Constitution because the final instrument will be what the Government of this Island and the Governments of the other Islands choose to agree to before the Federation is brought into effect.

Before I sit down I would like to say this; I believe that every Barbadian is sufficiently conceited as to wish to remain in Barbados alone but most Barbadians are sufficiently sensible as to realize what has been said time and time again, that there is no place for the small unit in the present world. We, in the West Indies, are sufficiently of a similar nature and mind as to be able to work together; distance no longer presents the difficulty which it did before on account of the aeroplane and swift travelling. Therefore apart from our own advantages which we will get from freedom of movement which will be accorded to us in one shape or the other, it is impossible for the West Indies to carry on sufficiently well without joining together and being able to speak with one voice.

We have been asked to voice our own opinion as to the Federal Capital. As a matter of diplomacy and tactics, I hope they will not vote for an experimental Capital and a temporary Capital here because I believe that if they have the temporary Capital in some other place, they will be so satisfied that it is unsuitable that they will gladly come to a place like Barbados. (Cheers). Turning a more humorous note, I would say that as we barristers know, it seems to be almost a habit that if a man

finds difficulty in choosing between two girls he invariably finds and almost realizes that he has married the wrong one. (Laughter). I will tell you this; we barristers have the experience that we are satisfied with what we get and we always have the wisdom not to look at two at the same time. Some people look at ten at the same time. (Laughter). If you go to a place like Trinidad in certain months of the year it is cold at night and hot by day; with the heat under your feet by day you live in Hell and by night you live in Heaven.

I like my political opponents but I cannot get them to like me, (Laughter). Why should I say that the honourable junior member for St. George is not right because his views are different from mine? The honourable member's dreams have some reality about them. I hope that Mr. Bustamante likes me just as I like him. The accommodation in Jamaica is suitable but I do not think that anybody would go so far up that way to look for a Capital; the idea is to look to some place away from the Federation for the Capital. In this case we have facilities which other small islands have not got; we undoubtedly have the political wisdom which the other small places have not got, and more than that, no one would deny our political experience and the presence of people who are not merely politically conscious but who have forced upon others that they can look after themselves and who have developed the ability to look after themselves, is bound to be impressive and helpful to other Legislatures. If I say that I hope they do not choose Barbados for the temporary Capital that is only because I strongly support that choice, but I feel sure that wherever they make the temporary Capital they will sooner or later come to realize that if they want it to be successful they should choose Barbados (Cheers).

I can tell you that when Mr. Bustamante was rather critical at the idea of Federation I heard the Leeward and Windward Islands say: "Look here if Jamaica does not want to come in, and if British Guiana does not wish to come in, and if Trinidad is a bit lukewarm, why don't you fellows in Barbados offer to create a Federation of all the other Islands including yourself and press them to come in? We will have the Federal Headquarters at Barbados and it will not take long before we will find everybody coming in." British Honduras is too far away; don't bring them in because they will have criticisms against you. But as far as British Guiana is concerned when she gets over the pains and struggles of pregnancy she will as it is said of a mother, rejoice in the fact that she has brought a man child into the world. We know that countries cannot evolve without having these struggles; if Barbados can be made the Federal Headquarters we will see that they will be glad to come out here. They will find in Barbados the hospitality which makes them feel at home; they will be given better facilities than they are accustomed to at home.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker,—It is stated on the Order Paper that I spoke on this Federation issue. I intend to speak next and I would like that mistake which has been made in the Order Paper corrected, because it is not a correct interpretation of what took place on the last occasion. The Deputy Leader of the House adjourned the House before the normal time for dinner and I spoke on the motion for the adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member did not speak on the question of Federation.

Mr. BARROW: I am quoting from the Order Paper for today. "To resume debate on the consideration of the Report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation."

On the 8th June, 1954, Hon. G. H. ADAMS moved, seconded by Mr. VAUGHAN, the consideration of the Report. Messrs. CRAWFORD, GODDARD, MILLER and ALLDER, spoke. Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS moved seconded by Mr. BRANCKER, that further consideration be postponed, Mr. BARROW spoke." I just want to make it clear that I did not speak on the Federation issue. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

On resumption,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was debating the motion that the principles enunciated in the Report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation be accepted. The honourable senior member for St. George was about to speak.

Mr. BARROW: Prior to our Conference on West Indian Federation which was held in the United Kingdom in April last year, this Chamber discussed the Standing Closer Association Committee's Report of 1948—49. At the time certain views were expressed on the floor of this House, and on account of the emotional atmosphere which prevailed at the time and which, to some degree, has been introduced by the several speakers into this present debate, the ordinary man in the street in this island up to the present moment, even after reading the speeches which have been made on the subject, is not fully aware of the implications of the proposed Federation of the British Caribbean Colonies, nor can he fully understand the attitude either of the leaders in the Caribbean area or, I might even go as far as to state, the attitude of this House, on the question. It is my opinion that our discussion last year was a rather belated one, because the Report was published sometime in 1949, and it took this House four years even to discuss this Rance Report and it is perhaps for those reasons that we gave the impression to people outside the colony that Barbados was dragging its feet on the question of Federation and that our attitude by reason of the hiatus between the publication of the Report and our discussion in this Chamber was a lukewarm one. Our attitude was a lukewarm one. It is true that in the heart and breast of every member of this House there does exist some conviction as to the efficacy of Federation and its necessity for the salvation of the West Indian peoples; but we should do everything in our power, if we are arrogating to ourselves the right of leadership in the West Indies, to make sure that we do not give the impression to the outside world that we are not worthy of that leadership. That is a fault of which we are not alone guilty, because the majority of West Indian Governments sat back and waited to see what attitude would be adopted by the others before they would come out loudly and clearly in favour of Federation.

I would like to go back a little to the nineteenth century when Federation was first discussed at the Montego Bay Meeting of nearly all the responsible Leaders of the British Caribbean when the first important step was made towards our objective. It is my opinion that if we were serious about Federation we would have utilized the enthusiasm which prevailed at that time and the keenness shown by the masses of the West Indian people for the fulfilment of their aspirations in this respect. Shortly after, not short enough unfortunately, the Rance Committee published its deliberations; if we had struck when the anvil was hot, if we had not allowed the print on the Rance Report to dry so much until it became dim and obscure, the feeling of the West

Indian peoples on this problem would have been a lot warmer than it is at present.

The desire for Federation, contrary to the experience of other people within and without the Commonwealth who have attained this stage of political development, has sprung in the West Indies not from any desire to unite against a common enemy, or by reason of geographical continuity or propinquity or through any strong chauvinistic and nationalistic indoctrination, may be for the purpose of presenting a common front against a common enemy, but because in an almost idealistic manner we have had over the past one hundred years, leaders from all walks of life and representing substantially every sector of our national economy, putting forward the view that the West Indian islands could only succeed in achieving a working economy by uniting under a Federal structure. But even today, Mr. Speaker, when we should be in our debates rectifying all the sins of omission which we have committed or of which we have been found guilty in our dealings with the problem of Federation, I very much regret to say that for reasons best known to themselves, those very persons to whom we look for leadership in the Caribbean Colonies, are still trying to becloud the whole issue of Federation by the introduction of various shibboleths into their discussion and debates.

Without any sense of immodesty, I will come straight to the Report of the London Conference which was held in April, 1953. I consider the Report, from one aspect, as a personal triumph; because until I spoke in this Chamber on the question of Constitutional Amendment, not one Caribbean Leader had pointed out to the masses of the people that the flexibility of a Constitution such as the one which we propose to embark upon, would depend in the final analysis upon the ease with which it could be amended so as to meet the necessities of the moment and the demand of future generations. Not one Caribbean Leader had pointed out that the Rance Committee had decided that the question of amendment would not be set out in the Constitution at all and it even went so far as to vest the most sanctified principle of Federal Constitutions in other hands; therefore they had alienated their unalienable rights by the failure to make provision for Constitutional Amendment. Paragraph 78 of the Rance Committee's Report says this:—

"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. We recommend, however, that it be provided that no amendment diminishing the proportionate representation of any Unit in either Chamber of the Federal Legislature, or the number of representatives of a Unit in the House of Assembly, or increasing, diminishing or otherwise altering the limits of a Unit, should have effect unless a majority of the electors voting in any Unit concerned approve such an amendment."

That whole paragraph is nonsense because they were saying that amendment might be made by Order in Council, no provision was made for it and yet they fettered the Constitution by suggesting an amendment. On the floor of this Chamber I said that any Constitution which did not vest firmly in the hands of the people of the area themselves, the right to amend the Constitution to suit the exigencies of future generations, would be a wholly useless Constitution. I am very glad that after talking to one or two of the delegates who were together at that Conference and the then Leader of the House himself, they saw the omission and every one must

have been convinced of it, because in the Report which we are now discussing a specific Clause has been proposed to be inserted in the Constitution for the amendment of the Constitution.

On the question of amendment, there is one further aspect which was not fully investigated, and that is the mode of amendment. Having vested the power of amendment in the Federal and Unit Legislatures to give the machinery by which the amendment should be effected, I feel that that provision was not investigated sufficiently. In 167 years of the working of the American Federal Constitution there have been approximately 21 amendments; there is the famous amendment abolishing slavery, there is the famous 14th amendment which provided that no State shall enforce any law to infringe or restrict the liberty of the subject without due process of law. We have not got that provision in the Constitution; as a substitute we have the rule of law. The significant fact which I am drawing to the attention of honourable members is this: as much as the more enlightened section of the American peoples would have liked to amend the Constitution so as to make the liberty of the subject more a practical reality than a mere beautiful turn of speech, and they offered very good and valid reasons, for it, the difficulty of amending the Constitution made it impossible in 167 years for them to be able to pass more than 21 amendments. President Roosevelt in the days when the economy of the United States was imperilled and when he wanted to vest larger and fuller powers in the hands of the Legislature, he had to describe the machinery of amendment of the American Constitution as having been designed for the horse and buggy days; that is the view which I take of the machinery of amendment as set out in the Report of the Conference which was held in the United Kingdom last year. I only want to sound a note of warning; I am glad that they have decided not to leave the powers of amendment in the hands of the United Kingdom because that would make our Constitution a mockery; but I very much deplore that those illustrious persons who attended that Conference last year did not work out the machinery for amendment which would be much more suitable to the conditions of our living here in the West Indies.

The Report itself which we are now discussing, refers in paragraph 31 back to paragraph 78 of the Rance Report and states this:—

"In paragraph 78 of the main body of the S.C.A.C. Report it was recommended that no provision should be made in the Constitution itself for its amendment. We consider, however, that it would be better to lay down a definite procedure for constitutional amendment and have agreed upon the insertion of the following provisions:—

"A. (1) Subject to paragraph (B), the provisions of the Constitution will be subject to amendment by Federal law:

Provided that a Bill for the amendment of the Constitution (in this paragraph referred to as a "Constitutional Bill") shall be enacted by the Federal Legislature and

- (a) will require to be passed in the House of Representatives by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the total membership thereof.
- (b) will require to be assented to by resolutions passed by the Legislature in each of six or more units,
- (c) will not be assented to by the Governor-General but will be reserved by him for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure."

Then in sub-paragraph (2) of this paragraph 31, the Report states this:—

"Resolutions by unit Legislatures assenting to constitutional Bills shall

- (a) where the unit Legislature consists of two Chambers be required to be passed by two-thirds of the membership of the Lower House and assented to by the Upper House, and
- (b) where the unit Legislature consists of one Chamber, be required to be passed by two-thirds of the membership of that Chamber."

You will see by the very wording of paragraph 31 of the Report of the London Conference that it will be within the power of the Other Place to hold up any amendment for the whole Caribbean area, because each Unit has to agree to it, and where there is a bi-cameral Legislature, unless the Other Place assents to a Bill which has been passed by two-thirds of the membership of this Chamber, the whole of the Caribbean area may be held up by the failure of an upper Chamber to assent to a Constitutional Bill which has been interpreted as a Bill for the amendment of the Constitution.

Before we come down to the actual drafting of the legislation we should make sure that we do not make the machinery of amendment so elaborate that it defeats the powers of amendment in our own homes. Man was not made for the Constitution but the Constitution is made for man; when it comes to anything which is so vital and sacred to the everyday existence of the citizens of the area, I would be the last person to suggest that we should have some frivolous and trifling power of amendment vested in the Federal Legislature; but, at the same time, we must ensure that we do not make it so difficult that when the majority of opinion in the Caribbean is for a Constitutional change, an attempt to effect such a change is not frustrated by a self-seeking minority. As I said before, if there is one thing in the Report of the 1953 Conference for which the delegates to that Conference are entitled to our commendation it is the insertion of some powers of amendment in the Constitution itself.

I will now come to what may turn out to be the shibboleth on which the aspirations of all men of goodwill in the Caribbean may be wrecked, and that is the shibboleth of emigration. This is such a monumental stage in the historical and economic evolution of the West Indian peoples, that I make absolutely no apology for calling it the emigration shibboleth. For this reason, if there was one delegate at the Conference whom I consider to have clearly seen the issue in its proper perspective, it was one of the delegates from Trinidad who stated the object of placing emigration on the Exclusive Legislative List. I do not consider Mr. Hannays to be omniscient, but events will prove that this issue was not as important to the future of Caribbean Federation as we think. There is no country in the world—I speak advisedly—and I will choose the four most successful Federal Governments in the world. I will not quote South Africa as an example because that is one of the worst expressions of the Federal principle; but I will choose the United States of America, Australia, Canada and Switzerland, and I would like to inform hon. members that if we, in Barbados, put emigration on the Exclusive Legislative list we will be creating a historical precedent. Without any experience at all of the operations of Federal Governments, we are doing something which the founding fathers in America, which the authors of the Swiss Constitution and of the Canadian Constitution and of the Australian Constitution considered in their wisdom to be one of those things which would be best left alone for the sake of compromise in the

first instance, and in the second instance, because it means absolutely nothing whether you have emigration either on the Exclusive List or on the Concurrent List. In our present Constitution here in the West Indies it is much more dangerous to insist on having emigration on the Exclusive Legislative List than having it on the Concurrent Legislative List. In not one instance of the Federations I have quoted, does the Federal Government have its discretion fettered by the fact that emigration is on the Concurrent List, so much so that the State Governments have given up attempting to legislate on subjects such as emigration. In our Draft Constitution as it stands—the one which is published in the S.C.A.C. Report—it is specifically stated that these items which are on the Exclusive List are items in respect of which the Federal Government itself alone should have power to legislate and those items which are on the Concurrent List—and there are quite a number of them—are items in respect of which the Federal Government and the Unit Government should alone have power to legislate. If Trinidad pass emigration laws, the Federal Government can pass emigration laws as well. There is a recent Constitution which provides that where there is any conflict with local and Federal law, the Federal law shall prevail. I submit that the Federal Government will have unrestricted authority to legislate for emigration; I should say that Mr. Hannays was the best Statesman in that respect at that Conference; the danger would have been if emigration had not been mentioned in the List at all.

Those matters which are not matters on the List are left for the Unit Governments and the Federal Government would not have any authority to legislate on matters of emigration if it had not been mentioned at all. The fact that emigration is mentioned in the List is a triumph for West Indian unity; we should not be beating the air and contending about matters of emigration. My opinion is borne out by the four greatest countries in the world; Switzerland has brought together people who are specially diversified in their outlook; they have managed to co-exist in an atmosphere of friendship where wars have continually raged over and around them. The Swiss have something which West Indians would consider an unworkable idea; if you pass a law, every citizen has to legislate and his vote has to be called for; that is the power of referendum vested in the Swiss Constitution. My opinion has been substantiated by the Federal history of those four great countries. Do not let us look for shibboleths whether consciously or unconsciously; we should not be discussing emigration. We have passed the worst law in respect of emigration; we are discussing Federation and the first people we kept out were Dominicans, and I understand that we were trying to send out coopers to Dominica. The first persons against whom this law was inflicted were some traders from a neighbouring Island; I would call that effrontery. Are we serious about this matter?

We have the same power to make Regulations as Trinidad has, and where Trinidad has diverted our attention from the real issue is that they have made Regulations which I consider to be inimical to the interest of West Indian solidarity, for political reasons and personal reasons which are the worst possible reasons that any Legislature will have. I want to say that if Mr. Hannays agrees that emigration should remain on the Concurrent List, if by not discussing it at all we hasten the day when we will have our Federal set-up, why don't we tell them now that we have re-examined the Constitution and have examined the working of Constitutions in other

countries? We have absolutely nothing to lose by the item emigration being put on the Concurrent List at all. By insisting on putting it on the Exclusive List we may appear to be championing the cause of the small islands and the islands which are not industrially advanced. We have nothing else to offer but to appear to be their champions. In Trinidad, Mr. Gomes probably has something to offer in the way of jobs; Mr. Bustamante can use his blandishments and we have nothing to offer but championing the cause of the small islands. We have already started lobbying and filibustering before the Constitution gets under way, or before the 'Ship of State' weighs anchor. In the history of the West Indies this will be the only opportunity for us to talk of this problem and this problem should be put in its proper perspective even if it is not the view of members of this Chamber or members outside of Barbados. I do feel that the matter should be put in its proper perspective before we begin to divert public attention from the true issue which concerns us.

I am now speaking about the real aspect of emigration. Before 1923—my dates may not be entirely accurate—there was freedom of movement among all countries of the world. Passports were unknown and Barbadians could go to the United States of America at will. It was only in 1923 when the Americans had more or less reached the last frontier—when the American economy was on the verge of ceasing to expand at a rapid rate—that they began to pass restrictive laws. Before 1914, in Europe there was complete mobility except in time of war, and in the West Indies the same advantage prevailed. What is the meaning of restriction, and of insisting that we should have freedom of movement? The world population had a habit of spreading itself out to those countries such as the United States of America, which afforded them economic liberty and the essential liberty without which no right-thinking human being can exist. Despite all the social embarrassment to which the West Indians were exposing themselves by going to the United States of America, they went there because there were jobs available; and in the same area, Mr. Speaker, nobody in his right senses would leave Trinidad or Jamaica and come to Barbados because there was no economic liberty here. That is something which would exist when there is no restriction on freedom of movement; when you say you want freedom of movement, you do not mean that you want people to go and remain for a month in Trinidad because you always had that right; in fact, West Indian Governments are trying to get people to come in as tourists; we mean by freedom of movement that we want people to go and work. In England there is the problem of getting people to go to jobs, but you do not have that problem in the West Indies. America has got more restrictive laws on the influx of emigrants to that country especially where West Indians are concerned. What happens is that when you have more work than people to do it, you have to send for people so as to maintain your own economic wealth. If we run short of Labour in Barbados we would have to send to Trinidad or St. Lucia and ask people to come in and work. In America there are the worst emigration laws keeping out our people, but they still have to send for our workers because the fruit would rot on the trees. In England when the manpower is on the field of battle they have to send for factory workers and they discover that we have the technical skill which they do not want to ascribe to us in time of peace.

From 1929 to 1934, there were 25 million unemployed people in America; Barbadians were coming back from America themselves. It is all right for Mr. Gomes to talk about keeping out people, but the day when they have more jobs than workers in Trinidad they will have to send for Barbadians and *vice versa*. There is a natural tendency and propensity for the world's working class population to sort itself out; no country in its right senses when it is trying to build up its economy and when it is short of labour, will observe any restrictions to the letter. The question of freedom of movement is a question as to whether there are jobs available; when Trinidad wanted workers, Barbadians and Grenadians went down there in droves, but you cannot ask a country when it has unemployment at its doorstep to accept people; the people themselves would not want to go. The average Barbadian prefers to remain in Barbados where he can get a meal than to go to Trinidad to be unemployed amongst those people who are not overflowing with the milk of human kindness. We have to look after our own people in time of necessity; the day we create our economic resources in Barbados and we can provide continuous jobs for every Barbadian who wants a job and still have jobs left over we will get workers, immigration laws notwithstanding. The same thing applies to other colonies; the question of the flow and ebb of labour and working people is simply an economic question and a question which is closely bound up with the psychological inhibition which a man has against leaving his home. You can pass all the laws in the world to keep out people and then you will find that you cannot get a ship to land goods and you will have to relax your laws; but people are not coming in in any numbers which would substantially affect the livelihood of Barbados if Barbados cannot provide jobs for them. There is no point in passing a law to the effect that Barbadians should be employed first because that is a matter of course, except in the Government Service; you prefer to employ a man whom you can understand than one whom you cannot understand. As far as trade is concerned, the day we pass laws restricting people who can maintain themselves, the cost of living in Barbados will skyrocket no matter what the Chamber of Commerce says. A trader is one individual who should be allowed to come in and go out as he likes; foreign competition is a healthy factor in the economic life of any community. Let us look at this whole problem from a rational point of view; we should be above looking for votes in the small islands. The rate of progress up to the beginning of the first World War was symptomatic of a state of political stagnation rather than one of people who were politically aware. Even now, our Executive Committee Act of 1891 is still dictating to a large degree the political activities of this colony.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this question of amendment and the question of emigration to be the two most important elements in this Report of the Committee which deliberated in the United Kingdom in 1953. I only hope that everything I have said is rightly understood in a constructive manner and not necessarily critical of any one's point of view. My attempt is to try and put the whole problem of Federation in its proper perspective.

There are three other things which I would like to mention. In the first place, there is the omission of British Guiana and British Honduras from the Federal set-up. It now appears to me that if the interval of time which lapsed between the Conference last year and the Montego Bay Conference

has not been utilized by the progressive people in the Caribbean to foster and bring about Federation it has been employed by the antagonists of Federation to wreck the economic future of the West Indies. It is significant that in that same period of time between the Montego Bay meeting at which we had the enthusiasm of all the delegates including the Guianese and people from British Honduras and the full support of those countries and the London Conference certain happenings took place and I wonder how many people have sat down seriously to consider the trend of events which have developed in those two territories! In the one case, there is the action of people whom we would least expect to be seceding from the idea of participation in any Federation of the British Caribbean Colonies, and in the other, there is a violent wrenching away from the idea of participation in Federation even by the people who call themselves progressive in that colony. Let me quote, for instance, the People's Progressive Party. I would have thought that on their coming into power on the eve of this Conference which was held in London last year, in order to gain goodwill and show that their outlook was essentially West Indian, they would have come out unequivocally in favour of the Federal idea and would have appointed delegates forthwith to attend that Conference which took place at least on the dawn of the election of that Government into power; but they have wasted time in expounding views which they do not understand or appreciate. I certainly feel that if the Government elected in British Guiana, which calls itself the people's Government, really wanted the support of the West Indian people — I really feel that if they were one with us and did not have motives ulterior to our own, they would have come out strongly in favour of Federation, and not one British battleship would have dared to pass fifty miles off Barbados. The very leaders in the West Indies who attacked the antics of the People's Progressive Party in British Guiana—those very leaders would have drawn it to the attention of Her Majesty's Government that on the eve of Federation the taking away of the Constitution of one of the proposed Federal Units would be inimical not only to the interest of the West Indian people, but to their expressed desires.

That is my analysis of the whole situation; whatever be the demerits of the particular situation the one cardinal sin was the very failure of these territories to support the West Indian peoples and throw their gates open to an island of economic development. Some of them talk about continental destiny; but where are they now?—Behind Pelican Island constitutionally when they had the greatest Constitution in the world; their outlook should have been West Indian and not otherwise. The antagonists of Federation must have sat back and smiled. Unconsciously these territories have made themselves the tools of the Imperialists in the widest sense; from the moral and industrial angle as well, they have made themselves the tools of Imperialists policy by failing to open their gates and declaring their desire to support their brothers in other places in the Caribbean. If you look at the picture on the other side of the Caribbean, we see a Party which calls itself the People's Progressive Party, being seduced by a neighbouring Republic which has not succeeded in making its mark in world affairs on the one side and on industrial interests on the other side. They are now arrogating to themselves a continental destiny which is another political shibboleth; and the coincidence is so remarkable that I have been forced to concede that the enemies of Federation were

active while we, as its protagonists were asleep, and it is time that we awake from our slumbers.

The history of the past 25 years in the Caribbean will one day have to be re-written in its true perspective when most of us would have been called to our account and I hope that our accounts will be in order. There is also the problem of the Federal Capital and in this problem I am prepared to stand as *Athanasius contra mundum*, well aware that I am speaking contrary to sentiment of most of the members of this House, and contrary to the emotional thought of most Barbadians. As I have said before, and I say again, Barbados is the last place in the world we should put the Federal Capital of the West Indies and I underline the word "last." If we were looking for an administrative headquarters of a broad colonial setup, I would say put it in Barbados, we have here all the conditions precedent to the successful working of such a scheme—our history and everything else—but if we want to develop a sense of nationhood and to stand up to the other man and to say "I am a West Indian" and if the very fountain from which all those ideas or *weltanschauung* must emanate is from the Federal Capital to infuse neighbouring colonies with that sense of nationhood, Barbados with all its social inhibitions and parochial outlook and economic stagnation is the last place in the world from which those ideas would spring. Truly, looking at the matter as a West Indian, Barbados would be the last place I would like to see the federal capital permanently located, but for a temporary headquarters, I would agree with its being put in Barbados.

We must bear in mind that we are not setting out something on paper. We are creating a unified West Indian people; we are creating a people to have an independent outlook, a people with some good mixture of African culture and not a people where their culture and history have been suppressed. We are creating a people who still have a sense of independence and who have not been completely detribalised as can be said of the Barbadian. It is true to say that the Barbadian is a very good and hard-working man and with slightly more honesty than other people with whom I have come into contact but we in Barbados must question ourselves as to where is our wealth of culture, where is our sense of nationhood, where is our sense of pride in our ancestry, which are essential elements for people to possess who wish to stand on their own feet and desire to have an independent *weltanschauung*. I say that it is only a sense of inexorable conceit and arrogance which can lead members of this Chamber to think that our claims for a federal capital are superior to those of Antigua, Grenada, Trinidad or Jamaica, because, geographically, we are not in such a position that we can feel ourselves to be part and parcel of a West Indian Archipelago; and culturally, we are completely different from the other West Indian. Of course, you will understand that I say so subject to the important premise that you want in your federal capital those cultural, economic and psychological attributes. If those attributes are not to be important, I would say Barbados is eminently suitable for the headquarters. I do not feel that the foundation on which a federation should be erected could be obtained if Barbados is made the federal capital. As I see it, Barbados has nothing to contribute to the federal capital except its sunshine and good sea-bathing, and even these we retain through no fault of our own.

However, Sir, the federal capital in Barbados can do a lot for Barbados and that is why I would

not go on any tour in support of any other place. I feel that a federal capital here will do a lot to break down much of the stupidity which exists here.

Mr. Speaker, I pass on to the last aspect of this report to which I wish to draw your attention. We seem to have accepted too readily the idea that the seduction of British Honduras and the rape of British Guiana are a *fait accompli*. I would like to say that I do not consider that position to be irretrievable. We should not relinquish the idea that one day the colonies of British Guiana and British Honduras may become members of the federal set up and join hands with the others to go forward to greater and better prosperity. We must never give up the idea. In the context of the state of development of the world, there are few areas which are left unexplored and unexploited and in the light of the economic stage of development of these two countries and with the bonds which exist between us which are the inestimable bonds of consanguinity, which are more than the bonds of mere geographical contiguity, that natural sympathy must flow between our peoples. I say that because of our imperialist history, we belong to the confraternity of bondage and suffering. No provision having been made under the federal constitution for its expansion, so far as we are concerned, we must leave the door open so that we can admit the possibility of expansion. Our policy must be the policy of the open door in this respect.

I may say that at one time the honourable Premier of this House did see the danger of these two colonies not joining in the federation and did plan to make a goodwill tour to those colonies but, unfortunately, the decision to do so was postponed. It is a great pity that some of the leaders of the West Indies, like Mr. Marryshow and Mr. Manley and the honourable Premier and others who profess to have the interest of the West Indian people at heart and who by their history have to some extent shown such interest, did not go to those neighbouring colonies and warn them of the danger of isolation into which they were drifting.

Mr. Speaker, let me give one word of warning. We do not want any more conferences on West Indian Federation. We have had too many already. At this rate of progress it would take us another fifty years before federation becomes a reality. I consider this debate should be the final discussion on the subject. I am convinced from the speeches which were made in this Chamber that every honourable member feels himself in favour of federation. Let me repeat that we do not consider it necessary to have any more conferences on federation except the inaugural conference of the Federal Government. Any tidying up or anything of that sort can be done on a different level; certainly, not at the level of a West Indian Conference. I think nearly everyone who was in authority has got a trip on account of all these conferences. We must say now: "All trips have come to an end; let us get down to business." In the meantime, let us not try to becloud the issue if there are any obstacles let us face them and let us get over them. Let us not use every bagatelle that confronts us as an excuse for further delay. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that members of this Chamber will not be burdened with any more lectures on the subject of federation. I do hope that the next time this Chamber will be called to speak on this subject of federation, it will be an accomplished fact.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, this question of federation has unfortunately become a subject for debate, and I am afraid nothing more than debate, over the past few years somewhere or other in the Parliaments of the Caribbean and even in

London in matters pertaining to it, it is merely a subject of discussion. So far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to go into any details in connection with the Report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation which was held in London in April 1953, simply because I do not think much good can be achieved in any Legislative Chamber emphasising this detail as against that. As regards our preference for the Federal Capital in Barbados as distinct from that for Antigua or anywhere else, I am prepared to say that we should leave it to those persons to whom will be allotted that task, and our general interests otherwise to work out the details which even if I am not completely satisfied with, suffice it that the goal of federation is achieved, and that the majority of the British West Indies will at last become a British Caribbean Federation, I would be happy.

It will readily be recalled, Sir, that this matter was discussed in this Chamber so long ago as October, 1937, at the instance of the late lamented, Mr. Christopher Brathwaite, who was at that time a member for the metropolitan constituency. You will recall that he raised the question as to whether the Government of that day was prepared to forward to the Secretary of State for the Colonies any representations on the subject of a Federated British West Indies, and the reply to the question was tersely worded that "the Government was prepared to forward to the Secretary of State for the Colonies any representations on the subject which the House of Assembly desired to make." Since that date in 1937, there are only three or four members in this Chamber today who were here on that occasion and I believe those who were members on that occasion who are here now actually participated in the debate. I just said that to show that we want federation in this country; we feel the time has come when there should be a sort of time limit for conferences, or that there should be some dead line, some date by which something could be achieved. I remember in the negotiations in connection with the independence of India a time limit was placed within which British rule should terminate and the Republic of India be instituted. Lest I be misunderstood, I am not suggesting anything other than a British Caribbean Federation for our peoples in these parts, eventually to become a self-governing unit of the British Commonwealth of Nations. I only mention the case of India as regards the time limit.

As I recall in regards to our case, the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, Col. Oliver Stanley, a Conservative, was responsible on the 14th March, 1945 for raising the question of a Federated West Indies and that was eight years after we discussed the matter in this Chamber. On that date, Col. Oliver Stanley was responsible for a despatch in which he remarked among other things that "the question of a West Indian Federation is a long history", which it is unnecessary for me to recapitulate here and he then went on to say that "the ultimate aim of any federation which might be established would be full internal self-government within the British Commonwealth." He expressed this opinion in the despatch:—

"I regard it as desirable that a lead should be given by His Majesty's Government in favour of the aim of federation and that British policy should aim at the fostering of a sense of West Indian unity and of the removal of the present obstacles in the way of federation. In particular, the fullest possible use should be made of every unifying influence, as circumstances permit, by the development of joint West Indian services,

"joint services, and through the organisation established under the Comptroller for Development and Welfare. It will be recognised that in recent years, and particularly during the war, there has been an increase in the matters which have been dealt with on a West Indian as opposed to a purely Colony basis, and that a yet wider field where such unified action could advantageously be taken is now open, e.g., in such matters as the establishment of a West Indian meteorological service, the adoption of the same quarantine code, the development of broadcasting and so forth."

Well then, Sir, that despatch of the Tory Secretary of State for the Colonies was referred to with obvious approval on the 14th February, 1947, by the despatch of that date from the then Secretary of State for the Colonies who was Mr. Creech Jones, a Socialist member of the British Labour Party. He said that in Col. Oliver Stanley's despatch of the 14th March, 1945, on the subject of a Closer Association of the British West Indies, "it was suggested that the issue of political federation should be debated in the Legislatures of the Colonies concerned and that if all the Legislatures were to declare themselves in favour of the aim of federation, a conference of West Indian delegates might be convened in order to consider the formulation of concrete proposals for Closer Association." I refer, Mr. Speaker to these passages in these despatches not because I, for one moment do not believe that honourable members have not known these despatches absolutely by heart to quote them without reference, but because I think it is necessary to emphasise that, for too long a period of time, we have been only discussing this most important and highly fascinating subject but have not got anywhere as near to the actual federation of the West Indies, as we certainly hoped when we first discussed the matter as long ago as in 1937 in this Chamber. I certainly felt that we would have got through this matter which is the subject of two despatches by successive Conservative and Labour Secretaries of State for the Colonies.

It will be recalled that Mr. Creech Jones reminded us of the despatch by the Conservative Secretary of State which pointed to need for closer association of the individual colonies and for the development of some central organisation of government, and he made it clear that if any advance in the political, economic and social fields were to be achieved, it would seem essential that separate units, especially the small ones, should take a wider view of the problems confronting them. The memorandum further stated that wherever possible, British West Indians with the highest professional and technical qualifications should be available to administer the various Government services, but in most cases it was not economic that the activities of persons so qualified should be restricted to comparatively small units of administration. He then went on to suggest that the Colonies would benefit from the establishment of a full customs union, and to control the administration of joint services, for example, the Administrative, Medical, Legal and Police Services, these should be centralised.

In his eleventh paragraph he states:—

"Possibly the most important reason of all for the view that closer association is necessary lies in the fact that it is clearly impossible in the modern world for the present communities, small and isolated as most of them are, to achieve and maintain full self-government on their own. It is not, for example, practical politics to suppose that communities of two hundred souls, or in some cases even

"less, should play an independent part in international discussions. On the other hand, a community of well over two million people in the Caribbean area, with much that is homogeneous in their culture, could reasonably hope to achieve real self-government, and to be strong enough to stand against economic and cultural pressure and to formulate and carry through a policy and way of life of its own."

Sir, by means of that quotation which is better expressed than perhaps I might be able to express it, I want to emphasise that there is too much of a time lag between the early and the immediate discussion on federation and the actual bringing about of federation. I personally would hesitate even now to prophesy a date when federation will actually come to pass within this Caribbean area, but I am disposed in order that this Chamber should not be the cause of further delay to leave the matter entirely free to those persons sitting around the table to represent this island, Jamaica, Trinidad and all the other islands, to come to some conclusion even although it may not represent the ideal state. It may not be Utopian, but so long as they evolve something which is 90 per cent satisfactory, I think that is more essential than continuing as we are now on this matter, that is, merely having regular debates on the subject and yet being unable to see federation as a matter of practical politics, or to view it as a practical thing for the West Indies in the foreseeable future.

I do not believe that it is proper that we should tie down the representative of this Chamber when he leaves here on any future conference to any details which may be dear to the hearts of the majority of the members of this Chamber. As soon as you do that, and the others around the Conference table, do not agree with him, he would have to come back here for a further mandate and that will cause a further time lag, and still there will be no federation. That is my attitude to the matter. It is time that those representatives who will be reporting for the various units of the Caribbean get around the Conference table again and actually hammer out something which would contain such broad outlines as are reasonable and workable as one would like for a federation and then report to their respective Chambers of Government to have the proposals ratified. The representatives of this Chamber who attend such a Conference should realise beforehand that any part which they may take in moulding something reasonable and worthwhile to initiate a British Caribbean Federation would receive the gratitude and approval of the Legislature and there would be no quibbling by us about details.

With regard to the proposed site for the Federal Capital, we would like it to be Bridgetown but if Barbados is not approved of by the majority for the site, we would make a concession to Antigua or Grenada, if any of such places is approved by the majority. Do not put our delegates in the position where they will have to say that they will have to return to this Chamber and ask that we agree to whatever detailed proposal was made in that respect.

There is one other note which I would like to strike, Sir. On the previous occasion when this matter was discussed, the honourable senior member for St. John, sounded what I thought to be a most unusual note. Accustomed as I am of hearing him often, and even agreeing with him frequently, I was surprised—almost horrified—to note the line he took. The line which he took sounded like a voice of 25 years ago and that of one of the plantocracy or the mer-

chant class in this community. If I did not realise how allergic the honourable member is to those classes and the inveterate opponent he is of them, I would not have been amazed to hear him use such a phrase as "federation is no longer a subject for enthusiasm." Sir, if that is so, it is only because we are tired debating it, and of not yet seeing anything achieved. The honourable member later said that it was a matter which called for caution. There again, can there be greater caution than we are exercising? We can hardly approach this matter more carefully than we are doing; we are approaching it with the greatest caution; I may say too much caution. We are not making a step without pausing for more than a year. What greater caution could we exercise, I do not know, I cannot contemplate.

Sir, it has been said that we are parochially minded. I would say that that might be true of a quarter century ago, but it is not so to-day. For proof of that, when the West Indies are represented as a cricket team in England, Australia, or anywhere else, the common people, in this island as the majority of us are called, do not fail to give praise to Ramadhin and Valentine. They do not care whether these players hail from Trinidad or Jamaica, so long as they are deserving of praise, our people give to them as much credit as they would give to the three W's who belong to this colony. As I have said, there is no question of parochial mindedness. I may also mention that in September, last year, we had an eminently successful conference of barristers-at-law from all over the British Caribbean. The honourable senior member for St. John was not present, but he may well have heard that everybody who was present at that conference regarded himself just as a barrister of the British Caribbean irrespective of the particular island or colony from whence he came. While speaking on this matter, I am reminded of a phrase which was used by an honourable member while speaking on this matter on the last occasion. The honourable member made mention of "a second rate place like Grenada." I regard that as a most unfortunate remark. There is no more beautiful island in the entire British Caribbean than Grenada and I think Your Honour will probably agree with me on that statement. Its harbour is overwhelmingly superior to our present harbour which I hope would soon cease to exist.

Sir, as I have said, the note which I am endeavouring to strike, is that although it is very entertaining and interesting to be discussing this subject every now and again which serves to bring it afresh to our minds, I feel we have arrived at the stage where we have expressed frequently and fully our points of view, therefore, we should leave the matter to the representatives of the various colonies at Conference table to mould a scheme which they feel would be reasonable and workable for all, and even although every detail of that scheme would not find approval with every representative. Sir, we want our representatives to come back on the next occasion when we discuss this subject with a drafted plan of something, something for execution, something to be regarded as necessary to be placed forthwith on the Statute Book of the Imperial Parliament. Sir, I hope that my point has been sufficiently stressed and that it will bear fruit.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I feel that on a subject like this, I should not sit silently. Perhaps what I may say may not be of much use, but still, I have a few small ideas to add to the debate. The honourable Premier in introducing the consideration of this report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation in his usual lucid style told us certain things, but he did not, to my mind, touch on

the various points which we would have liked to hear emphasized. For instance, he did not touch for very long on the question of freedom of movement. As we all know, the honourable Premier would probably be one of the delegates who would be making the final arrangements for the Federal Constitution, therefore, I think it is essential that all of us should give our views and our ideas.

I have listened attentively to the views expressed by the honourable junior member for St. James and the honourable senior member for St. George and although they made very excellent speeches, I do not agree in many respects with all that they said, especially those views expressed by the honourable junior member for St. James. I think this honourable member has entirely agreed on the matter of freedom of movement as it appears in this report. Now, Sir, my idea of arriving at a bargain is first of all reaching an agreement on the matter. If you do not come to an agreement, you will never close the bargain. To my mind, unless this very important matter of freedom of movement amongst the Caribbean Federation is crystallised and put into the Constitution before we start, it will be very difficult to get so important a matter as that amended afterwards. I consider it as one of our most important points, because, after all, what are we doing if we put up barriers to our people moving amongst each other in the various units? I have never heard of any person living in a particular State in the United States of America being refused admission to the State of Texas or any other State. If we cannot have freedom of movement amongst the units, to my mind, we would be simply getting off at the place where we were before. I counsel our representatives not to wait until afterwards to have this most important matter written in the constitution; that should be crystallised before; do not wait for amendments; you may have to wait for fifty years.

As regards to the other point raised by the hon. junior member for St. James with regard to financing the federation, I know he has a good reputation in dealing with figures. He quoted a minimum and a maximum, the minimum being \$141,000 and the maximum \$700,000. I happen to know the cost of these things in a small way from my experience of the workings of the West Indian Sugar Producers Association which is a sort of federation of sugar producers in the West Indies and I can assure him, judging by the figures set down year by year by that Association, it is better to look at the cost of financing a West Indian Federation at the maximum of \$700,000 than at the minimum of \$141,000. That is my view.

I feel as a Barbadian that we have a lot of work to do before we spread out our wings to federation. I certainly think, before we embark on this expensive scheme of West Indian Federation that we should get all our needs—at least all the necessities. We should have the basic needs of our development accomplished before we go into it.

The next thing is with regard to our position as a part of the federal structure. I believe every West Indian, whether he comes from Jamaica or any other colony, realises that we are the strongest and the most powerful brother of them all. It is a fact that the others are poorer and in family life, the stronger brother must take care and generally rules the others. If we do not definitely try to hold all that we should get in the original stage of our entering the federation, we would be placed in a weak position. After all, we have all to lose, and the others have all to gain in federation. That is no secret; I imagine a blind man will see that. If we do not take advantage of all that we should get before we start the ball rolling,

we are going to find that what little we have will go and we will be in a worse position than when we entered the federation.

As regards the various remarks I have heard about sugar barons being against federation, I would just like to quote a little bit of history to show that statement is not correct. Years ago, as far back as 1876, when the idea of a West Indian federation was first mooted, we had real sugar barons in those days and there was one who not only owned many sugar estates in this island but he also owned a lot of land in the island of Nevis. He was an ardent federationist. Why sugar barons should be accused of being opposed to federation, I cannot understand. The fellow whom I mentioned made a big fight for a federated West Indies, but, poor fellow, in his fight for it, he died a pauper. He even went so far as to move fishermen from here to establish a fishing industry in the Island of Nevis. All his efforts were of no avail. Sir, I only mentioned that to show that the so-called sugar barons are not, as has been said, all against federation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not have much to contribute to this debate, but lest my silence be taken as I am one who is not in favour of federation, I propose to add my quota. However, it does appear to me at this stage that honourable members would prefer a short adjournment for dinner than listen to me, therefore, I am moving the adjournment of this House for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. R. G. MAPP seconded the motion.

The question that the House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

ON RESUMPTION

On re-assembling,

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the Government proposes to adjourn the federation debate in order that honourable members can proceed with Private Members' Business.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that further debate on this motion be postponed.

Mr. SMITH seconded the motion which was agreed to.

ADDRESS RE ACQUISITION BY GOVERNMENT OF JOES RIVER FACTORY

His Hon. The SPEAKER: The first item of Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph: To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to acquisition by Government of Joes River Factory.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the passing of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

Whereas the Peasant Proprietors of St. Joseph are gravely handicapped on account of the difficulty of selling their sugar canes to a Factory in their District; And whereas the Peasant Proprietors of St. Joseph are extremely worried over the prospect of Sugar Factories outside the area refusing to accept the canes which may be sent from the St. Joseph area, where heavy rainfall can be responsible for a low standard of cane juice; and whereas they have been put to very heavy expense in transporting their canes long distances to Factories outside the area, and whereas many Factory workers have been

unemployed as a result of the closing down of Joes River Factory in that Parish during 1953 and 1954 reaping season; and that said Factory is being maintained, with its modern equipment, in first class working order; and whereas Peasants throughout the Island, through their Representatives in this Chamber, have time and again expressed the hope that Government would become the owner of an up-to-date Sugar Factory, or Factories. Be it resolved that the Ministry of Agriculture, on behalf of Government and Cane growers of this Island, without any undue delay, explore the possibility of the acquisition for the freeholders of the Island as a whole, of the Sugar Factory known as Joes River in that Parish, before any attempt is made to dismantle, or otherwise dispose of same; thereby avoiding further reduction in number of Sugar Factories in this Island which is already below the minimum necessary for the grinding of the Island's Crop.

Sir, this is a very important matter. As you may have heard, Joes River Factory was closed down suddenly last year and since then the people of St. Joseph — peasants and workers in the sugar industry — have been coming to me day after day very much perturbed. These people have brought to my notice that at any time we have heavy rainfall in that area there is the possibility of the sugar cane juice not being up to the standard which sugar factories require and because of that factory owners are not too keen in buying those canes and if they do buy them, they do not want to give the same price for those under the hill as the ones on the top. Before I go further, I would say that last year after this factory was closed and after having many interviews with the people of that area, I did intend bringing down an address to this honourable Chamber to beg the Government to do something about it but I was told not to do anything at that time because the owners of the factory were not altogether sure whether they would have closed the factory or not. It is a fact that this factory has been closed, and in my opinion, it does not seem as if it will be opened again by those owners.

Now, Sir, it has been said by some people that my colleague and myself have shares in this factory and because of that would not care to ask Government to take it over. I cannot speak for my colleague, but personally I do not have one black cent in it. First of all, I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not want the Government to buy the Joes River Factory and keep it as a running concern of the Government. I would never ask the Government to buy a Sugar Factory and run it. I want the Government to buy this factory and give it out to be run as a co-operative. I want Government to give peasants and sugar workers the opportunity of obtaining shares in this factory. In fact, I want to see in the course of time, peasants owning and running this factory. It has also been said that the owners of the Joes River Factory failed in running it and now want to dump it on the taxpayers. Let me say, Sir, that the particular owners of this factory never had a chance of running it. Nobody can say that they had a chance of running it because they only worked it for one year. I remember seeing a few years ago, a report which showed that that factory had made a good profit that year. The report was signed by a qualified auditor, so I cannot see how anyone can say that the particular owners of that factory failed in running it. I am sure that the previous owner of this factory ran it at a profit. I am sure he made money out of it all his life time. We all have heard in this Chamber how much money the previous owner, Mr. H. A. Williams made

through the careful running of that factory. He did everything to make it a profitable concern. He attracted more peasants to send canes to that factory by getting motor lorries to take their canes to it. As a matter of fact he was solely responsible for the presence of my colleague in that parish because after he staged so much competition and bought peasant canes at such competitive prices beside sending motor lorries all over the country for their canes, those things offended the "king pin" of that parish, the late Mr. E. T. Cox, who got mad with Mr. Williams and the only thing that Mr. Williams could do was to send and call my colleague to put Mr. Cox out of his seat in this Chamber. (Laughter). Without any flattery, I can say that the Joes River Factory is responsible for the progress of this country today; the people of St. Joseph are responsible for the progress made in this country today. I was born and bred in St. Joseph, my honourable colleague was not. He did not know what was happening at that time; he could not tell why he got such a hearty welcome in St. Joseph by that old gentleman, but it was due to the competition which was created by him and which had caused offence to the late Mr. E. T. Cox. Let me say again that after Mr. Williams had modernised the Joes River Factory he found himself in a position that the canes from that area could not pay him to run that factory so what he did was to get a fleet of lorries so that he could attract more cane growers to send their canes to his factory and he succeeded in doing so.

Sir, the argument may be used that this factory at present will not be able to get as much canes as to pay it to work but I am saying that if the peasants of this country are given the opportunity of sharing in the profits of this factory by taking shares in it you will see that the peasants of St. James and even as far as Christ Church would take an active part in this factory. I am sure peasants will prefer to send their canes to their own factories than to a private factory. Let me ask the question: what is responsible for Government appointing itinerant cane weighers? The answer is that the peasants became doubtful of the present cane weighers and were not satisfied with the weight of their canes so they asked Government for help and Government appointed itinerant cane weighers. Government came to the conclusion that that was the only thing to do in order that peasants should get a fair and square deal. I think it was the the honourable senior member for St. Lucy who in order to assist peasants introduced a Bill which had as its object the giving of a minimum price for canes. If I am not mistaken I think the Governor of that day tried to get the necessary figures from factory owners so that he could arrive at a minimum price according to that bill, but the figures which he received he had to drop like a red hot brick because if he had worked on the figures given to him the peasants would have got less for their canes. Sir, the only way that we can do our best for the peasants of this country is to buy a sugar factory for them and give them a chance to run it. The Government will then be in a position to tell private factory owners: "our factory did so and so; we paid so and so and made a good profit so you will have to pay the same price." Until Government owns a sugar factory, how on earth would it be able to go to factory owners to dictate to them what they should pay for their canes? It is different with goods that come from overseas. One can see the invoices of those goods and by that can go into the cost price and the merit of those goods, and as a

matter of fact Government has a control office set up for that purpose. In the case of a minimum price for peasants canes, we have to take the time from the same factory owners. Sir, I am sure if Government acquire its own sugar factory it will be in a position to see the working of it for itself and in that manner would be able to tell factory owners how much they should pay for peasants canes.

When it comes to the closing down of sugar factories, I know that years ago you used to get sugar factories competing against each other and sending all over the country to buy peasants canes. As a matter of fact, the owners of Lower Estate factory used to send as far as St. Andrew and St. Lucy lorries and cane cutters to reap peasant canes and paid a better price than anywhere else. Since the working class people have managed to get people to represent them so that they now obtain a better price for their work—that is due to the Barbados Workers Union and the people of St. Joseph for electing such an amiable person as our Premier to come forward and represent them and the Island as a whole—that has not been the case. In passing I would say that the present Government would never be able to repay the electors of St. Joseph; Government would have to buy about a dozen Joes River Factories and put them at the disposal of the electors of St. Joseph so as to repay them. It is the electors of St. Joseph who have caused such a rapid change in this country; it is the people of St. Joseph who have obliterated starvation and nakedness from this country. It is a fact that prior to this Government coming into power, children could not go to school through the want of help; the workers of this country could not take a chance of going to bed. I would not go any further than drawing those two instances. Sir, you can go all over the island now and see new houses as well as houses which have been renovated. Can you say who is responsible for that? I can tell you that the people for whom I am asking help are the persons who are responsible for that. I will go back to the point which I was making with respect to owners of sugar factories at one time competing with one another to get canes for their factory. Sir, owing to the labour question, you are now getting the abandonment of factories, one after the other. Nowadays, three or four factories are going out of operation at a time and the canes which used to be ground by those factories are being sent to other factories, therefore, you are not getting any more competition in the buying of canes. The owners of the factories that are operating nowadays can afford to sit back; they do not have to depend on your sending canes to them to be ground; they have adopted the policy: that if you send your canes to them, you send them; if you don't, you don't. Sir, what must this Government do in this respect? Must it sit back and allow peasants to be at the mercies of these already filled up factories? It will come to this; if you allow a factory like Joes River to be abandoned—a fully equipped factory, which as I understand is second to none,—and allow other factories to buy parts from it, the peasants who grow canes in the parish of St. Joseph will be at the mercies of the owners of the far away factories. Sir, there are other sugar factories which are going out of existence and every time a sugar factory goes out of existence, there is more unemployment. I can tell honourable members that one of the engineers who were formerly employed at Joes River has asked me for a job, and in his doing so, has intimated that he would do any kind of work because as his

position stands at present, he has a wife and child to support. That man is one of the many who have been thrown out of work by the closing down of this factory. Sir, every time you see a factory closed down, people are thrown out of work. If Government get peasants from all over the island sending their canes to that factory and I am sure they are bound to get more money for their canes. Government can set up a Board to run that factory.

Sir, you can imagine the success in a venture of that kind by Government when Government can get a person like the honourable junior member for St. George to advise it on the running of that factory. The honourable member has an ice factory in operation at Tudor Street and he is running it successfully. The honourable member would run more successfully the Joes River Factory with its first-class machinery. Sir, if we do not try to help the peasants of St. Joseph now, whom on earth do we expect to help them? If this Government do nothing to help them, whom would we expect to do something for them? If we sit back and allow an opportunity like this to pass by, can we any more preach democracy and socialism? Can we go back to the country and say that we are prepared to go through thick and thin with the masses and expect them to believe us? If we do not try and give the masses all we can now that we can, we can never tell what would happen in the future. I am sure if anything happens to the honourable Premier tomorrow, this Government will not work as well as it is; I am sure dissensions will come about if the honourable Premier pass away. I do not desire it, but it is a possibility. Sir, we have it in our hands now to help the peasants of this country to own a sugar factory. We have sufficient peasants in this country to supply Joes River Factory with more canes than it can grind to manufacture into sugar, so the idea of not getting sufficient canes to operate that factory is out of the question. Sir, I will say nothing more now; if needs be, I will reply to points raised by honourable members who I know are eager to support an Address of this sort. So long as this Government is doing something for the people, it is doing nothing wrong. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,— I take great pleasure in seconding the Address which is before this House. There is a lot of reasoning in favour of this Address and according to the honourable mover of the Address there is a lot that the Government should concern itself with. First of all, I would like to say that it is unfortunate that in recent years owing to the large crops and the few sugar factories in operation, the grinding of canes continues until the end of May and sometimes until early in June. This has a disastrous effect on ratoon canes since the period which these ratoons should be springing is delayed by about two months. I happen to be a member of the Sugar Industry Board where most of the business of the Joes River Factory has been discussed from time to time, and viewing its acquisition by Government from that position, I think it is an admirable investment and one which Government should not skip. Of course, I am not thinking of Government acquiring this factory to operate it, I think the Government should think in terms of operating it as a co-operative. There is no mistake in the argument introduced by the honourable mover of the Address when he said that the factory should be regarded as an efficient one. I will go as far as to say that in the area, there are four factories—Haggatts, Swans, Bruce Vale and Joes River—and the Joes River Factory is regarded as the most effi-

cient plant of them all. What I would say to justify the Government's consideration of the acquisition of that factory is that if the canes grown under the hill have to be hauled over the long high hills, particularly Horse Hill, to a factory, it is obvious that labour and transport must be borne by the product and the cost of transporting these canes over the hill would be high. The people under the hill must stand to benefit if you continue to operate the Joes River Factory. I think it would be lamentable and regrettable if the Joes River Factory goes out of existence. I do know that the canes of Foster Hall Plantation in that vicinity which used to be ground at Joes River Factory are now sent to Guinea Factory in St. John and I think that the shifting of those canes from Joes River Factory to Guinea did reduce the economic tonnage for grinding at Joes River to such proportions that it placed the owners of it in so much difficulties as to force them to curtail the operation of that factory.

There has been a tremendous amount of argument that plantations of 100 acres or more should not be broken up. There is also much argument in favour of plantations being broken up for small holdings of not below 4 or 5 acres as peasant holdings. I believe that this Address would provide the Government with an amendment to bring about a Land Settlement Scheme and there are several ways and means by which that would help the country generally. I feel reasonably sure that, with a careful examination, the Government may be converted to the idea that a co-operative of this type in the area would be a relief to the country.

Apart from that, a useful opportunity would be provided for land tenure; the peasants in the island can be regarded as being land hungry and this plantation would certainly answer a long-felt need. Some of the land in this country is being reduced to orchards because it is not considered as suitable land for Agriculture. Then there is the hilly side of the plantation; there is little to induce the average peasant to go to the mountains but if the land were made available to him he would bring the areas into cultivation.

Apart from the Land Settlement Scheme I have no doubt that people would be willing to send their canes to that factory and the profits would not be paid out to a certain group. Probably for the first year they would be free from income tax which is about 40%.

Another point is in respect of the Labour Welfare Scheme. We started with a ceiling of £300; that has been working well but it has reached a stage approaching saturation and the Government sooner or later will have to consider taking the ceiling from £300 to £500. It is a question of shifting a million dollars from the Labour Welfare Fund and bringing to bear the use of the Peasants' Loan Bank with the funds which have been released and creating some kind of settlement; I have no doubt that that would be a tremendous success.

Cane agriculture has been going up by leaps and bounds and if we have to continue to close factories in the area Haggatts and Swans would be out of business. Any factory which is taking ten or eleven tons of canes to manufacture a ton of sugar is hurting the sugar producers. If both of these small factories eventually go out of operation, what is to be done? The result is that the canes in the area would have to be brought up to another area and there would be meagre profit to the producers in the former area. I could say a lot more in connection with this matter but I do not think it would be the best thing to do at this stage; however, I implore the

Government to consider the possibility of people acquiring this property with the mere idea of purchasing a factory which is up to date and which is in operation in the area the inducement would be to bring the canes on top of the hill. I commend this Resolution to the Government with my belief and conviction that its implementation as a scheme would be successful and I hope that the Government will investigate the possibility of a Land Settlement Scheme and the operation of the factory as a co-operative. With those few remarks I pray that the hon. Leader of the House, who is aware of his responsibilities in matters of this kind, will have his attention aroused in this matter.

Mr. BRANCKER: From the time that I have been a member of this House I have found it incumbent upon me to sponsor the cause of the peasant proprietors of this country. I represent a parish which has been shabbily treated for the whole of its history by the factories in that district. In any part of the island in which the peasants are suffering it is my intention to give them my full support. We have had a petition from the peasants of St. Joseph to come to their rescue in urging the Government to purchase this sugar factory for them. I have always advocated that the Government should have its own sugar factory; by that means we would have an idea as to how to run our own sugar factories and we would get an idea of the profits made by the factory owners of this country. We are fortunate in that the matters relating to Agriculture are in the very safe and capable hands of the hon. senior member for Christ Church; we realize that a matter of this kind will receive the most careful and urgent consideration.

There are various reasons why this matter should commend itself to the unanimous support of the members of this Chamber. Firstly, the factory owners of this island do not want the Government to own a sugar factory; we can conceive of one of their stool pigeons or their ilk contributing a letter to the Press if this Resolution receives publicity. We have seen such letter and the reply to it. We are a Socialist Government; if we were to try to buy Bulkeley or Andrews Factory we realize the price which the owners of either of those factories would want for it. The report by one of the consulting engineers of this country is to the effect that Joes River Factory is in an absolutely first-class condition. This is one case in which there would be no question of the Government purchasing a "white elephant." I think that in the interest of the peasantry of this island and in particular those peasants who are represented by the two honourable members for St. Joseph, we should, by our vote, ensure that the Minister of Agriculture gives to this matter the serious consideration to which it is entitled, and that he recommends that this unit become the property of the inhabitants of this island for the benefit of the people of this island.

Mr. BRYAN: I should like to add my quota of support to the passing of this Resolution. As has been mentioned by previous speakers, representatives of the people in this Chamber have time and again brought to the attention of the Government the need for a Government-owned sugar factory. One must admit that with the recent trend of events such as the closing down of several factories, the need for such a factory has been increased. Now it is common knowledge that Joes River Factory, which experts claim to be one of the best equipped factories in the island, has been closed for the past two reaping seasons thereby adding to the already existing deficiency in our factory capacity. The closing down of this factory has also brought about several advantages mentioned in the Resolution. We find the

worry that the peasants in the area have experienced in placing their crops at other factories over the hills; we find that mention has been made of the added expense of the transport of crops to these factories; we find that mention has also been made of the unemployment which has been produced in the ranks of the factory owners. What I think is a very important point is that it seems to be the general practice of factories to pay less for canes from under the hills than for those on top of the hills. One can very well imagine the plight of the peasant proprietors down the hills in the wet season; they will be forced to sell their crops at low figures or to keep those crops until the end of the season, which would be a disaster. I understand that this factory was first fitted up as a syrup factory and today it can manufacture both syrup and sugar. That point is worth while considering because this is the age of bulk shipment and I understand that if this factory were used solely for the production of syrup it could well be made to pay its way. It is said that the juice in this area is best suited for the manufacture of syrup; I understand that this season Barbados could have sold a considerably greater amount of vacuum pan molasses if it had been available.

I feel that the request which is being made of the Government to come to the rescue of the peasant proprietors of St. Joseph is a reasonable one. As I have mentioned, it is an opportunity to alleviate some of the suffering caused by unemployment; it is an opportunity to assist these peasants by way of putting an end to the system of paying less money for canes which are from under the hills than for those on top of the hills. This is an opportunity to reduce the extra expense for transport which, in itself, lowers the profits which should be accruing to the peasant proprietors in the area. This is an opportunity of which the Government should avail itself to purchase this factory because I understand that there is a system of withholding from the peasants an appreciable amount of the price for their canes for a very long time. When one realizes that the peasant proprietor plants and reaps his crop in about 15 months and then he has to wait for another nine months to receive the amount of \$3.00 per ton which is withheld from him, you must come to the conclusion that that is without justification. I have been told that these factory owners receive practically the full amount for their sugar when it is delivered and a very small marginal difference—the difference between the price of sugar as sold in the open market and the price of sugar as sold in the free market—that is the marginal difference which is withheld from them.

I understand that the area of the estates surrounding Joes River Factory amounts to about one half of St. Joseph. Mention has been made of the opportunity to establish a Land Settlement Scheme and I feel that this area is well situated for such a Scheme. There is at Joes River a considerable amount of land lying idle, land which, to my way of thinking, could well be used for orchards and also for cocoanut cultivation which would assist in supplying the copra requirements of the island. If you can imagine a few hundred people settling on five-acre lots in this area you will agree with me that such a scheme would assist in raising the economic level of the people of this island and also in raising their living standards. This is a golden opportunity for the Government to explore the possibilities not merely of purchasing this factory as a protection for the peasant proprietors but also for creating more peasant proprietors in the island.

In our Five Year Plan we have set about to assist the peasant proprietors who already exist: we included in that Plan irrigation schemes and assist-

ance in cultivation by Government-owned tractors. I repeat that this is an opportunity for us to create more peasant proprietors and give them a chance to own a stake in their own country. The wealth of a country can be gauged by the prosperity of its peasant proprietors; this Government should grasp the opportunity of giving these people what has been denied them since Emancipation — a chance to own a stake in their own native land. I commend this Resolution to the Government with the hope that after exploring to the full the possibilities I have mentioned, they will accede to the request which is being made of them tonight and come to the aid of these peasant proprietors in the St. Joseph area.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, As is well known I have tried on two or three occasions to influence the Government through Addresses relative to the the purchase of sugar factories and I have backed up my Addresses by expert evidence from Government-appointed Committees which went into the question both of sugar factories and the question of seasonal unemployment. There is no more comprehensive support of this Resolution which has been introduced by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph than to quote the opinion of Professor Shephard, an expert in the sugar industry, who was invited here by the Government for the express purpose of giving a statement on the entire sugar industry and in calculating a method for the price of sugar cane. Professor Shephard, who was a world-acknowledged sugar economist has given his opinion where the sugar factories and productivity of the present crops of Barbados are concerned. There is no cause for rejection of this opinion when I make the two quotations from this Report and another Report, unless the Government want to repudiate their invitee and condemn his findings which they have no qualifications for so doing. Professor Shephard has said this:—

“There were over 500 sugar factories in Barbados at one time, and the number has now been reduced to 51. Cane growers have shared in the benefits gained from the erection of progressively more efficient factories, but there still remain too many obsolete factories. Several factories have been abandoned in recent years and others, now worked at a loss, will soon cease to operate. The disappearance of these inefficient factories would occasion no regret in normal times and should be welcomed as an indication of economic virility.

But in the present abnormal circumstances and as a temporary measure it is desirable to retain all the existing factories, for the island does not contain sufficient factory capacity to mill all the cane which can be produced in a favourable season. Two factors have tended to conceal this danger: the first is the appreciable area of cane land which has been compulsorily devoted to food crops since the outbreak of World War II; the second is that there has not been an exceptionally favourable cane growing season since 1938-9. The land recently diverted to food crops will soon return, presumably, to sugar cane, and add to the output of cane. The new variety of cane B.37161, which has only recently come into almost universal production, yields at a much higher rate than the standard varieties of 1939, and nobilised seedlings, now in their trial stage, promise to outyield B.37161. If then, a season as favourable as 1938/9 is experienced in the near future, the output of sugar would be not 156,000 tons, but in the region of 200,000 tons. The record crop of 1939 was taken off only by extending the end of the grinding season from May into July. An early start and late finish of the crop season en-

tails a loss of sugar, for the sucrose content of cane is normally lower in January and in June and July, than during the period January to May. But the factory capacity of the island has diminished since 1939, and if still more factories are abandoned it is doubtful whether it will be possible to handle an exceptionally good crop even if the grinding season is unduly prolonged. In such a season many cane growers would find no market for a portion of their crop.

It needs, then, only a favourable season to produce a record crop, but if to this probability we add the possibility of utilising the enormous reserves of sheet water for irrigating cane then it becomes obvious that the factory capacity of the island is woefully inadequate to meet future requirements. The deficiency in factory capacity would soon be made good in normal times by the erection of new factories, but the total cost of a modern factory of say 30,000 tons capacity, would now be nearly £1,000,000, i.e., about £30 per ton of sugar capacity, compared with £12 pre-war. The Ministry of Food has undertaken to purchase all Colonial sugar up to and including the 1949 crop, but beyond that year the outlook is uncertain. It may be taken for granted that investors would not venture on the erection of a modern factory at present abnormally high prices and in the absence of a guaranteed market for sugar, but even if investors were willing to subscribe the necessary capital it would not be possible to obtain and erect machinery in a period of less than three years.

It therefore appears necessary, as a temporary measure, to retain all the existing factories, despite the fact that some of them are known to be inefficient. Indeed, it is advisable to expand the capacity of the present factories wherever economically possible.”

The most important part of Professor Shephard's statement is this:—

“It therefore appears necessary, as a temporary measure, to retain all the existing factories, despite the fact some of them are known to be inefficient.”

That quotation is from the Report of Professor Shephard. Now I come to the Blood Committee's Report on the question of seasonal unemployment; that Committee which included members of the Sugar Producers' Association the Labour Commissioner and the hon. Premier, was appointed on the 6th March, 1948, and reported on the 3rd September, 1948. At paragraph 13 of their Report the Committee state this:—

“As indicated previously, a number of the less efficient factories have closed down and it has been estimated that the present factory capacity is insufficient to reap a crop of more than 150,000 of sugar without loss of efficiency. Under present conditions, it is considered that, with good weather conditions, the island could produce a crop of some 180,000 tons of sugar. It is understood that this lack of factory capacity is receiving the attention of a Committee appointed by the Sugar Producers' Association but your Committee wishes to emphasise that a solution to this problem is urgent if the island is not to lose sugar in the event of a favourable year resulting in a large crop.”

Then in paragraph 14 they state this:—

“This deficiency in factory capacity can only be made good by the erection of new factories but, owing to the general shortage and present high cost of materials, it will be some years before any new factories can be erected. In the meantime, your Committee considers that all existing factories should be retained as operating units and the capacity of the

present factories should be expanded wherever this is economically possible."

Mr. Speaker, Joes River Factory did not work last year. The whole essence of this matter is this; unless the crop is reaped within a certain period of time from February to May, with our present capacity we are bound to suffer a great loss of sugar. I have estimated that in that year 1938—9, according to expert opinion we lost something like 32,000 tons of sugar because of the extension of the crop to July. With the dismantling of Joes River Factory that loss is bound to be increased and this island cannot afford that. This is an indifferent waste of money which is sorely needed in the Colony. It is all very well for certain honourable members to say: "You are making a political speech." I anticipate such remarks from the honourable senior member for the City. I feel that where the sugar industry is concerned in this Chamber, it should be a highly political matter. I am not advocating for one moment the nationalization of the entire sugar industry; I never advocate the unnecessary and impracticable; but I do say that if Government misses the opportunity of acquiring this factory I will now have to suspect them of being coerced into the refusal by people in the sugar industry of this Colony. It must be remembered that the last people from whom the Government should take advice would be the sugar producers; they want to keep the Government from any knowledge of sugar production it is all very well to say that this factory and that factory have not paid; but a factory does not pay the industry if the owners calculate to make £15,000 this year and they make only £12,000. A layman outside the sugar industry is a fool where this matter is concerned. There are systems of accountancy; there is a system of accountancy which exists but which would not be acceptable to the authorities; there is a system or rather there is such a thing as cost accountancy. What do we know about the labour costs of sugar production? What do we know of the savings effected through the use of modern machinery? Those savings can be considerable, therefore it is not for us to sit back and accept what is popularly propagandized by the sugar industry that this factory has lost money and that factory does not pay. This is an opportunity for the Government to discover for themselves what pays and what does not pay, because I can envisage that just as Puerto Rico has made sugar production a public utility so one day we might find that that is an absolute necessity here. We cannot continue to be ignorant of the one and only industry in the community—the sugar industry in which a certain type of worker depends for employment and which affects every section of the community.

The lighterman as well as the clerk is affected by the loss of sugar production in this island. The Government cannot say that they cannot manage a sugar factory; this is a golden opportunity for the Government to acquire a sugar factory and do not let them be influenced by agricultural experts. Because a man is qualified technically in science and agriculture that does not qualify him as an expert in the sugar industry; he is just an expert in the particular science and agriculture and his opinion where economic judgment is concerned may be as worthless as the next man's opinion; it takes an economist to give an opinion where economic judgment is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the Government would be doing this cause an excellent service if it takes hold of the opportunity they now have. Let them not fail to grasp this opportunity. I am sure that when Joes River factory becomes a Government concern that would be considered in all parts of this island as something admirable; then there will be

no doubt on the part of the peasant proprietors about their canes being taken at a factory and there will be no doubt as to the correct price of the canes. None of us can say with any dogmatic certainty that the price paid for canes is compatible with the profits made. Here is a golden opportunity for the the peasants to receive the maximum price for their canes through the ownership of a Government factory. There are many honourable members who preach Socialism on the political platform but when it comes to the issue of implementing their political doctrine they are quite shy in taking the step. I advise the Government not to miss this opportunity to acquire one processing factory, for it is an opportunity which is afforded them to acquire a knowledge of the sugar industry and discover exactly what is the real cost of sugar production and what, from time to time, are the real profits as distinct from the published profits. Let us by no means lose the opportunity to give the peasant proprietors that security which they now lack.

I want to move an amendment to this Resolution. I beg to move that after the word "parish" the words "and of sufficient adjacent land to make the economic working of the factory possible," be inserted; that is even a more important issue than the factory capacity. Perhaps there is no more important issue facing the future of the British Caribbean than the system of land tenure which must eventually affect the economic future of this colony. As to this question of land settlement in this colony, it is enlightening to know what has been done in other communities in the West Indies in this direction. The Barbadian is known for his industry and he takes pride in himself; peasant proprietorship his synonymous with low production. When you come to consider the question of peasant proprietorship as compared with big organizations, the results are not only comparable but in many instances superior, because of the attention which the peasant can give directed by scientific knowledge. You cannot expect that plots which are very often separated from each other and owing to the lack of any system of irrigation or of any comprehensive agricultural direction and with the lack of substantial credit — you cannot expect that with these shortcomings the peasant can produce to capacity. If the Department of Science and Agriculture were suited for the direction of the peasant proprietorship it would be less spectacular that it has been with the plantation system.

As the question of land settlement schemes which have taken place in other places as compared with Barbados, we have made a beginning at Seawell in the rental of tractors; we have made a small beginning in respect of the extension of the Peasants' Loan Bank but it is still a beginning, and I want to tell the honourable member, the Minister of Agriculture, that it is a right beginning. Let them go on with the expansion of the peasantry and support their production. I can tell honourable members that in other colonies in the British Caribbean the Government has undertaken land settlement schemes; they have purchased existing estates by compulsory legislation in order to launch land settlement schemes. Barbados uniquely is the only British Caribbean colony where the Government, until the present Labour Government, had no particular tradition as regards land settlement. The existing estates in Jamaica were purchased with the object of starting land settlement schemes.

I am not advocating the breaking up of estates in this island, but I advocate that this group of estates be acquired for a Land Settlement Scheme.

There is the fear that the multiplication of the peasantry will lead to less production but that is not necessarily so. I will make a quotation as an indication of my faith in the peasantry; I would quote from Professor Halcrowe as to what he says about the Barbadian peasant. On page 5 of his Report Mr. Halcrowe says this:—

"The Barbadian peasant folk are practically entirely of African or African-European descent. English is the only language. The majority of both men and women speak and write extremely well; in this respect, Barbados is undoubtedly well ahead of many other countries not excepting some of the older European nations. The Barbadian peasants and, indeed all the poorer classes dress quietly and remarkably well. They are modest and respectable, remarkably honest and by no means lazy. They are religious up to the point but, strangely enough, they are definitely not sanctimonious. The common type of dwelling house is a small, tidy, square, wooden, two or three-roomed house, with a single roof and plenty of lattice windows. Some of the dwellings look rather flimsy, especially as they are usually placed two or three feet upon little stone piles. There is, however, a tendency nowadays towards stone construction. Many of the people display considerable initiative in many ways. In short, the Barbadian peasants are a law-abiding, industrious and generally very admirable people."

There is particular relevance in implementing this Resolution and acquiring this group of estates, because in the parishes of St. John and St. Joseph notably there is less land settlement by a great percentage than there is in any other part of the country. The number of small holders in St. Michael is 3,790; Christ Church 3,038; St. George 2,129; St. Philip 2,516; St. James 2,199; St. Lucy 1,551; St. Andrew 1,076; St. John 723 and St. Joseph 798. There is reason for acquiring these estates so that you would multiply the peasant proprietorship in land hungry St. John and land hungry St. Joseph. The Government need have no fear of embarking on a scheme such as that which is in existence in the Sudan and in the proportionate profit farms of Puerto Rico. The Government need have no fear in implementing this Resolution without any further hesitation.

Mr. SMITH: I accept the amendment which has been proposed by the honourable member.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I am giving my whole-hearted support to this Resolution. I think that it is as early as February 1952 when I posed a question in respect of the hardships suffered by peasants in the leeward parishes. Our problem is a different one from that of St. Joseph where there is an area of lower sucrose content than any other part of the island. My question was as follows:—

"Is the Government aware of the hardships created to cane peasant holders by certain factory owners in the reaping of their canes during the present crop, especially in the Parish of St. Lucy?"

If the answer to the question is in the affirmative, would the Government take steps to have such conditions remedied, even to the extent of nationalising one or some of the same sugar factories or setting up one or more factories on a co-operative basis so as to relieve the said state of affairs?"

I need not remind the Government of the reply which was given to that question. I know what is passing through the mind of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph. What has happened recently is that quite a number of sugar factories have been extended by putting down ancillary equipment but the actual grinding capacity has gone down. If you take an overall picture of the position you will find that what I have said is correct. What worries me is this; the honourable junior member for St. John has pointed out quite correctly that the capital cost of the erection of a sugar factory is high but having regard to the price of sugar we may find ourselves in the position of producing sugar cheaply in the world markets and if we continue with the present state of production it seems to me that at some time or other unless this question is kept before our eyes we will be in a rather precarious economic position. It is a question of getting 200,000 tons of sugar and at the same time being able to produce it at the cheapest cost. As to the whole question of peasants not being able to get their canes ground at the factories, the matter of factory capacity should be borne in mind. I have been hearing that factories such as Swans and Haggatts group may go out of production and that would add to the difficulty. I think that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph is on good ground and I would recommend that the Government should go into this whole question, not merely in respect of the matter of Joos River. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg to give my wholehearted support to this Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — I rise merely to contradict what the honourable junior member for St. Joseph, my colleague, has said about my going to St. Joseph some years ago. Both Mr. Cox and Mr. Williams are dead, but they have relatives who are alive. It is perfectly true that I knew of the competition in price going on between these two persons; I also know, having heard so, that Mr. Cox's influence in the parish was great. I went to St. Joseph and told Mr. Cox that I was coming forward for membership of this House and I would like him to support me; he promptly said: "I am not doing that because Mr. Williams is at present in England and it would look as if I am stabbing him in the back." He promised me that he would not interfere with the election and after that, he was my strongest supporter in the parish; he never failed to help me after that first year. I have made these remarks only for the reason which I have given.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week, the 22nd instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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