

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 29th 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. 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*), Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER and Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for circulation.

DOCUMENT

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Financial Report of the Accountant General of the colony for the month ended 31st May, 1954.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the honourable Premier. I beg to lay the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No 7 Order, 1954.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the House and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55 Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954-55 No. 10 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution, in connection with an enquiry into a Social Security Scheme for Barbados.

By your permission, a copy of this resolution was circulated to honourable members. It is an urgent matter and I beg to give notice that it is my intention to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with this resolution today.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 7 Order, 1954.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$405 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1954-55 Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954-55 No. 11 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution to provide certain equipment for the Bay Estate.

Hon. M. E. COX: Bill to amend the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House in Committee of Supply at the next meeting of the House in order to deal with the resolutions of which notice has just been given.

Mrs. BOURNE entered the House and took her seat.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. M. E. Cox seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill to amend the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945, was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

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

ORDER NO. 1 POSTPONED

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 1 and to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the day. Government proposes to return to Order No. 1 later on today.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction to the Committee when

in Committee of Supply, to deal with the Resolution for the sum of \$3,500 which I have just mentioned.

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

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

VISIT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISER

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I will deal with the Resolution which I gave notice of just now. This Resolution for the sum of \$3,500 is to pay passages and other incidental expenses for Professor J. H. Richardson of Leeds University, to come to Barbados to enquire into the possibilities of a scheme of Social Insurance. I am sure honourable members will be sympathetic with this Resolution, because at various times beginning from 1944—1945 there have been questions and addresses debated in this House to that effect. On the Order Paper of the House at present there is an address introduced by the honourable senior member for St. Philip asking Government to investigate some system of Social Insurance Scheme for Barbados. Not long ago, the honourable junior member for St. Philip asked questions to that effect, and I think it was in 1945 that this House passed an address asking Government to appoint a Committee to investigate the possibility of a modified Beveridge Scheme for Barbados. The Government proposed to appoint a Select Committee to go into that question as a result of a Message from the Governor of that time. I believe one was appointed by the Other Place but this House did not get that far and the session died.

Recently,—I think it was about March this year,—Professor Richardson went to British Guiana to examine the possibilities of a scheme of Social Insurance for that territory. He stopped off here and my ministry discussed the matter with him. He expressed his willingness to come back to Barbados to undertake this investigation. We have just heard last week by cable from the Colonial Office that he is willing to come. A provisional passage was booked for him on the *Ariguani* which is due to reach here on the 2nd August, 1954, and confirmation of that provisional booking must be made by the 1st July 1954; hence the urgency of this Resolution.

According to the figures in the Addendum, provision is made for air passage. Honourable members have heard me say that he is booked for provisional passage by the *Ariguani*, but it is not certain whether he will be able to return by boat or by air, so, the Government thought that it would bring down the Resolution making provision for return air passage. Naturally, if the money is not spent it will lapse in the Treasury. The figures shown in the Addendum also include provision for an honorarium, hotel expenses, incidentals, and internal transportation if necessary. The figures represent roughly the amount that was spent by British Guiana in connection with the same gentleman when he was carrying out such a scheme there. I would say for the benefit of the House that the Other Place is sitting at present and will prolong its sitting a little longer than necessary in order to deal with this Resolution today owing to its urgency. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Chairman,—I must say that it is very laudable on the part of Government to institute into this Colony what in all metropolitan countries has become traditional. When this Social Insurance Scheme is introduced in Barbados it will be an innovation because the only general

form of Social Security which we now have is Old Age Pensions; and as all of us would confess, there is a lot to be desired even on the scale which we now try our best to carry it out. Five shillings per week when a person reaches sixty-eight years is still I think far from what is desirable in a colony like this, where the main type of labour is agricultural which causes people to break down at a much earlier age of life as compared with what is the case in higher developed communities.

Sir, as laudable as this effort may be, yet I think we should first try to tackle the question of unemployment. I can almost predict that in the report of the Official who is to undertake this Social Insurance Survey that one of his leading comments will be that in a community such as Barbados where unemployment is, I believe, out of all proportion to what it is in more advanced communities,—that is the proportion of those who are not working to those who are working is much too great—that he will see no possibility of this country instituting any scheme until we get rid of our tragic situation of unemployment and underemployment. No doubt, unemployment and underemployment are almost permanent features of our society. In the Scandinavian countries and in the British Isles, social security has been worked out by the foremost economic and sociological experts, and we can see that in those countries the question of employment really affords the systems which have been instituted in those countries. Social security schemes are not easy to institute in countries; as a matter of fact, I believe the scheme which was introduced in the United States of America only came to its present peak during the regime of the late President Roosevelt. As is known, there is a traditional sentiment in the U.S.A. of what I may term to be ironicalism, which means that the individual should be as far as possible dependent on his own resources throughout his life. However, that thought has been more or less destroyed during the regime of the late President Roosevelt; but there is still the lingering suspicion in certain circles, even in the U.S.A., that there is too much of this dependence upon the State for the social security of the individual.

Another question in our society which is very relevant to the institution of any worthwhile security scheme, is the question of birth control. We cannot go on indiscriminately adding to the population of the country if we expect any system of social security to be established with permanency. Unemployment, underemployment, and birth control are vital matters to the question of social security. If the population growth is too rapid it will make nonsense of social security, and that holds good for a community like ours. Even in more advanced communities than ours, all that must be taken into account. It must be remembered that a system of social security will include in addition to Old Age Pensions which we now have in operation and which I have expressed as quite inadequate, such things as Widows and Orphans Fund, Bread Subsidies, Protective Food Subsidies for the young, and so forth. Social security is really based on a system of redistribution of the wealth of a country through taxation.

I personally think that there are many sections in our business economy where higher wages can be instituted. I would like to say that the first investigation into this question of social security should be an investigation into the ability of certain industries to pay higher wages. Some industries and some business concerns in the colony. I believe, are paying the maximum wage which the industry or business can carry; but I am uncertain as to whether

others are paying anything near the maximum wage which these said concerns can carry; therefore, I think it should be the first duty of the Social Security Officer to discover whether wage exploitations still exist before embarking upon any recommendations for wholesale social security schemes. As an honourable member on my left has said *soffo voce*, a social security scheme is a very far reaching scheme indeed, but it is a very laudable effort. There is too much suffering among individuals, while the terrible record of our infantile mortality speaks for itself. There is also too much suffering among the unemployed and under-employed; consequently, nobody can deny that a system of social security is absolutely essential for this colony. So far, this is a laudable effort on the part of this Government, but I doubt very much whether any worthwhile system of social security can be introduced and established in this colony under its present economic and social conditions. The question is, 'are the workers in all sections of the community paid as adequately as their industry or business can pay them?' The modern conception of the State is that the State should come to the assistance of all sections of the community whether or not they lack the social necessities for an adequate as distinct from a leisurely life; but I have read comments here and there, — although I have not studied them extensively — which state that any system of social security must be forgotten if the question of unemployment goes beyond a certain percentage of those employed in the community.

As far as I understand, Mr. Chairman, some other officer has been invited to come here to survey the question of employment and unemployment and I think we should receive his report first. (A VOICE: Why?) I think that the question of social security cannot be adequately reported upon until the question of unemployment is really known. I am advising Government that as laudable as is its effort in this respect, it is putting the cart before the horse in this instance unless it can assure this House that it will be in possession of this unemployment report before the new expert begins his investigation. As a matter of fact, I would not be surprised if the social security expert requires such a report as a guide before he can submit his findings.

Sir, I cannot be opposed to the institution of social security in a community like this where social conditions, for all ages and for all sections of the community are so lacking. I issue the warning that we may be merely tinkering at the question or wasting paper and money, unless we set about it by instituting first things first. I think the Government should make every effort after discovering the state of unemployment to see that there is a considerable increase in the numbers of permanently employed before embarking upon a system of social security.

Mr. Crawford entered the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman,—Just this morning I was referring to some questions which were asked in this Chamber from time to time on this matter. I think the honourable introducer of the resolution said that he believed everyone in Barbados would agree to the principle, and rightly so. The question of persons needing help in some way or the other is probably as old as the days when it was written: "The poor man at his gate." There will be always the poor in these lands. However, with all social schemes which have now come to fruition and now form part of Western civilisation, taking it from Scandinavia to the United

States of America; it must be borne in mind that the whole thing is bound up with the economic background of the particular country. As the honourable junior member for St. John has said, I do not think Professor Richardson can promise us anything further than a good Colonial Benefit Scheme or something to that extent. I sincerely hope that whatever he advises Government to do, that Government would take his advice in order to provide some form of social security for this island.

I think whatever scheme he may advise as suitable for this island may be based around Friendly Societies; and because of that, I think it is unfortunate that the Wells' Report on Friendly Societies was not adopted. I think it is a very good report but I have heard it said, that if the Wells' Report were ever adopted in Barbados, certain friendly societies would go out of operation. At the same time I notice all through that report, Mr. and Mrs. Wells have urged very strongly that quite a lot of good could come from administration of Social Security where Friendly Societies are concerned. I think that the whole cardinal principle behind the question of Social Security is the question of full employment. As I have said earlier, our question is largely one of our population of over two hundred thousand people. We do not have sufficient work for our large population and that question ricochets and goes all through our Society in Barbados. It will be very difficult to get an all-embracing system with this background. It means that large subventions will have to be given from public funds; it would have to be a tidy sum.

I am not of the same opinion as the hon. junior member for St. John. I think you should try to bring a scheme of some type and base it around that of your friendly societies. If possible we should include old age pensioners and also something to aid the middle class and lower income groups. It may be said, that the middle-class people take care of themselves by having small securities, like insurance policies which they provide sooner or later for themselves and which they use as a saving to build houses and things of that kind. I am not trying to envisage any scheme which is herculean because it is largely a question of cost, and what you can put up. Here again, even if some say that there should be some scheme where employers should pay a subvention I do not think that such is in the best interest of the people because it would cause a rise in the cost of living. As I have understood it, that is the reason why British goods are so dear; British industries have to pay subventions to the social security scheme and that is the reason why they have high expenses of operation. I am throwing these things out to show you the problems of implementing the scheme, but as the hon. junior member for St. John has vividly reminded this House, our main problem is one of too much unemployment. If we can place more people in employment thus having very little unemployment then a Social Security Scheme can possibly succeed. To my mind a system such as was recommended by Mr. and Mrs. Wells would work here. They recommended a Colonial Benefit Scheme and I think a system like that with a few adaptations would be much more in keeping with our needs. We should not try to reach Mars with jet aircraft; this whole question is wrapped up with the economics of our area. In spite of the help which we get from C.D. & W. this area is still one where you have too much unemployment and under unemployment.

I do hope that the report of Professor Richardson would see the light of day and will not waste

away in the archives or shelves of Government, to be seen some day by our grand children who would look at it as a thing of the past.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On the one or two occasions in which this matter has been discussed or has been referred to in this House, the honourable Minister of Social Services and the honourable Premier himself both expressed a certain amount of apprehension with regard to the ability of this colony to finance a Social Security Scheme. If I remember correctly, within this present session they have both said that they thought it beyond our present resources; that being the case, I sincerely hope that the real significance of this visit of Professor Richardson to British Guiana will not be lost to this House. According to the resolution before us, Professor Richardson went to British Guiana to examine the possibilities of a Scheme of Social Insurance for that territory. Now, British Guiana, as we all know today, is completely under the domination of the Colonial Office. The Legislature is nominated by the Governor and the constitution itself lies suspended in mid-air like the mythical Arabian Flying Carpet. The significance is that in that colony which is completely under the control of the British Crown, the Governor has the sole responsibility and therefore it is under those conditions that the possibility of introducing a Social Security Scheme has been investigated. I cannot say whether this inquiry originated in London at the Colonial Office or by the Governor himself in British Guiana; but the fact of the matter is that from a Crown Colony in the West Indies, the ball has started to roll. I say that for the reason that I want to emphasise in a colony like this, where apart from our constitutional position, we boast of having what calls itself a Socialist Government, so we cannot afford to make it appear that we are unconcerned with this question of Social Security. It would be criminal indifference if now that Professor Richardson is doing something about the matter in British Guiana we fail to utilize his services here at this time in the same respect.

Shortly after the United Kingdom Government introduced their scheme of Social Security around 1944 or 1945, I suggested in this Chamber that as soon as the Department of National Health had been set up, we should endeavour to get an expert from there to give us advice in this matter. It is a matter for regret that there should be this undue haste with this resolution. I understand the Other Place is waiting on it but I think in a matter like this which would involve the colony in the biggest individual expenditure it would have to undertake, that we in this Honourable House should discuss it in the fullest possible manner, so as to give a pointer to Professor Richardson as to our reaction on the matter. It is not good enough for us to merely bring him here by voting this money. There has been no public discussion yet in Barbados on this question of Social Security. Much as we loath to detain the Other Place, yet I am sure the Other Place will agree to make a little sacrifice by remaining a little longer in order that more than passing attention will be given to this matter today.

I was saying, Sir, it would have been criminal neglect on the part of the Barbados Government if it failed to obtain Professor Richardson's advice now that he is in the West Indies on this matter. We should make it perfectly clear to him that in so far as Barbados is concerned, we are not approaching this question in an academic manner, — that is,

because he is in the West Indies we are utilizing his services. We should let him know that we are deeply interested in this matter and we want him to pursue his enquiry in Barbados with the utmost precision, because it is our intention to implement any recommendation he might make and to work on his suggestions. All of us would readily conceive that the cost of a Social Security Scheme for this colony must be abnormally high, relatively speaking, but I think honourable members should not fail to bear in mind one or two small points which need to be re-emphasized. The first is, that this scheme is worked on a comparative basis and the second is, that the Government itself, today undertakes a very large expenditure on Social Services which will be eliminated if and when we give effect to a Social Security Scheme. Nowadays a large amount is being spent on Old Age Pensions and on Poor Relief. I personally feel that the expenditure on our Almshouses should be completely eliminated if and when we embark on this scheme. It may be necessary of course to maintain the buildings as Cottage Hospitals but their functions such as providing assistance for paupers, feeding and sheltering them, may not be necessary. It may be argued that the expenditure on Almshouses is a parochial expenditure; but I am sure that honourable members will realize that the Government yearly has to grant subventions to Parochial authorities because a large portion of their revenue is spent in the direction of Poor Relief. Old Age Pensions, Poor Relief Expenditure by our Almshouses, our Family Allowances by way of Income Tax, these and other things in that direction, are ways and means of collecting the revenue for expenditure on Social Security.

Mention has been made by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy of the part that existing Friendly Societies should play in Social Security Schemes. According to my recollection of this matter, Sir William Beveridge originally recommended that Friendly Societies in Great Britain should act as state agents for disbursing the benefits of social security to their members under the Government Security Scheme. I know it is the belief that if and when a Social Security Scheme comes into operation here, it will sound the death knell for many Friendly Societies. I am not sure whether the Beveridge recommendation with regard to the utilization of Friendly Societies was carried out in Great Britain; but there is a possibility that where Friendly Societies have a good record for public service, we may be able to use them to disburse the benefits of a properly established Social Security Scheme to all their members. Honourable members will remember that I tabled an address in here last year on this question, and in that address the matter was set out in some detail. I pointed out in that address that a Social Security Scheme suitable for this colony would cost about three million dollars if we attempted on a modern scale to provide some of the benefits which are provided in Great Britain today. I do not know what the actual figures are today in Great Britain, but I think in the early stages the cost to the population worked out at something like fifty-five dollars (\$55.00) per head per year. We may consider that their scale of benefits is really too high for us; and making allowances for differences in National Income, its distribution and what not, I doubt that we can embark on anything more ambitious than one quarter of the benefits now received by the average British man, woman, or child. Therefore, roughly, although this is not the only way in which these estimates are computed, if our population is put at 200,000 and we estimate

at \$14 per head per year, we would see that we are running into an expenditure of nearly \$3,000,000. This can be checked by the various benefits which I have suggested in the various categories in my address. Among the things which I have suggested are maternity benefits for female workers, widow's allowance, retirement pensions, family allowance, Orphans allowance, Unemployment and Sickness allowance, and Married allowances for sickness and maternity. As I have said earlier, this scheme has to operate on tripartite basis; and therefore I was pleased to see the emphasis placed on that matter by the two previous speakers. They both stressed that we must bear in mind the total amount of our unemployment. If we are going to have large numbers of unemployed with us continuously, we would never be able to make a Social Security Scheme work successfully here; therefore, at the same time that the Government is thinking in terms of having this investigation carried out, it must actively concern itself with the development of the industrial activities in this country to such a point as to absorb large numbers of the unemployed. Either that, or emigration, or some scheme which would entail the maximum employment of all able-bodied people in the island. We must think of everything in order to make this scheme work, in order that every man, woman and child may derive the maximum benefit from it.

There are other matters which might, well be threshed out today, especially the suggestion of an alternative scheme if in the opinion of Professor Richardson a comprehensive social security scheme was found too heavy for Barbados. I think Government might well be advised to suggest to him to conduct at the same time the possibility for an Unemployment Insurance Scheme for workers in given industries, such as agriculture, and one or two others, so that if in reality it is beyond our resources to tackle the complete scheme right now, we may be able to provide some sort of an Unemployment Insurance Scheme for given categories of workers, like sugar industries workers who are entitled to some treatment of the sort.

Merely to hasten discussion and to permit this resolution to go to the Other Place without undue delay I shall stop at this point, and let other honourable members say what they want to say on it.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I think that we should decide whether we want a survey of this sort. We are speaking of a Social Security Scheme but I see here that mention is made only of a Social Insurance Scheme. Now, Sir, relative to the idea of getting Professor Richardson to come here, I regret very much that whenever a matter of this sort is brought up it seems as if we always discover somebody being present in the area. With the frequent visits of our politicians to the big countries in the world one would have felt that they would have discovered Professor Richardson even before he went to British Guiana. However, it seems to me as if we have to thank what is taking place in British Guiana for the discovery of Professor Richardson and for his coming here. He is not the only person to come to Barbados in this way.

I see from the addendum to the resolution that it would take him one and a half months to carry out his investigation here, and I would like to know whether it is going to be done in six weeks. We are in the habit of getting these people here and extending the scope of their work and thus extending their time here. I do hope we have substantial information ready to put at his disposal as soon as he

gets here. I wonder, if his report on British Guiana has been released yet so that we can know the type of survey he carries out; perhaps, it is a stereotyped kind of work. We have an Unemployment Agency and if all those who are unemployed are registered to date, he can get some idea of our unemployment. There must be some means of getting our seasonal employment and unemployment figures. We have no great number of industries here employing people to any great extent. No matter what we say today this gentleman must have some method of going about this business; and in his going about it, all that he is going to do is to apply the peculiarity of Barbados to it. I do hope when he comes here he will do a thorough job and do it in the time that is set out in the addendum.

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, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one resolution in Committee and asked for leave to sit again.

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 resolution was read a first and second time and then agreed to.

RESUMPTION IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1954—55 No. 9.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am asking for leave to take the resolution standing in the name of the honourable Premier.

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

CONTROL OF MEALY BUG AND V.H.F. EQUIPMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this resolution is for the sum of \$3,912 to be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1954—55, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1954—55 No. 9 which forms the Schedule to this Resolution. As honourable members can see from the Schedule it is made up of two amounts — Head V, Agriculture, (New) Control of Mealy Bug, for which the sum of \$3,300 is to be voted and, Head VII, Miscellaneous, V. H. F. Equipment, for which the sum of \$612 is to be voted. The notes to both items set out fairly clearly the objects of this resolution.

Against item No. 1, Control of the Mealy Bug, it is stated: "An amount of \$28,000 was provided in Supplementary Estimates 1953/54 No. 37 for the implementation of a scheme to set up an organisation to mix, bag and deliver to sugar cane growers as a soil insecticide mixture for the control of the sugar cane root mealy bug. It was not possible to complete the work on this project before the end of the financial year. A revote of the unexpended balance of \$3,300 at the 31st March, 1954, is now required for the purpose of completing the work."

I will give some further details in connection with this matter. The work on this mealy bug project was not completed before 31st March, 1954. Certain adjustments and extensions to the Building remain to be done to improve the working conditions of the employees. Funds are required to purchase equipment and furniture borrowed on a temporary basis and to replace pipe line loaned from the stocks of the Department of Science of Agriculture for the irrigation scheme to provide water on the premises.

I know you will ask for a break down of the amount. It is as follows:—

Furniture	\$ 150
Pipe Line replacements ..	150
Alterations, etc., to building and equipment (for) controlling dust etc., ..	3,000
Total	3,300

Honourable members perhaps will want to know something further in connection with the working of the plant, and the progress that has been made in the control of the Mealy Bug pest. I would say that now the crop season has been concluded, the incidence of the Mealy Bug pest is only now fully appreciated by most planters. They are now in the position to know what yields the various fields give coupled with the knowledge of what they normally should have given, and as far as it has been stated, the incidence of the Mealy Bug pest is more apparent and more abundant than was at first thought. As far as the Agroicide mixture is concerned, it has proved to be fairly expensive with the result that peasants cannot purchase it in great quantities. The Agroicide is not really beneficially used by peasants, generally speaking, because it is uneconomic to them. In the case of planters, they can more easily obtain it and even in their case they are complaining of the price. Up to the 11th May, 1954, 4,000 bags of Agroicide limestone dust were produced. I beg to move that Head V Agriculture, stand part of the resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is surprising to-day, to learn that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is now showing some anxiety about the hazard of the Mealy Bug. I have said in here before, and I am again saying to-day that I am more than unhappy over what is taking place in the country by this pest. I do not think the Hon. Minister or the Government as a whole is truly aware of the situation; I am not saying so with any desire to create hysteria or false alarm, but we are faced with a rather awkward position. What is more unfortunate is that it is not the type of hazard which any Government or any Department of Agriculture can look into, and bring to an end in a short period. What we are faced with today would surely take two decades to eliminate, and I am speaking without any exaggeration. On Saturday afternoon driving through the country along Mt. Wilton Road, shortly after six o'clock, I saw a migration of a colony of Mealy Bug, taken across the road by ants. I paused for a moment to watch the spectacle.

We are faced with an awkward position, and more so because the peasants are unable to buy Agroicide at the cost of \$40 or \$50 per acre to combat this pest. Then there is the cost to apply it. All through the years we have peasants who find it difficult to buy Chemical Fertilizers which are sold for about \$12

per bag, enough to serve an acre. If the peasants cannot spend \$12 to fertilize an acre of land, how can they spend \$50 on insecticide to combat this pest? This whole matter is hitting at our economy and there still seems to be some neglect. We can release U.S. dollars to import Canadian potatoes but we are denying the people in the colony from importing an American insecticide which would provide us with the opportunity of growing our own potatoes. About six months ago I was talking with a bookkeeper of a Plantation in St. Joseph about this Mealy Bug pest, and he assured me that the Mealy Bug was in no way affecting his fields. In a recent discussion with him he said that he now has the worry of fighting this pest by the application of Agroicide.

I am told, — I believe it can be investigated, — that there is an insecticide made from petroleum products which can reduce the cost of application by about 50%, but I understand that it is not permitted in the colony because it involves American Currency and the Currency Board is unwilling to release dollars for this insecticide. I just read a pamphlet on the use of Agroicide and it does not recommend its use on food crops such as yams and eddoes. There is a recommendation of the planting of corn instead. I understand that the Department of Agriculture has just arranged a scheme of buying corn at \$2.70 per bushel and provided that the correct variety of corn for the particular areas is released we can get an average of 40 to 60 bushels per acre. Our population for the most part has to depend on carbohydrates and with the unemployment situation being what it is, the question that must arise is; How are you to get food, for the population if we have to continue at this rate? At present, the average plantation owner has to treat the land he throws out with Agroicide, therefore there can be no planting of food crops under the circumstances. It is no desire on my part to create alarm, but it is time that we realize the awkward position with which we are faced. I am surprised that the Department of Agriculture has not made some declaration of the position of the Mealy Bug pest in the country at the moment. I do not think it is aware of the expense of the hazard and the danger. At the same time I am not blaming anyone for what can be regarded as apparent neglect.

I have been talking with people all over the island about this matter. The question is whether the peasant is in a position to buy Agroicide insecticide to combat this pest. The plantation owner may be able to do so. What is going to happen if a peasant with land adjacent to the fields of a plantation owner continues to hatch the Mealy Bug pest while the plantation owner is trying to rid his fields of it? Probably the potency of Agroicide may last for three years but it is a physical impossibility to treat all the areas affected with this Mealy Bug pest in the first five years. I am therefore asking the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to see whether he can get the Department of Science and Agriculture to let Peasants Instructors and Peasants Advisers go out in the various districts and stress the need for the use of this insecticide to combat this pest as early as possible. I will also say that some scheme should be devised through which Government can make releases of this Agroicide insecticide on a long term basis of payment to peasants who are unable to buy it.

We are faced with an awkward position and I say so with a lot of strength. We have reached the stage when we should be prepared to release dollars for the importation of the oil insecticide. I am ap-

pealing to the Government and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to devise some scheme whereby this oil insecticide can be released. Sir, this is not the type of thing which needs debating at length; I just want the Government to be aware of the position and to see what can be done to help the peasants.

Let us get on with the job of helping the peasants; it is the best thing we can do. Let us get the oil insecticide that can be used for the eradication of the Mealy Bug. I know it is a question of dollars and the removal of Customs Duties to get it, but let us get it so that peasants would be able to buy it in case they are unable to buy the better article.

Mr. BRYAN and Mr. ALLDER entered the Committee and took their seats.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I want to repeat what I said some months ago, when we were dealing with a resolution for the sum of \$28,000 for the eradication of the Mealy Bug pest. Sometimes one wonders whether the Government members live on one of the other planets, because they are completely unaware of the conditions existing in Barbados. In January I told the Government that the cost of this Agroicide was putting it almost completely beyond the reach of the average small land owner. The only way that an ordinary peasant can pick up \$50 per acre and spend it merely for treating the land is if he were going to plant gold or diamonds in it. Sometimes one wonders where Government members live and how they live because they seem to know so little of what is going on around them. The point is that these small land owners cannot afford to treat their small areas with Agroicide, therefore, those areas remain as breeding grounds for this pest, and they continue to affect the land of other people who may be able to treat them. I pointed out on the last occasion that the eradication of the Mosaic disease had been only possible after the most rigid inspection. The honourable senior member for the City, although he does not represent an agricultural area, suggested on the last occasion that the Agroicide insecticide should be distributed freely to the peasants.

The honourable member does not represent a rural constituency; so far as I know there are no peasants in the City of Bridgetown. He saw that it was impracticable for the small land owner to spend \$50 an acre merely to treat his land. Let Government ask any peasant if he makes as much as \$50 out of an acre of canes. The only way he can make that amount is if he works the land and credits himself with the labour. If he has to pay for labour he cannot make \$50 out of an acre; therefore, how can he spend \$50 an acre merely to eradicate the pest. The Government seems to ignore the realities of certain situations. It squanders money in the most reckless manner in certain situations while in others in which the benevolence of its generosity is expected or desirable it is as parsimonious as any Scotsman and completely dead to the true interest of the colony.

I do not care how much the planters spend; I do not care what they treat their fields with whether it be Agroicide or any of the scientific products recommended by the Department of Agriculture or by members of the planting fraternity in other parts of the world. This island will still be infested with the Mealy Bug until such time as the small landowners themselves are enabled to treat their fields and until such time as the most vigilant inspection is carried out.

Mr. HAYNES: I consider that the honourable senior member for St. Philip has struck a very important note about these small landowners. The

trouble with them is that they continue year after year to replant the same ground with canes without even destroying some of the stumps, and by their continuous action they encourage this Mealy Bug in as much as it can only thrive where the soil is tight. In other words the ground must be tilled regularly, every three years or so. I am suggesting to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that he issue instructions so that peasant instructors should visit small growers and influence them to stop this continuous rearing of ratoon canes, or the rearing of eight, ten or eleven crops, which is absolutely ensuring the increase of this merciless pest.

The next thing is this; I had the experience in my district of the Entomologist, who is a good man, coming down there and saying that he did not think that this Agroicide could be applied to that district because it must be done mechanically. He did not advise that this insecticide should be used unless you can get the mechanical methods of applying it. The result is that there is no proper system of treating the small crops. It seems to me that something should be done about this matter of applying this insecticide to the small holdings because that is a very important matter. I do not see that any progress can be achieved unless a concentrated effort is made in connection with this matter. I only hope that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will take up the matter of the application of this Agroicide to the small holdings and see if he can allow the peasant instructors to be instructed in the practical methods of applying this insecticide.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: While I am here as a representative of the City I am also a representative of Barbados; my interest is as much in Agriculture as it is in commerce. I do not think I could be tired of saying that the Hon. Minister's presentation of cases is one to be commended since he has assumed the office of Minister of Agriculture; but I am just reminding the Government that it seems as if it is not their desire to give accurate and full information. On the last occasion when a Resolution of this nature came before this Chamber I said that I thought every effort should be made to distribute this insecticide free of charge or at a minimum cost to the peasants. When I said that it was drawn to my attention that the cost of this insecticide was around \$10.00 per ton, the Hon. Premier said that it would be \$8.50 per ton and it would be sufficient to cover three acres. I do not consider that the Hon. Premier was wilfully misleading the House, but when Resolutions are brought before this House honourable members must give correct information. Now it has been admitted that the statement which I made was correct—now that the Government is aware that the cost of this insecticide is not \$8.50 per ton to cover three acres, but in the vicinity of \$40.00—I suppose that the Government will be in a position to make a statement as to its policy of distributing this insecticide among the peasants. I think we should be all concerned about anything which strikes at the root of the main industry of the colony; this is a matter of great importance. I was at pains to listen to the honourable junior member for St. George today; it is not merely that the sugar producers can afford, by virtue of their broad acres and the profits they make, to supply this insecticide, but you would be doing nothing if the peasant next door is not given an opportunity to have this pest eradicated from his holding. Now that the Government realizes that the statement which they made in January was not a statement of fact—the amount of \$8.50 per ton to cover three acres would be a bagatelle—now that that statement has been found to be incorrect and the information was false, not

by design—(Hon. M. E. Cox: That was given by the Director of Agriculture) I make no apology to whoever gave the information. I make statements of fact. I knew that the Government members were wrong and other honourable members also knew they were wrong but they insisted that they were right. Now that they know that they were wrong will they declare what policy they will adopt to assist peasants in the eradication of this pest?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: We are all thoroughly convinced that Agroicide is indispensable for the use of peasants. However the figure quoted by the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable junior member for St. George is not exactly correct; as far as I know, it is almost correct. They urge that it would cost the average peasant between \$45.00 and \$50.00 an acre to combat this pest. My information is that the actual Agroicide would cost \$30.00 and that in the case of plantations which have to pay to apply it to their fields, it would cost another \$10.00 or \$12.00; in the case of the peasant they would apply it to their holding themselves. Whether the cost is \$30.00 or \$50.00 per acre it is still very expensive for a peasant with the result that the average peasant cannot buy this insecticide and apply it to his field.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to honourable members not to be talking across the table when another honourable member is speaking. I am hearing more than one voice all the time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I was going on to say, Mr. Chairman, that when fields are treated by plantation owners with Agroicide that may be good in itself but if adjacent fields which are owned by peasants are not similarly treated the ravages of the mealy bug pest will still appear, because this pest travels from one field to another very quickly. I can give the assurance that now it has been brought home to us that Agroicide is too expensive for the peasants to purchase as freely as they would like to purchase it, the Government will have to come to their assistance.

I would like to give further information to the effect that arrangements have already been made to assist peasants in the spraying of the Agroicide. Agroicide is a mixture which has to be sprayed so as to be effective in its results, and arrangements have therefore been made by the Department of Agriculture for this spraying apparatus to be loaned to the peasants. As to the point which has been raised by the honourable junior member for St. George about the use of other insecticides being investigated, I want to give the honourable member the assurance that already investigations are taking place in respect of three other insecticides in order to see whether they are more effective than Agroicide; therefore the honourable member need not have any fear as to that particular point.

Among the planting community there is a divergence of opinion as to the usefulness or otherwise of Agroicide. It may be that some of the planters who are not so liberally inclined would probably think twice before going to the expense of purchasing Agroicide. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the old method of treating these pests has been to open the fields and allow them to remain fallow and let the sunshine do the balance; that is one of the methods being tried out. Honourable members should consider, having regard to this question of the mealy bug pest and the spraying of fields with Agroicide, that certain food crops may not be grown on account of this insecticide being applied to certain plants and that will present a great difficulty in the planters complying with the Order in connection with the compulsory planting of food crops. I make these points so as to bring home to honourable mem-

bers the fact that the Government is taking an active interest and following up this matter of the application of this insecticide and the question as to what crops can be grown in certain fields which have been sprayed with Agroicide. All these matters are engaging the attention of the Government. Honourable members can rest assured that now that we are fully convinced that the peasants will have to be assisted, the Government will, of necessity, have to come to the aid of the peasants and assist them in securing adequate quantities of Agroicide for the treatment of their crops in the hope of saving the island's main industry.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On the question of the price of Agroicide the honourable member seems to be suggesting that in quoting the cost of supplying this insecticide at \$45.00 per acre, I might have been misleading the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I said that in so far as peasants are concerned, they apply the insecticide themselves and I say that the cost of labour should not be included in the general way; the cost of labour is separate and distinct.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Presumably the honourable member will realize that the peasant's time is worth him something; but all peasants do not perform their own work, and in the case of those who do their own work their time must be of some value to them. If there has been any misinformation given to the House in connection with this matter, it has been given by the Government, and I suggest that they should be much more careful in future as to how they misinform the House. When this Resolution came down to the House for the purchase of equipment for mixing this Agroicide and making it available for use, the Resolution was handled by the hon. Premier himself. I am not suggesting that the hon. Premier fails to inform himself of matters which he presents to this Chamber; I only want to recount the facts for the convenience of honourable members. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew, who is an experienced planter, told the House that the cost of this insecticide was between \$50 and \$60 per acre; the honourable junior member for the City was very sceptical about these figures and he took the hon. Premier to task for not having gone into the matter thoroughly. This is what the hon. Premier said; he said that the cost of this insecticide was \$8.50 per ton and it would serve three acres; therefore the price would be around \$2.80 per acre. On the strength of this assurance the House passed the Resolution without much further discussion; now the hon. Minister of Agriculture admits that the cost of this insecticide would be \$30.00 per acre and \$10 or \$12 for its application in the case of plantations, and in the case of the small holder the insecticide would be applied for him, no labour is involved and therefore no value should be attached to it. The discussion would have taken an entirely different turn in January if the House had been apprised of all the facts because we would have known that the peasant could not spend this money in spraying his land. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew, was considered to be talking through his hat, and the Government members pooh-poohed him; now they admit that this insecticide will cost the planter from \$42 to \$45 per acre and less than six months ago the Government said, that it would cost the peasants \$2.80 per acre! The Government must make sure of their facts; when I get up to talk in this House I make sure of what I am talking about first. At that time I told the Government that the cost of this insecticide would be beyond the capacity of the peasants to purchase, and I am glad to see that six months later

they themselves are realising that what I said at that time was correct.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolution passed in Committee of Supply was read a first and second time and agreed to.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

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

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

On reassembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 19/1954, relating to the establishment in Barbados of a Police Training School to serve the Leeward and Windward Islands in addition to Barbados.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I have the honour to appoint the following honourable members to serve on that Select Committee:—

The Hon. Premier, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, (Mr. BRANCKER), the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. BRYAN), the hon. junior member for Christ Church (Mr. GODDARD), the hon. senior member for St. Philip (Mr. CRAWFORD), the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. VAUGHAN) and the hon. junior member for St. George (Mr. MILLER).

INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL, 1954

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 7, as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:—To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act 1921, and to make certain provisions relating to the income of charities and to gifts made to charities.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The object of this Bill as hon. members will see, is this, roughly speaking. There is a great probability that more and more people in this island will contribute to charitable organisations as defined in this Income Tax Act and especially the University College of the West Indies. At the present moment section 13 of the Income Tax Act, 1921, allows exemptions from income tax to persons who give to charity—charity being defined in that Act—and one of the requirements of paragraph (iv) of that section is that the charity must be established as a society or institution, but if there is no such establishment no income tax exemption is allowed. In addition to that the charity must be in Bar-

bados. Section 13 of the Act sets out the Incomes which shall be exempt from income tax and paragraph (iv) says this: "The income of a society or institution established exclusively for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes or a public nature within the Island and not carried on for private pecuniary profit;"

Money going to the University College of the West Indies will still be liable to income tax in Barbados. I mention that because while the Act will cover institutions other than the University College of the West Indies, the Government is not ashamed to say that it has been largely moved by the consideration of the help which might be given to the University College if we make it possible for people's income to be exempt from taxation in case that might make for the advancement of education in other parts of the West Indies.

There are some other territories which do not allow voluntary gifts to be exempt from income tax and this provision is liable to be absurd; the matter is not completely free from dispute and I believe that there is a case hanging fire in Trinidad on this particular point. It is not unknown for persons to move the Government to give them so much a year for the education of their children but the children have not yet begun to go to school, and they claim income tax exemption on the ground that the money must come out of their income; we have not gone so far as that.

Paragraph two of the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill sets out that this Bill seeks to substitute for the qualification "society or institution" the expression "body of persons or trust." If you give money to a trust to carry on something that trust still has to pay income tax.

The "Objects and Reasons" of the Bill in paragraph 2 go on to state that Clause 3 of this Bill seeks also to remove a doubt which has arisen with respect to the interpretation of paragraph (iv) of section 13 of the Act by making it clear that in order to be entitled to exemption from income tax, it is necessary that the charity should be established within the Island. At the same time, power is given to exempt the income of trusts established in Barbados where the purpose is to be effected outside the Island, provided that the Governor-in-Executive Committee approves of the purpose. That is the sort of exemption which will rope in persons who have been established as trustees of the University College of the West Indies; people may band themselves together as trustees for gifts to be used for educational purposes and they would come under section 13 because they are not an institution or society. It is proposed to amend section 13 of the Act by deleting these words "society or institution" leaving in the words "not carried on for private pecuniary profit."

Paragraph 4 of the "Objects and Reasons" says this:—

"As it is felt that gifts to charities should be encouraged so long as there is no room for abuse and as the present law prevents such gifts being made, this Bill by clause 4 seeks to provide for exemption from tax in the case of gifts of annuities or other annual payments for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes, whether within or without the Island. But so as to prevent abuse, this Bill further provides that where the purpose for which the gift is made is to be effected outside the Island, exemption from tax shall only be allowed if the Governor-in-Executive Committee approves the purpose. This would permit deductions in cases of gifts made for purposes such as those mentioned in the preceding paragraph."

Section thirteen, paragraph (iv) of the Act will now read:—

“The income of any body of persons or trust not carried on for private pecuniary profit and which is established within the Island exclusively —

(a) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature within the Island, or

(b) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature which, being without the Island, are approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of exemption of its income from income tax under this paragraph.”

If a body of persons band themselves into a trust to collect funds for the purpose of subsidizing an organization in a neighbouring colony, it is hardly likely for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to allow that trust to be exempt from income tax; but if a body of persons form themselves in a trust for the purpose of educating Barbadian students who are living either here or abroad, the Governor-in-Executive Committee might feel that this benefit is for Barbadian children and we will permit exemptions. We are making it clear that we are still maintaining the principle that the charity or body of persons must be in the Island but we make the exemption subject to the approval of the Executive Committee if the trust established here is for an institution outside the Island. The Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture is an Institution which we can help.

I think that it should be sufficiently clear to honourable members what is the object of this amendment. It has always been possible for a person to get off income tax if he makes a gift to the Hospital or an Almshouse; this amendment goes further and allows exemptions for purposes outside the Island. I have spoken at greater length than perhaps this Bill would warrant, but I thought that if I made those explanations the honourable senior member for the City may not ask any questions. (Laughter). I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is something for which we, on this side of the table, have been asking for a long time. This Bill is a very commendable one and I am asking the Honourable Premier to give us a little enlightenment as to what type of charities would be considered as charities of a public nature. I understand that a Bill of this sort usually has a Schedule attached to it whereby it would be set out clearly that this charity and that charity will be exempt from income tax. There are a number of charities which exist today and at the end of the year when firms are paying their dividends they generally set aside something for these charities. I know a list of twenty charities and they are all deserving public charities. There are many companies in which I am interested; I see that list of charities every year and those charities are of such a nature that they embrace people from all walks of life. There are three or four Homes for elderly women, there is one for elderly gentlemen and I am sure that now that this Bill which we are considering will become law for this year's distribution of profits, it will encourage firms and persons to give to charities more generously than they have given in the past.

With the high taxation which is existing today, if a firm gives away \$2,000 to charities, it costs that firm \$800, to give away that \$2,000. I want to say that with Company Income Tax at the rate of

40% when firms give away that \$2,000 they have to give the Government \$800.00 on top of that; they would feel much more satisfied to give these charities \$4,000 if they knew that that money would go to the charities to which it is intended the money should go. I remember that during the War one firm was quite prepared to set aside a very large sum of money for some charities in Barbados but it was explained by the Managing Director that they would have to hand over to the Government so much money for taxation purposes that they should continue in the usual role. What I am asking is this: will the Hon. Premier consider putting in a Schedule all existing charities to which you could add or take away from?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the hon. member, the income which is exempt from taxation is the income of the charity or Institution itself—not the person who is giving the charity. Perhaps I may have given a wrong impression; voluntary gifts are free from income tax. If the honourable member suggest that the Government should review its point of view I would take that into consideration.

Mr. GODDARD: I am sorry if I did not understand the Hon. Premier clearly on that point, because I would say that this Bill does not go far enough. I ask the honourable member to review his point of view in Executive Committee. People give these charities which are deserving and it is right that the Government should encourage the giving to these charities because that relieves them of a burden of maintaining these Institutions which exist. Take secondary education, for instance. There are some private schools which are not run for any profit; trusts have been established and these schools are supported by contributions and dances. If these schools did not exist the very children who attend them would not be able to get into the existing secondary schools. Today there is a Waiting List attached to every school in this island, even the privately run non-profit schools. If the Government had a sufficient number of schools so as to accommodate all the children you would say that these other schools are not necessary; but they are necessary because four hundred children could not get into any secondary schools since there is no room for them.

We have Homes for people who are in fallen circumstances; they have to be provided for. There are people whose families pay for them so as to have them kept somewhere. Public-spirited men and women in this colony after investigating the circumstances of each family who has applied for assistance, render this assistance by giving contributions either on a weekly or monthly basis and they see that the money is spent to the best advantage. Unfortunately many people do not know the amount of charity which exists among all classes of people in Barbados. If this Bill is not what I interpret it to be, I am asking the Hon. Premier to pay some attention to it and see if what I have suggested cannot be put into effect; if we exempt Institutions and they are not covered by this Bill I think we will fall very short of the mark indeed. I like to see people give freely to worthy charities; a Schedule can be made out and the Government can say “This is a deserving charity and any one who gives to that will be exempt” I hope that the Government will pay due attention to the points I have made.

Mr. MILLER: I beg to support the remarks of the honourable junior member for Christ Church. It has occurred to me to ask the Government to insert a Schedule in this Bill in relation to deserving charities: I am always begging for something or the other. At the moment we are hoping to raise

the necessary funds for sending Mr. Nicholls to Vancouver; the Government gave a donation but we still want to raise the last \$500.00. I would mention the Carlton Cricket Club; there are people who would be happy to donate a gift to that Club as well as to other organizations like the Civic Theatre and the Empire Club, but there is the fear of having to pay income tax or company tax in respect of these gifts. I am also asking that the Government make a special effort to review the legislation which is at the moment before the House so as to have some arrangement made for people who are in a position to give assistance that such people may be provided with the necessary Schedule.

Mr. BARROW: I am afraid that everybody is making an appeal for exemption from income tax on account of gifts which are made for purposes which are other than charitable purposes. No one could suggest that a trip to Vancouver, laudable as it may be, is a charitable purpose within the meaning of the Act; that money would be spent before the income tax year had come around. I would suggest to the Government that if they want to encourage Institutions which we are attempting to foster, the Government should go further than the amendment which is before the House. I would like to see a certain amount of the cost of educating children at the University College of the West Indies to the extent of £250 per annum free from income tax. Speaking subject to correction, in Trinidad if a man is educating one of his children out of the colony — and I think that Barbados is not interpreted as a foreign colony — in respect of a barrister's son who is being educated in Barbados, the Court in Trinidad ruled that Barbados was not within the ambit of the particular Ordinance. This Act does not meet the requirements of people who send their children to the University College of the West Indies. If there is a conflict between sending a child to England to study Arts or Natural Science and a decision has to be made as between the United Kingdom and the University College of the West Indies, the Government should enable people to make a decision in favour of the University College of the West Indies and exempt a part of the income for the education of the child at the University College. Every child whom we send to England to be educated is put down to the national income and expenditure of the United Kingdom as part and parcel of the invisible exports of this country, just as the tourist trade is some part of the invisible exports of the Chancellor of Exchequer. If we want to keep money within the area we should encourage people to send their children to the University College of the West Indies. It has been admitted recently that if there were more students at the University College, the overhead charges would be more evenly distributed; there is still the tendency to place a snob value on education in the United Kingdom, something of which we are not completely innocent. Many of us still place a snob value on English education and I would suggest that preference should be given to education at the University College of the West Indies and provision should be made for something more far-reaching in respect of exempting income spent on children at the University College from income tax.

Another point is this; allowances are made for any debts which a person is legally obligated to pay. The anomalous position is that if any income tax payer in Barbados goes and incurs a debt of £10,000 for instance, and he signs an undertaking to repay that debt by instalments, those instalments are entirely free from income tax. No matter for what pur-

pose he incurs the debt, as long as he is under legal obligation to repay that debt, he can get it all free from income tax.

Another anomaly is this; a married man is allowed \$1,300.00 per annum for his wife, but if he divorces his wife and the Court orders that he pay his wife £500 per annum, or if he is separated from his wife and the Court orders that he pay £1,000 by way of alimony to his wife, the whole of that amount is free from taxation. That anomaly is putting a premium on unhappy marriages; it is encouraging husbands who cannot get on too well with their wives to be separated from their wives and pay them money by way of Court Orders. If a man is happily married he only has a deduction of \$1,300, but if he is separated from his wife he can get the whole of any amount which he has to pay by way of alimony free from income tax. I am not now talking about my interpretation of the Act because I am sure that the Honourable Premier will say that my interpretation is different from that of the Income Tax Commissioner; I am talking of the cases I have known. On the point of the judgment debt Section 18, sub-section (2) of the Act says this:—

“Annuities or other annual payments, whether payable within or out of this Island, either as a charge on any property of the person paying the same by virtue of any deed or will or otherwise, or as a reservation thereout, or as a personal debt or obligation by virtue of any contract; provided that no voluntary allowances or voluntary payments of any description shall be deducted;”

The position under this Sub-section is that all you have to do is to borrow £10,000 and sign a judgment debt for it in the Court of Common Pleas and you can get the whole of your income free from taxation. I actually challenged the Income Tax Commissioner about that matter and he refused to tell me whether he was adhering to the Rule or not. Those are the anomalies which I think the Government should consider if the consideration of this Bill is postponed. I hope that this matter will be taken up with the Attorney General and the Income Tax Commissioner. I am not suggesting that Section 18 Sub-section (2) of the Act is in the best interest of the Government; I am only pointing out certain anomalies which the Honourable Premier may not have had time to go into.

Another observation which I would like to make is this. Paragraph 3 of the “Objects and Reasons” states this:—

“As it is felt that gifts to charities should be encouraged so long as there is no room for abuse and as the present law prevents such gifts being made, this Bill by Clause 4 seeks to provide for exemption from tax in the case of gifts of annuities or other annual payments for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes, whether within or without the Island.”

I would like to say that I do not see how any Income Tax law could prevent anybody from making charitable gifts. I think the language which is used in the “Objects and Reasons” of this Bill is rather involved. Our present law does not prevent gifts to charity being made; by a sin of omission, our present law does not allow such gifts to be free from taxation. Members of the public should not be given the impression that this Government has a law preventing people from making charitable gifts. I would say this: there is a rule against a man leaving money for an indefinite period in his Will, and people go to the Court of Chancery and have these Clauses in Wills set aside. The people who usually move to do that are the members of the family of

the person who made the charitable gifts. I do not think that the Government would prevent anybody from making charitable gifts and they come within the definition of charitable gifts in the law both here and in the United Kingdom. I would therefore suggest that the definition of charitable purposes for the sake of freedom from Death Duties should be amended and that the Government should allow the expenses of educating children at the University College of the West Indies to be, to a large extent, free from taxation if not altogether. In view of the future federation of these territories what I have suggested would stop the definite drain which takes place from year to year from these Colonies to the United Kingdom and which is classified as invisible exports by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I must agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in the observations which he has made. Before I go very strong on the matter, I am wondering whether the Hon. Premier will agree with the actual amendment which we are proposing to this Bill. With regard to Section 4 of the Bill, is it right to say that the Act as it is proposed to be amended, will give an individual the right to exemption if he makes a gift to charity? If this Section is to be interpreted in the way in which I interpret it, then it only remains for me to suggest that I think that the best way of avoiding abuse in this respect would be to have a Schedule attached to this Bill. If you make gifts to charitable institutions it must be obvious that the Income Tax Commissioner will demand the receipts proving that you have given something to charity. I have read the American Income Tax Act and allowances are made in respect of gifts for religious purposes. When a man puts down \$120 for religious purposes he does not get any receipt for that; you do not get a receipt when you put collection in the plate; when the honourable junior member for St. Philip comes once a year and makes his collection for Missionary purposes, what happens? We must commend the Government for bringing forward this amendment. I recall that just recently when the first Lady of the Land was opening a Creche in Christ Church it was reported that she suggested that she would like to see more of these charitable organizations started so as to relieve the miserable conditions existing among the people in the outlying parishes. It was pointed out in an article in the Press that the difficulty was that while people were willing to give to charitable organizations they were not given any relief by way of income tax.

I recall a few years ago that a gentleman of some affluence in this City had an amount of money to be drawn from public funds, and he asked me if I would recommend some charitable institutions to which he could give this money. Naturally, I thought of Mr. John Beckles' Institution which I consider to be the best working Institution of its kind in the Colony, and I suggested that one-half of the money should be given to that Institution. However, the unfortunate thing was that the gentleman came back to me and said that if he gave away this \$1,800 he would have to pay income tax on it. The result was that Mr. John Beckles' Institution and other Institutions which I recommended for this charity were the poorer; it was not that the Government was the richer. If my interpretation of this Bill is a correct one, I strongly commend the Government for having brought it down; but I suggest strongly that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed for the reason that throughout the Bill there is that fear of abuse unless the position is made absolutely clear. Now that the Government is giving the right to persons to get

exemptions from gifts to charity there will be the opportunity for abuse as intimated by the honourable senior member for St. George, unless you attach a Schedule to this Bill.

I say definitely that a matter of this importance should not be left to the whims and fancies of the Executive Committee; let this Chamber decide on having a Schedule to this Bill, because some day it might be argued that some members of the Executive Committee favoured some organizations and I will not support any exemption for any class organization. In the circumstances, I think it is better for the Government to postpone the consideration of this Bill and let a Schedule be attached to it. There are things which can be left to the discretion of the Executive Committee, but I have a list of the charitable organizations in this Colony, and I say that it is not sufficient for people to say that they are acting in the interest of charitable organizations, people who do not intend to look for work to do at all, but who, under the guise of helping other people, are putting money into their own pockets. You may have members of the Executive Committee disposed towards such individuals and that might not make nice reading when it is finished in this House. I repeat, let a Schedule be attached to this Bill. We believe in freedom of worship and people may say that this is a religious organization but one wonders if we should not insist on a certain percentage being given to charity. Let us attach a Schedule to this Bill once and for all, and I am wondering if we should not say: "This is the limit to which a man should be able to give to charity." If I press on the honourable senior member for Christ Church to give £5,000 to some organization (Hon. G. H. ADAMS, the Electors' Association?) like the Barbados Progressive League. The honourable Premier has put that straight in my mouth and I ask him to avoid suspicion.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member, but only charities outside the island have to be approved by the Executive Committee.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If that is so, the honourable member should appreciate the more that a Schedule should be attached to this Bill. I appeal to the honourable member, but I can always tell his stubbornness from the nod of his head. (Laughter). When you make an amendment to the Act there is always the possibility of advantage being taken of it. I repeat that there should be some limit to the amount given to charity; charity should be defined in a Schedule just as you have it in your Customs Regulations now that registered charitable organizations and not individuals are given exemptions with respect to gifts of clothing, and so on, which are sent from the United States of America. Finally, I say that the principal thing is that there should be a limit to the amount which you should give to charity for religious purposes, for scientific purposes and even for the education of children. There are quite a number of people who have children at the University College of the West Indies and they will have to do everything possible to keep them there; there are other people who can put down any astronomical figure and it is the Government's business to see peoples' returns. The Chief Justice of the island can only interpret the law as he sees it. I again suggest to the honourable member that he should postpone the consideration of this Bill and consider the points which have been made in connection with it.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am grateful for the suggestion which honourable members have made as regards putting a Schedule to this Bill, but it is im-

possible to carry out that suggestion. In connection with charities outside the island, are you going to look up, for instance, all the religious organizations in England? You would have to put in every College in the world in the Schedule. The Governor-in-Executive Committee is nothing to do with local charities; if the Income Tax Commissioner is satisfied that the charity is of a public nature, it is exempted from income tax. The danger I see is in the fact that there are 66 or more religious organizations in this island; that might give the Income Tax Commissioner some trouble. I should like to point out that a chance gift is not an annuity; the Bill provides that no voluntary allowances or voluntary payments of any description shall be deducted other than voluntary payments by way of annuities or other annual payments made exclusively for these charitable purposes which are of a public nature within the island. A man may say that he gave the Wesleyan Church £100 this year, but the Income Tax Commissioner could not allow any exemption because he may not be doing the same thing next year. In order to show that it is an annuity or annual payment he would have to make two payments or be bound by contract to pay annually just as sometimes you give by way of order that you will pay a subscription to your Old Boys' Club for five years. That is a certainty; it is an annual payment and therefore you can get off exemption. The fact that it is an annual payment will prevent abuse before it starts. I must appeal to the honourable member to see that you cannot make a Schedule in respect of every possible worthy cause outside the island. In British newspapers you will see that appeals are made to contribute to the Cancer Hospital; if somebody came along and said "I am binding myself to pay an annuity to the Cancer Hospital," we would say "Yes," but if you put that Institution in a Schedule you will have to put in many others. If the honourable member appeals to the Government to make a Schedule to this Bill he must see that making such a Schedule is impossible. While locally the danger lies with these many religious denominations, very few people will have positive evidence to satisfy the Income Tax Commissioner that they are not making a solitary gift but that they are binding themselves every year to give something to this or that religious denomination. I thank the honourable member for pointing out to me the wording of Clause 4, but it is provided that the payment must be an annual one for public purposes. To confine this provision to an Old Women's Home would not be charitable within the meaning of the law. If honourable members hear that the Income Tax Commissioner has not allowed a gift to a particular organization to be exempt from taxation they must see if the organization comes within the definition of public charity. The possibility of abuse seems to be in respect of religious organizations and it is difficult to see anybody putting himself down to pay something regularly every year to these organizations.

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

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

Clauses 1, 2 and 3, were respectively called and passed.

Clause 4 was called. It reads as follows:—

4. Subsection (2) of section eighteen of the principal Act is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the semi-colon appearing after the word

"contract" and by deleting all the words appearing after the word "contract" to the end of the subsection and substituting therefor the following—

"Provided that no voluntary allowances or voluntary payments of any description shall be deducted, other than voluntary payments by way of an annuity or other annual payment made exclusively—

- (a) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature within the Island, or
- (b) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature which, being without the Island, are approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of permitting deductions to be made in pursuance of this subsection."

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Chairman,—At the second reading of the Bill, I understood the Hon. Premier to say that the honourable junior member for Christ Church said that the income of the person making the gift will not be free from taxation, and that only the income of the charitable bodies would be free from taxation. I do not think he meant that, but that is what he said.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I did give that impression at first. But I said later, before I sat, I am making a correction of the impression given earlier. I said then, both would be covered and exempted provided they gave the necessary information.

Mr. BARROW: I never understood the Hon. Premier to say both. He said, that he thanked the honourable junior member for Christ Church for pointing out the payments. If you are making a charitable donation, it would not be liable for deduction; anyhow, I do not think we should make any heavy argument over that. I can see where the confusion has arisen in the minds of honourable members; it is a question of what I consider to be rather poor drafting. It is set out in section 18 the deductions which are allowable on income to be paid. Under sub-section 2 of section 18, instead of setting out the deductions which are allowable from persons' returns, it is left at that. The way it is drafted at present is that a proviso is put in, as follows:—

"Provided that no voluntary allowances or voluntary payments of any description shall be deducted other than voluntary payments by way of an annuity or other annual payments made exclusively—

- (A) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature within the Island, or
- (B) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature which, being without the Island, are approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of permitting deductions to be made in pursuance of this subsection."

It can be seen by this that deductions are by direct and indirect inferences rather than by direct application. This is not a criticism on the Bill; even the *apologia* given by the honourable Premier, did not clear up the matter in the minds of honourable members.

The question that clause 4, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 5 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, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND ESTATE AND SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT, 1941

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: The next order of the day, stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of the Bill to amend the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941, and to provide for certain exemptions in the case of charities.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is similar to the last. We are doing for the Estate and Succession Duties Act, what we have done to the Income Tax Act. As the objects and reasons show:—

Paragraph (3) of the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941, allows, subject to certain restrictions, exemption from succession duty in the case of gifts made to charities that satisfy the requirements of paragraph (iv) of section 13 of the Income Tax Act, 1921, and in the case of gifts made for any purposes solely charitable to be carried out in this Island.

In pursuance of the policy of encouraging gifts to charities, as expressed in the Bill intituled the Income Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1954, and in order that the law relating to death duties may be kept in line with that applicable to Income Tax, this Bill seeks to exempt from both Estate and Succession Duties gifts made to charities which satisfy the requirements of the above-mentioned Bill as well as gifts made for charitable purposes recognised by the provisions of that Bill.

To ensure that where exemption from Estate Duty is allowed the sum so allowed shall be fair and equitable, this Bill seeks to provide that the sum so allowed shall be calculated on a proportionate basis.

In short what we have done to the Income Tax Act, we are doing here.

Schedule A of the Estate and Succession Duties Act, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting paragraph (3) thereof appearing under the head "Exemptions" and substituting therefor the following new paragraph —

"(3) (1) The provisions of sub-paragraph (2) of this paragraph shall apply to any interest or property given either *inter vivos* or by will in any of the following circumstances, that is to say —

(a) in support of any body of persons or trust establishment within the Island exclusively—

(i) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature within the Island, or

(ii) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature which, being without the Island, are approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of this paragraph;

(b) for charitable, religious, educational or scientific purposes of a public nature within the Island or for such purposes which, being without the Island, are approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the purpose of this paragraph;

Provided always that bona fide possession and enjoyment shall have been or shall be assured by the donee or legatee immediately upon payment of the legacy or upon receipt of the gift and thereafter retained to the entire exclusion of any benefit to any relative of the donor or testator by contract or otherwise.

(2) In any case to which the provisions of this sub-paragraph apply —

(a) no succession duty shall be payable;

(b) There shall be deducted from the total amount of estate duty payable in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Act, an amount which bears to such total amount of estate duty the same proportion as the value of such interest or property so given bears to the total value of the interest or property upon which the total amount of estate duty is payable.

(3) For purposes of this paragraph the expression "body of persons" means any body politic, corporate or collegiate and any company, fraternity, fellowship and society of persons whether corporate or not corporate."

Although I think this legal drafting is clear to honourable members, if they want to see what are the present exemptions and the paragraph which it affects, they can turn to Estates and Succession Duties Act, 1941, — 16 on page 663 of Volume V. In place of paragraph 3 of the exemptions which exist now that section which I have just read is added: This is how the paragraph was worded in the Act:—

"Succession duty shall not be payable in respect of any interest or property given either *inter vivos* or by will in support of any religious, charitable, or educational Institutions situate in this island, or for any purpose solely charitable to be carried out in this Island, provided always that bona fide possession and enjoyment shall have been or shall be assured by the donee or legatee immediately upon payment of the legacy or upon receipt of the gift and thereafter retained to the entire exclusion of any benefit to any relative of the donor or testator by contract or otherwise, and provided further that exemption from payment of such duty is allowed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee."

We are deleting that now and in its place we are putting the provisions which I have just read to you and which is in the Bill. 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 of the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were respectively 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, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF LONDON CONFERENCE ON WEST INDIAN FEDERATION RESUMED

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—The Government proposes to go back to Item No. 1, to resume debate on the consideration of the Report of the London Conference on West Indian Federation. I am therefore asking leave to proceed with that order.

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

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I do not propose to speak at length on this matter because I think we all would agree that the discussion and the debate on it have on *ad nauseam* and it must be a relief to honourable members now that the debate on it seems to be approaching finality and our decision will be made known in the very near future, possibly tonight. I think we all agree that the delegates to the London Conference should be congratulated on the remarkable degree of unanimity which they achieved. Up to the time that the London Conference took place, we in the West Indies, like "Alice in Wonderland" were running quickly hither and thither and getting no where. We seemed as if we were simply going back to the position where we started. However, when we take into consideration the divergence of views of the delegates who attended the London Conference; when we take into consideration the peculiar circumstances which certain colonies had to face in considering this matter, I think we should all agree that it is remarkable to see to what extent of common ground they reached in their decisions, and how well they were able to sink their individual objections in the interest of the region as a whole. In fact, that the Conference was able to report as it did and to arrive at the decisions which were arrived at speak a great deal for the amount of give and take and the degree of compromise effected by the delegates.

Sir, I think honourable members would agree that there is no need for us to argue that federation of the West Indies is desirable; we have covered that ground already. We have gone on record as being in favour of federation but have disagreed with certain recommendations of the Rance Report. I take it therefore, that this House agrees with federation of the West Indies as not only acceptable in principle, or generally acceptable, but very much desired. However, it is very obvious from the debates in this House on the last two occasions when we were giving consideration to this matter that there have been some recriminations. There has been a degree of what I would term as "leaning over backwards" on the part of certain honourable members of this Assembly, so far as certain fundamental viewpoints on federation are concerned. We are definitely in danger of overlooking the need to stress that Barbados should not go into a West Indian Federation unless there is emigration or the free movement of people within the area. From the speeches of certain members of the Opposition on the last occasion, there seems to be some softening up of their attitude towards that question. I refer specifically to the speeches of the honourable senior member for St. George and the honourable junior member for St. James who I am sorry are not in their places at the moment and in view of the fact that much prominence was given to certain views of theirs, not only in the newspapers of Barbados but also in Trinidad, I feel that we should restate and re-emphasize our position and our viewpoint on this question of freedom of movement.

Sir, to show you how seriously we regarded this issue of freedom of movement when we debated it last year, I would just quote from a speech by the honourable junior member for St. James. I am going to quote a paragraph which I think is particularly apt, for the simple reason that because federation has been delayed, it seems to be the policy of certain people, for political reasons, to thrust their powers in the direction of Barbados and to accuse this party in power of delaying federation for political, personal and other reasons. It is for that reason that I would like to quote from the speech made by the honourable junior member for

St. James in February last year in this Chamber when we debated this matter just before the London Conference took place. The honourable member said then:—

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

Sir, I quote that paragraph to show that there was a certain degree of unanimity in this House and by members of the Opposition on the point that the proposed Federal Body would have a constitution not as advanced as that of Barbados. On that fundamental point there was widespread objection. It was not a matter of politics, party or personal; it was an objection which the Leader of the Opposition at that time commented on and strongly endorsed. The honourable member went on to say:—

"I would never agree to allowing Her Majesty-in-Council to have the power to make laws for the public order, and the preservation of law and order throughout the Federal West Indies."

That is what he stated. He went on to say:—

"As a matter of fact, my only doubt about Jamaica which I know was lukewarm in 1946-47 is that she is likely to remain so in the future because she would desire to have some form of constitution such as Ceylon, because she feels she is big enough to be able to do better, and far enough away to be able to do better if she remains by herself. In my opinion, if we are going to start a federation, we should not allow the question of whether or not Jamaica will come in, prevent us from proceeding, because the difficulties of distance may undoubtedly be overcome as they are being overcome day after day by more rapid transportation."

Mr. Speaker, I say again, I quote those viewpoints of the honourable junior member for St. James to show that far from any one party, or any one person in Barbados doing this or that to retard federation, all parties at that time in this House agreed that federation was desirable but stressed that certain proposals in the Rance Report were not acceptable to Barbados, therefore every effort should be made to have the Report amended or revised.

We go on to what I consider the most important question so far as Barbados is concerned; and that is freedom of movement in these territories. I will quote again from the honourable junior member for St. James to show the feeling of this House on the matter. He said:—

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

That was the viewpoint of one of the leading members of the Opposition. He is saying most specifically and strongly that so far as Barbados

is concerned, this matter of emigration was a most vital one. The Opposition went so far as to say,—and I am remembering in part the words of the honourable senior member for the City,—that the Leader of the House as the honourable Premier was at that time, should go to London with the understanding that we are not entering federation unless there is freedom of movement throughout the colonies. That in effect were the remarks which the honourable senior member for the City made at that time and his words reflected the views, the sentiments and the wishes of honourable members of this House at that time. It was not a matter at that time of one party thinking so, or one individual thinking so; it was a matter of the whole House thinking so. We thought that that was fundamental to the whole issue of federation and on it the ship of State of federation would proceed in calmer seas or hit the rocks. Judging from the tenor of the debate on the past two occasions that view seems to be less clear, and certain newspapers carry the impression that one party of this House is trying to delay federation because it is not willing to give in on this particular question of freedom of movement.

I think this House as a whole, or with a few exceptions, would agree that a headline in the *Trinidad Guardian* recently makes it appear as if this House has changed its views on this question of federation and is now in sympathy with the views of Mr. Hannays of Trinidad or is willing to compromise on this issue of freedom of movement between these two territories. I think I speak for this House as a whole when I say that that headline does not convey the viewpoint of this House on the issue. We believe that freedom of movement is fundamental, vital and implicit to the very idea of having federation. The honourable senior member for St. George said at the time he was *athanasius contra mundum* in his argument that the question of freedom of movement was a domestic matter and a matter of economics. I think his case is one of *Athanasius contra Athanasium*. The honourable member further said that the question might well be left on the Concurrent List because if Trinidad wanted workers from abroad, she would bring them in. That is simply the attitude of mind of one honourable member who seems to be compromising in order to find favour with some other party. Sir, this matter of freedom of movement is fundamental to the whole issue of federation and we should get to the bottom of it; we should not treat it as if it does not matter. The policy which is domestic to Trinidad today would not be domestic in Trinidad tomorrow in a federal set up. I would just draw a comparison with the United States of America. If the industrial situation in that country is such that there is need for workers from abroad, it would let them in, but when it does not need those workers it would put up barriers against them. But it is erroneous to compare that situation with the movement of peoples between one State and another. Would the State of California think of blocking workers from another State of the U.S.A.? We have to bear in mind that Trinidad and Barbados would not be separate islands in a federal set up; they would be all part and parcel of the federal set up, and the question of freedom of movement would be a domestic matter to the whole federal body. It is vital that we in this House of Assembly should not allow it to appear as if we are giving in one iota on this matter of freedom of movement. I think it is a pity that Trinidad is adopting a short-sighted attitude in this respect, while at the same time making it appear as if she is in favour of federation. I am sure if Trinidad is in favour of federation,

she would look beyond her insular problems as regards all these things which should be the concern of the region as a whole; and adopt a regional attitude.

Mr. Speaker, — I feel that this question of freedom of movement is the biggest issue which was debated in this House on the last two occasions that we discussed this question of federation. I feel if the West Indies can solve and overcome this issue now, we will advance much nearer to federation than we have done in the past. The honourable Premier has made a suggestion which still keeps the door open for Trinidad to change its policy and to make the achievement of a West Indian Federation easier. I think, Mr. Speaker, if the House adopt that suggestion in the resolution, it would show that we are willing to adopt a reasonable and sound attitude on this question, and that we are willing to compromise to a certain extent without sacrificing anything which we hold fast to in this matter.

Now, Sir, another point raised in this Assembly on the last occasion but which I do not regard as fundamental as freedom of movement, was that of the Federal Capital. Some honourable members expressed the view that Barbados from the administrative point of view was well suited for the Federal Capital. I think when those honourable members stated that point of view, they stated all that was required to be stated. However, the honourable senior member for St. George said in his speech on the matter that we have lost pride in our race; that we have severed all our connections with Africa and from that point of view, Barbados is not suited to be the Federal Capital. I believe that point of view applies to many colonies not only Barbados. Jamaica is the only colony which it can be said has retained a burning sense of nationalism, and in the real sense of the word. In connection with Africa, Jamaica still retains a certain racial cult, that of the bearded African tribe, while it is true to say that all other colonies, in certain respects, have lost sense of connection for their forbears and a certain pride in our race. I do not see why any person should imagine that Barbadians do not have a glowing pride in the fact that our racial forebears were Africans. Sir, I am not going to dwell for any length of time on the Federal Capital because I feel if West Indians are sincere and earnest in their desire to have federation in the near future, they would not allow the issue of the Federal Capital to endanger it. I feel that Barbados should not be insular in this respect even though we should not undervalue ourselves to the extent of saying that we do not think the Federal Capital should be here. If, for administrative purposes, Barbados would be a most excellent place for the headquarters, I think that such consideration should weigh a great deal in any discussions about the Federal headquarters. The fact that we have regional conferences taking place here periodically, — only last week a conference of the Regional Economic Committee took place here,—the fact that we have good means of communications and are improving them, from those points of view, I think we have good claims to be the Federal Capital; but, as I have already said, that issue should not be allowed to stand in the way of our reaching agreement in the very near future on a West Indian Federation. I think we should have sufficient pride in our well being to believe that we can contribute as much as anybody else; and if the Federal Capital is offered to us, we should only be too glad to accept the honour and well and truly say that Barbados would make one of the best centres for the Capital when these islands are under a federal setup.

I started out by saying that those were the two primary matters which were aired in this House and on which I wished to dwell on at some length. Despite the fact that much water has flowed under the bridge since this question of federation was discussed at the conference at Montego Bay, I do not think any of us should despair over the matter coming to fruition at an early date. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, those of us who have seen and watched the affairs of the West Indies in the past few years know that West Indian leaders and peoples are coming together on important issues and are reaching agreement on them, thus making it easier for us to enter into the spirit and the adoption of federation. Recently, the West Indies took common action on such matters as citrus and sugar, and only last week it took common action on the matter of inter-island shipping which is of very vital concern to the Leeward and Windward Islands. Those of us who were privileged to take part in the discussions on those issues must pay tribute to the spirit of regionalism and to the importance of give and take, seeing each other's burdens and giving up something in order to assist in overcoming those burdens. Those of us who were privileged to see this attitude on the part of West Indian leaders have no reason to fear that although a West Indian Federation has taken a long time to emerge, or has been in the air for a long time, the efforts of West Indian leaders have been in vain. There are good hopes for the future of a West Indian Federation.

Sir, I think the assurance given by Her Majesty the Queen to a recent delegation to London that when the Governments of the British Caribbean take action together, they would be given equal status in negotiations in matters concerning G.A.T.T. or other matters vitally affecting the region, is an illustration of what we can achieve by a united and concerted stand. The fact that not only can we demand such a status but get it is an achievement. It shows West Indian peoples, as a whole, what we can achieve when we act together and go forward together representing the region as a whole.

As I have said already, we are now moving forward definitely towards our final decision and final stand so far as the London Conference, which I consider is the most vital, is concerned; and there will be no doubts in the minds of members of other territories as to how we regard the issue and what we feel about it when we give our decision. I think I can truly say that the only colony which will be out on the limb, so to speak, in this matter, will be Trinidad after we have reached our decision tonight. I think Trinidad should also come along at this time and show that she is willing to compromise on this issue of freedom of movement and to play her part in achieving federation for the West Indies. Sir, we have entered the debate on this question of West Indian Federation in good spirit; we have compromised so far as the constitution is concerned. We had our considered views on that question but we have compromised on them. If there should be free trade within the federation, well then, so far as Barbados is concerned, we insist that we must have freedom of movement. If we are to buy your goods, you must open your doors to the other islands which have surplus populations. We should not prevent anybody coming to Barbados because there is no work for them. The same thing should apply to all territories within the federation. If there is no opportunity for work for people in a territory, people will want to go to another territory to see if they can find work to do, and if they do not find work to do they will go back to the territory to which they belong inasmuch as they will quickly discover that it is better to be unemployed at home than in

any other territory. This defeats all the arguments against freedom of movement. This is the only issue which we feel strongly on, and if we can come to a common agreement on it, we would be doing ourselves and our reputation a good turn, and we would be able to prove to the world that we are greatly in favour of federation. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need to examine this question at any greater length than we have done already because we have covered a vast amount of ground on the question, in the past. It is time that we should think of bringing this job to a conclusion within the very near future.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move—

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Social Services has caught my eye first.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for three quarters of an hour.

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

RESUMPTION

On re-assembling,

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was debating the motion on Federation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is an occasion when no honourable member should be silent, and that is the only reason why I am speaking. I believe this is the third occasion on which members of this Chamber have spoken on this matter. I think this is not an occasion for flowery or flamboyant speeches, but an occasion for honourable members of this Chamber to make an appeal to the leaders of political thought in these islands to give honest and sincere action in this matter. Within recent years, since the advent of this talk about federation, we have discussed the pros and cons of it. We have tried to interest the man in the street in it because it can truly be said that to the average man in the street federation is a matter of indifference. I believe it can also be said that federation is a matter which all of us in this Chamber are free to express our views as it is not one of those matters which are parochial or domestic or for which we are accountable to the members of our constituency or party. It is one of those matters in which the moulders of political thought and general public opinion in the West Indies are responsible; therefore, it remains for those of us outside of that inner circle, not only from Barbados but from the other colonies, to make this last appeal to those who have to discuss this matter on the higher level, that we do not want them to make mere speeches but to give honest and sincere opinion to the matter.

From the history which we have been able to read, we learn that many years ago an attempt was made to federate these islands in the British Caribbean, but it was felt that the British Government was forcing it on the people of these colonies. There is still that feeling among some people today. I have read practically all of the speeches which were made on this matter. I have read those which were made at the Montego Bay Conference and those which have been made in England, but I am not quoting from any of them this evening. I shall not quote anything from what was expressed by the honourable Premier, or Hon. (Bertie) Gomes or Hon. Alexander Bustamante or Mr. Manley; I am going to express my view as I see it.

When an expression of views was given to this question of West Indian Federation many years ago,

I said in this Chamber that I was supporting it although I did not see Barbados gaining anything by it in the immediate or the foreseeable future, either constitutional or otherwise. I am not repeating that today because I think it is well known. I would repeat what I said then, and that is human relationship must move on or it must perish. If we were to sit and think of Barbados and its constitution which is a more advanced constitution than that of Jamaica, or Trinidad, or the Leeward Islands or the Windward Islands, even before we had this further advance in our constitution, we are bound to say that Barbados has nothing to gain by entering a West Indian Federation. But we must move on and no one should attempt to resist changes. Even although up to this day I can see no immediate benefit for Barbados entering a federal setup, I am conscious of the fact—though I cannot see very far in the future,—that the changes which enlightened political opinion is making us to believe would be better for the future development of these colonies, as a whole and the peoples of the colonies, are of no immediate benefit to this island. I am referring specifically to economic advancement, not to political advancement. Therefore, if we in Barbados can lend our weight by joining in a West Indian Federation for the economic advancement of these colonies or to bind the people in them together as a nation, then I must say: "Yes, let us federate."

The honourable Premier, the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable junior member for St. James, who have had the honour to attend the Conference at Montego Bay, have given us a general outline of what took place, and it remains for us either to agree with what they said or make our suggestions. Let me say that the way in which these talks on federation have progressed, we in Barbados have had no reason to change our minds on the question. We of this small Opposition in this House always offered federation our support. As I have often said, it is a question of a federation of your people and not your colony. I think a West Indian Federation is a unique attempt because of the water which divides the colonies from one another, but we must give study to what real benefits it might be to the smaller colonies; and I must include Barbados with the Leeward and Windward Islands though some politicians seem to put Barbados on a pedestal above those islands. When it comes to size, I do not place Barbados on a different pedestal, but as I have said, our constitution is far in advance of the others.

Mr. Speaker,—I must say that it is a serious blow to a federation of the West Indies without British Guiana and British Honduras joining in. As I have said, you federate people. I feel if there is to be economic advancement, you as a nation to present a case, must have area. From St. Kitts to as far east as Barbados, you will find all the colonies that are British have one thing in common. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Premier must realise that because British Guiana and British Honduras are not coming into the federation, a very serious blow is given to our efforts.

When this matter was discussed on the last occasion in this House, it was from this side of the table that we made it clear to the honourable Premier who was then Leader of the House, that we were giving him a free hand in the discussions that were to take place in London. We believed that with his experience as a constitutional lawyer and with his knowledge of West Indian matters he would always give sound judgment to all matters that came up for consideration, but the one thing which we asked him was not to give way in any respect to the ques-

tion of freedom of movement or emigration. We made it quite clear to him that we were not going to accept any compromise on that question. I sat, I listened and I read, and I must confess that I was at a loss to understand how any attempt could be made to offer any compromise on that question or how he can offer any compromise. It would be an outrageous departure from the trust which we had bestowed in him. We would be let down. On the other hand, immediately following the Conference in London on West Indian Federation, you read in Trinidad of happenings which in my opinion show that Trinidad is doing everything to prevent federation. The politicians of that country who apparently believe that Trinidad is the only place in the world, knowing very well that the honourable Premier of this Assembly is not going to compromise on anything that would say Barbadians cannot move freely into Trinidad, Jamaica, or any other colony, have taken a new angle. It is most selfish at this time to find Trinidad putting up barriers against people of other colonies and deporting people belonging to other colonies who are there. At this time, you find that people from Antigua, St. Kitts, Jamaica and other West Indian colonies are moving freely in England; yet Trinidad is putting up barriers against them and saying, "Get out of here." Sir, is that an honest and sincere effort if you are saying that you want federation? (VOICES: Shame! Shame!) Sir, West Indians are going to England by the four and five hundreds, and rightly so; and are causing the greatest embarrassment to the British people, but a Barbadian cannot go to Trinidad, neither can a Vincentian or any other West Indian unless he fills out 400 forms. Sir, I am still of the same opinion today on freedom of movement as I was on the last occasion. Whatever phraseology, parliamentary, legal or otherwise, you adopt to draft it into your constitution, let it be simple and plain that West Indians must move freely within the States or in the federation. All other things, even if it is the question that the Federal Capital should be in Barbados, are of a secondary nature. Of course I know that the climate of Barbados, the living conditions, and I believe the rum of Barbados—

His Hon. THE SPEAKER: The honourable member must be serious.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am serious, Sir, I am saying that the question of the Federal Capital will right itself, but I think it will be a wonderful thing to have the Federal Capital here. The honourable Premier has always disagreed with me when I say that everything that goes up will come down. It has taken him 20 years to reach the position which he now occupies; and with that experience, for him to agree to Barbados entering a West Indian Federation when Barbadians would have to remain in Barbados and cannot go into Trinidad or Jamaica, would be beyond my knowledge of him. Sir, imagine going from Baltimore to California and having all sorts of barriers. Let me say again that freedom of movement is the most essential and the most important thing in this matter of a West Indian Federation.

There is one other point which I would like to make.

It has been reported to me that the honourable Premier himself in closed conferences has been expressing the view that a section of the Barbados public, normally the Conservative element is opposed to federation. I hope that statement is not true and that rumour is a lying jade. Let me say that the views expressed by the Hon. H. A. Cuke in the Other Place on federation are his views. It is not

true to say that members of the party to which I belong are opposed to federation; any statement to that effect is untrue.

There are one or two things which I said on the last occasion which I think are appropriate to repeat now for the benefit of the honourable Premier. This would also apply to the politicians selected by the various colonies to represent those colonies at these talks. It is the desire of the Ministers here that members of the Local Chambers should be allowed to sit in the Federal Chamber also, and they use as an argument to the people in England to support that view, that you cannot find sufficient people in these colonies with the political acumen and ability, either to take over from them in the Local Chamber or to go forward to the Federal Chamber. I think it is absolutely selfish to hold that view. I will go as far as to say this: if you remove the honourable Premier or whoever you like and place him in a higher position, there is no chance at all of this colony going backwards, not even to where it was ten years ago. I therefore say, if the honourable Premier, or the Hon. A. Gomes of Trinidad, or the Hon. A. Bustamante of Jamaica, got before English statesmen behind closed doors and maligned the people of these colonies, it is downright selfishness and dishonesty and plainly personal. If the honourable Premier of this colony succeed to the Federal Government, or Mr. Manley or any leading politician in these parts, there are in these colonies young and astute people able to fill those seats and many of them are sincere. I know the fear is that many of them are too far left; but I say: "Give a leftist responsibility and guide him." Sir, none of us knows the length of our time here; therefore do not let us wait until our leading politicians are snatched away to look around for suitable people to fill their places. I would not support any idea that in your Federal Constitution you should write something to give people the right to serve in the Federal Government and in the Local Legislatures at the same time. This is not so in the Federal Governments of the United States, New Zealand, or Canada. I say again that there are youngsters in every one of these colonies who would be competent and capable of taking over from those who proceed from local legislatures to the Federal Legislature; and with guidance these youngsters would be able to conduct themselves to the benefit and advancement of the people of these colonies. Therefore, to go behind closed doors and make this indictment is as good as saying that the few who were sent to the Montego Bay Conference are the only people who can fill the seats in the Federal Legislature. It is dishonest and unkind to hold that view of other people who are up and coming in the political life, not only in this colony but in other West Indian colonies.

Now, Sir, the only dissentient voice of this Chamber, against federation is the voice of the honourable senior member for St. John. However, I believe his contribution is an honest and sincere expression of his own views. Probably he has not given sufficient thought to the matter. It would be rather easy for me to express that view also, when I take into consideration all the various commitments of this colony in the past, or commitments to the University College of the West Indies, the Regional Economic Committee, Ministerial Status and numerous other commitments like those, and the commitments which this Colony will have to meet within the next couple of weeks when the Maude Bill is passed. When you add to that our expenses for a Federal Government you will see we are just going on and on spending money without any immediate benefit to the man in the street. But, as I

have said, one is bound to look beyond that. Of all the organisations which were set within the last ten years in these colonies and in this part of the world, I believe that the greatest good can be done by regional planning. I have read reports of all sorts of different organisations set up in these parts during the last ten years and I lay greater stress and confidence in the work of the Regional Economic Committee than in any other body. Even, as I scan the various reports of these federal committees I am at a loss, because while I can offer criticism to the people of Trinidad for not wanting federation and to the leaders of Jamaica for their trying to stand aloof, I have also to offer to the leaders of political thought my praise and compliments in what they are doing or attempting to do. On the other hand, I have also to offer compliments to the Leaders of Jamaica and Trinidad for attracting foreign capital to their shores. It is most important to attract foreign capital for the development of your country, and in this respect I may say that we in Barbados apparently have missed the bus. We have lagged behind for some time. It was thought to be a political issue; but I do not think sufficient thought was paid to it by Government. Meanwhile we have missed the bus. If you are going to federate your three and a half million people as a nation you must industrialize your colonies. What I fear about this matter is what are the English industrialists coming in these parts to do. I would like to see them come to develop and use our local products rather than taking the work from us and manufacturing and producing the goods in England, and sending these goods back to us. I must say again that I have the greatest admiration for what Mr. Bustamante has done for Jamaica in this respect. I have also the greatest admiration for the Leaders of Trinidad because they say "Trinidad, and Trinidad all the time," although it can be termed as selfish to say so.

Unfortunately, British Honduras and British Guiana will not be joining the federation, but I believe they will have to come in sooner or later. I think the success of a British West Indian federation will depend on British Honduras and British Guiana joining in the federation. It may not appear so to other people but it appears so to me. Those countries have vast areas and natural resources to be developed. It can be said that we have seen the greatest developments in these parts since we have been talking about federation, and attracting foreign capital. I am sure the Hon. Premier or anybody else cannot deny that. I have been watching this matter very carefully. What matters to the man in the street is his getting a pay envelope to carry home to feed his family. What will matter to him most in a federal set up is whether he can move from Barbados to Trinidad, Jamaica, British Honduras or British Guiana in order to find work to do. Therefore, there must be freedom of movement.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is not something forced upon us by the British Government. Even if it is forced upon us we should accept it because we would be able to present a case better as a nation. I do not propose to argue about our security; that must be left to the United Kingdom. I may say at this juncture that I am one of the greatest critics of the British people in this country but I am more than conscious that it is because I am British,—if I can use that term,—that I am allowed to be so great a critic. However, I do believe that the British have a greater sense of the administration of justice dealing with the peoples of this colony than any other nation of the world, therefore, I am

very proud to be under the British Flag and proud because I am able to do what I have done in here today. Nevertheless, if your mother is wrong you are going to tell her that she is wrong. With all this political freedom there is still behind the scenes the attempt to keep us in economic strangulation, and unless the Leaders of these colonies thwart that, they will be doing the people of these colonies the greatest harm. You may put the federal headquarters in Grenada or wherever you like. Let the Premier of the Federal Government jump about the Caribbean on a salary of £3,000 a year and luxurious living and say that I am the Premier of the West Indies, but that is not sufficient for the man in the street. What the man in the street is interested in is his economic advancement. I observe that Mr. Bustamante and some others have made a request for money to set up the Federal Capital. However, I believe we should leave that to people like Mr. Bustamante. I may say that there are many instances in which I think the Hon. Premier of this House would do well to follow Mr. Bustamante.

I feel that we in this country will support the idea of the federation of the peoples in these parts, and again I would give the Hon. Premier a free hand in the matter. However, I still think that some proviso should be put in for freedom of movement.

I have said in this House that I do not believe I can be accused of being a Communist; you cannot accuse me of being a Communist today and a Conservative tomorrow. Communism will only thrive where there are the conditions for it, but repression is really no remedy for Communism. One wonders if it is felt at Downing Street that if you federate these people that will be a panacea for all the evils; I hope that the Leaders are not being fooled with that. I agree with Mr. Bustamante about raising the standard of living; if you bring people together as a nation and they are able to move about then there will be no fear of Communism. Would to God that the honourable Premier had been asked to go to British Guiana! He might have been able to advise the people there; that comes from the depth of my heart. I realise it is appreciated that every extreme view which is expressed with the desire to raise the standard of human beings might be expressed rashly and harshly, but it does not spell Communism. If Communism is what I read it to be, naturally, I dislike it, but I am a lover of human beings, of West Indians, but, above all, Barbadians, and I say that every view which is rashly expressed for social improvement does not spell Communism.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the Resolution when it comes up, but, as I have said, I will offer my amendment. I counsel the honourable Premier as I did on the last occasion that when he leaves for England whatever Conference he might attend let him make it quite clear that we want freedom of movement, but that is not the only thing. We expect the British Government to lend us a hand in this matter. Do not let us depend upon foreign nations for industrial development and capital; we do not want to be lent a hand like C. D. & W., because when they help you with £10,000 the sum of £9,000 will go in salaries. That is not good enough. We have Oxford and Cambridge and Aberdeen; you will find boys coming up from the rank and file with as good an economic outlook as anybody else who has been trained.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must address the Chair.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am referring to West Indian Leaders. When I have finished making my criticism somebody will write a letter and ask to get

rid of me. That is a matter of indifference to me; I speak of help like that which is being given in Jamaica. Although you have missed the bus with the few developments which we have around here, you will find the Jew coming in. That is not good enough. For years and years the British people have been taking from us and it is now their duty to give back something to us. Let them not just send us out into the world like that. I am not thinking of getting money to pay the Governor-General or anything like that; let it be realized that if we produce cocoa in these parts they will buy it from us; we will send it to them. They do the manufacturing in England, they give all the labour to the English people and then send back articles to us and fool us that it is economic development. That is economic strangulation. I could talk for a long time on this matter, but I have purposely avoided making any lengthy speech on it. I could make the honourable Premier rise about three or four times. I believe he realizes what I have said; the youngsters who are coming to the front are capable and competent; they may not be capable of drafting amendments as regards Constitutional development, but when it comes to hard horse-sense for the development of these parts you find that they have it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I do not think I should allow a matter of this importance to be passed this afternoon without adding my quota to it more particularly in view of the fact that the cosmopolitan parish which I have the honour to represent has a population of approximately 65,000 people; therefore this parish will be affected in one way or the other more than any other parish. While I am not prepared to detain this House with any lengthy speech, I think that emphasis should be laid on the question of movement of population. As far back as 1948 when we were conducting our election campaign we had in this island at that time delegates from some of the other Islands including Trinidad which was then represented by the honourable Albert Gomes. I remember well on that occasion when he assisted us in our campaign and he emphasised the fact that each and every island should consider itself as a parish of a country. Therefore it was rather strange some time after to learn that that idea had been lost and forgotten and that a new outlook which, to my mind can only prevent the successful operation of Federation, came into being. What is the earthly good of our agreeing to any Federation when people in the particular areas cannot move freely from one island to another? As the honourable senior member for the City has said, Trinidad feels that she is the financial or economic hub of the area; what would be the earthly good of our saying in Barbados that all the other parishes must contribute to the island, but unless the people in St. Andrew or St. Lucy or St. John pay a certain amount of money they will not be able to live in the metropolitan area because this area is the financial or economic hub of things? As has already been pointed out, we have very little to gain in joining the Federation at this stage and there might be quite a lot to lose. I think it is over 317 years that this island has been free from any direct control by the United Kingdom Government. We have no Order in Council; the Queen in Council cannot legislate for Barbados. We have always maintained a certain measure of independence; we have always had a more advanced Constitution than other colonies and now our Constitution has been further advanced. If we go into Federation now it is clearly seen that we will not be stepping up; we will be stepping down slightly. If we are prepared in the interest of other

colonies to come together as one unit to speak to the world with a united front, to accomplish international self-respect, to have a greater share in world affairs and be more respected by virtue of the fact that we will be considered as another Canada, or Australia or New Zealand — if we are prepared to do that, I think that it should be in the interest of Trinidad to abandon the idea of enforcing laws which will prevent freedom of movement among the islands.

As far as I have been able to gather, no such thing exists in any Federal structure; it does not exist in Canada or in Australia or in the United States of America and even in the recent days the last Federation being Southern and Northern Rhodesia no such thing has been written into the Federal Constitution. I do not see any reason why we who can be looked upon as a subject people, should do anything in a less honourable and dignified manner than any other people have done it. Why should we come into Federation in any less honourable way than that in which other Federal structures have been brought about? I feel that we should emphasize our point of view that if we do enter the Federation we must see to it that freedom of movement is written in the Constitution.

The honourable senior member for the City has already pointed out the complete somersault made by some people who spoke in a rather light vein in so far as this question is concerned. Without attempting to tread on the ground which will be covered by the honourable Premier, I think I remember well that the honourable junior member for St. James emphasized the point that we must have freedom of movement if we are coming into the Federation. I would say that this House gave the honourable Premier a mandate, the House gave him firm instructions when he was going to London to the Federation talks, that he must emphasize the point of view of Barbados that we are not prepared to come into the Federation structure unless and until ample provision was made for freedom of movement among the islands. It is surprising to see—it is not so surprising in the case of some politicians—that the ink has not been dried on the debates in this House in which it was emphasized that we must have freedom of movement and we have honourable members saying that we need not worry about any freedom of movement, that that is the means of stalling the Federation because some great man wants to be in the centre of things. That is not a true indication of what took place; I think it was the honourable senior member for St. John who said it was rumoured that certain elements in this island wanted Federation at any cost at this stage because of Ministerial Status and it would be a good means of getting the Federal Parliament to help us down. I am not in a position to say whether that is correct or not, but it does appear to be very strange that in such a short space of time one could come to this House and completely reverse what somebody else said just a few months ago.

I do feel that this matter is so important that rather than a wrong impression be given to whoever reads the debates, every honourable member should emphasize the fact that we are not prepared to enter the Federation unless there is freedom of movement among the units. When we have freedom of movement among the units I do not see anything which Trinidad has to fear; If Barbadians went to Trinidad and there were 100 jobs open, if a Trinidadian is running a business he can select the people whom he wants to employ. He can say: "Trinidadians must come first; my good Barbadian friends, I am sorry, but you will

have to wait until next time." The same thing applies to Antigua, Grenada, St. Kitts and the other islands. You cannot compel a man to employ anybody; that is left entirely to the will of the employer. I cannot see that any harm is done if agreement is reached on the question of freedom of movement among the islands. There is no point in entering the Federation with the stipulation that if Barbadians have to go to Trinidad they must make a deposit of £20. and they must leave within 28 days and have the same thing applying if Trinidadians come to Barbados. That is a complete denial of the principle on which Federation is founded. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that all those who are responsible for putting these proposals into action will emphasize that as much as this question was being discussed for many years and more particularly on many occasions since the Montego Bay Conference in 1947, we are very much nearer home than we were some years ago. I hope that everybody will approach this question in a spirit of give and take and understanding and unity among all concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS: I shall not be long in speaking on this question because it is getting late. I think we have come a long way since the first Despatch of May 1947 by the Secretary of State for the Colonies on this question. We have got outstanding problems to solve and the sooner we get down to some form of action, the better it will be for everybody concerned. I make passing reference to the Regional Economic Committee to which reference is also made in the Despatch by His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Regional Economic Committee is only a deliberating Body and I recall two statements which have been made, one by Governor Foot and the other by Sir Stephen Luke. With the pressing problems in our political and economic position, with our unemployment problem, we need something more than the Regional Economic Committee which is only a debating Body.

As regards the question of freedom of movement among the units, that is a very ideal solution, that is, if we are looking for the utilitarian State; but just as they were European jealousies in the last War we have had economic barriers being erected; but it is an ideal solution to the problem to have freedom of movement. In the Indian Constitution the matter of emigration from India is in the Federal list; as far as Canada is concerned nothing is mentioned as regards freedom of movement. In Rhodesia there is no question of economic want; the picture is that there is plenty to go around.

I hope that the West Indian leaders will rise to the occasion and achieve what has not yet been achieved. I hope that these leaders will be able to find some solution to a problem which must be regulated by supply and demand. In the end the Trade Unions will regulate the position; if you put freedom of movement under the Federal Government it is an ideal thing to have, but we must face the facts since the matter is fraught with difficulties.

As regards the point mentioned by the honourable senior member for the City, it was the fear of Mr. Bustamante that if some of the older heads leave their own Legislature to go to the Federal Legislature, the younger ones will have to carry on in the local Legislatures. The real fear was that as soon as the older heads will have to go to the Federal Legislature you will have inexperienced people to carry on and that is where the Communists will come in. That fear seems to have spread and I suppose that is how the matter came into being at the London Conference.

On the question of industrialisation, I said in the last debate which took place in connection with Ministerial Status that no matter whether you have a good constitution or not you have to make it work. I feel that in order to have a successful Federation we must industrialise. I believe that with a Federal Government we will be able to get large loans and we may be able to industrialise.

I think I can exhaust my ideas very quickly and I say that I am in hearty agreement with most of the views which have been expressed in this Chamber on this question of Federation. I do not want to make any amendment to the question of freedom of movement because I expressed myself on it on the last occasion. The decision has been taken by a democratic Chamber and you will be bound by that Chamber if you belong to it even if you have other views. I hope that the delegates will find a formula by which an active Organisation can be erected in the Federal instrument — one which is not too heavy—so as to be able to bring the three and a half million people in the area into some form of political and economic unity.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I am glad for this opportunity to speak in connection with this matter. Each and every one of us is compelled to make some statement on this vital question. The atmosphere and the conditions under which we meet tonight give us the assurance that the Federation of these Islands is an actual fact; we either have to accept it or reject it. I want to state here and now that it is over 80 years ago that our forefathers gave birth to this idea of federating these West Indian Islands and making a nation of them, and we who are the children and grandchildren of our forefathers should be able in this day and generation after this long turning over in our minds, to state emphatically that we are going to make this momentous step. The people of this community whom we represent are expecting us once and for all to state our position on this vital question. The leaders and peoples of our sister Islands are waiting with bated breath to hear our final decision tonight and it is for us to demonstrate to them our readiness and fitness to launch this glorious ship of West Indian Federation and give birth to a West Indian Nation. (Hear, Hear). We either have to go forward or backward; we cannot remain steady. The position of affairs of the day compel us to go forward and I think it is time that we should demonstrate that we are willing and ready to cast aside timidity and fear which are keeping our leaders back from making this momentous step. It is up to us to make the final declaration and demonstrate to the civilised world that we are enterprising and far-seeing enough to go ahead with this matter. We find ourselves in such an atmosphere that we cannot mark time any more; because of the fear and shortsightedness of our forefathers we, who are their children, must enjoy the benefits which Federation would have brought us about 60 or 70 years ago.

The idea to which they gave birth is a challenge to every one of us—it is a challenge which we can ill afford to ignore; we are challenged to go forward and give effect to the thought to which our forefathers gave birth 80 years ago. We are called upon by the two hundred thousand people in this island and the other two and a half million people in the other Islands to get off the political stage if we cannot measure up to the demands of the occasion and allow people of a more heroic and dynamic and aggressive spirit to take the lead. I want here and now to assure these leaders from our sister Islands who are now among us and to all honourable members now present that we have the might and

the wishes of the English-speaking world behind us bidding us to go forward and onward and create a West Indian nation. We can no longer hesitate with the obstacles and barriers which we see before us; let us go forward. Man cannot live by bread alone; bread is essential, but that is not all. There are obstacles in our way but we have in our midst people who are competent to go forward and overcome those obstacles. The only thing which beats a trial is a failure and if we acknowledge our failure before we start, then we are foolish. The pioneers of the world went out without fear and if we go forward with this venture we will be surprised to see what will come out of it.

I do not want to tire the House but this is one of the most glorious opportunities which have presented themselves at any time since our existence in this hemisphere. I think we should grasp this opportunity or otherwise let us report that we have tried and failed. Do not let us mark time; let us go forward. If we fail, we fail, but do not let us sit down and visualise hardships and difficulties and not step out. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the passing of this Address with respect to Federation. This should not have been an Address; this should be a final Resolution in this matter of Federation and I hope to have the opportunity of making a final speech on a Resolution in this Chamber to have this Federation in operation for all time.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am sorry for two things. One is the hour of the night and the other is the absence of some honourable members. I am sorry that it is after ten o'clock and I am more than sorry that some honourable members are out of their seats. While doubtless in time they will read the Report which will be accurately set out, I think it would have been so much better for them to be here to hear what I am going to say. It is essential that I say it. It is lamentable that in a matter this sort which means so much to the future of the whole of the West Indies as well as to the future of Barbados in which we are living—it is lamentable that some honourable members should make speeches and in those speeches make attacks—veiled at some times and open at other times—on persons who differ from them and that those attacks can be based on no foundation whatever or could obviously only be due to a desire to score off somebody of opposite political views or to hide one's real feelings. It is even more lamentable when some sections of the Press, it may be in some cases that they get second-hand or third-hand information as, for instance, the *Trinidad Guardian*, or persons who did not attend at the Reporter's desk give the impression to the outside world that some great speeches have been made showing points which were made by the advocates of Federation and really play into the hands of those who, without justification, throw at Barbados the undeserved taunt that Barbados has been a stumbling-block in the way of Federation and still is that. It is true that Barbados has been a stumbling-block in the way of Federation in 1874 or 1876, but not since then. I digress here to say something personal. I know what I had to fight when I went to London. Before I got to London a gentleman from a colony which is nearer to us than Jamaica is, made it his business to say, as I was told, "Mr. Cuke and you, but especially you, are going to London prepared to wreck Federation." One man put it in a slightly different way which seemed to be, on the face of it, flattering, but which was equally damaging. He said: "You have the fate of this Conference in your hands; if you say Barbados will come in, the Conference will be

saved". I made it quite clear that neither Hon. Mr. Cuke nor I had left Barbados as Plenipotentiaries; we left with no idea of wrecking any Federation. Barbados has gone on record as being wholeheartedly in favour of Federation but there were certain things which we had a mandate to carry out. I said that Barbados was not coming into the Federation unless the principle of freedom of movement was accepted and I stood by that too. I was very glad that at the opening or at the end after the delegates had spoken, Mr. Lyttleton made it quite clear that the delegates would not be expected to think that they would be bound by any decisions made but they would have to go back to their Legislatures, and he quoted Mr. Cuke and myself. As the Conference proceeded the delegates began to realise that Barbados was as sincere as anybody else. I would like to pay a tribute to Mr. Judah as well as to Mr. Simmons and Mr. Glaspole for the extremely statesmanlike way in which they approached the subject and it showed that the colony which they represented must have gone pretty thoroughly into the question of Federation before it sent up its delegates. Just as Hon. H. A. Cuke produced voluminous figures to show the financial implications with regard to the fiscal policy Mr. Judah did the same and it was largely due to Mr. Judah and Hon. H. A. Cuke, both Conservatives—but what is the good of a Conservative if he cannot say something about money? I say it was largely due to them that we managed to persuade the representative of the British Treasury that we could not afford to pay 25 per cent. of our revenue towards the expenses of the Federal Parliament. The figure was brought down to 15% eventually. It is not that we are opposed to Federation; it is because we wholeheartedly support Federation that we call on our people to look at the matter straight in the face. To knock \$810.00 per year off our Five Year Plan would mean that some schools will not be built. Federation will be the salvation of the West Indies; but Federation costs money and it costs marking time in our own plans. I still stick to that. I invite Barbados to come into Federation but I say that we have to pay for it either by increased taxation or by using some of our money to pay for Federation.

Having said that personal bit, I go on to say that I am a bit surprised that Mr. Bustamante—I shall be very moderate in what I am going to say now for obvious reasons. According to last Saturday's *Observer* Mr. Bustamante has seen fit to say that he does not know my position and that every time he comes to Barbados I fall sick and strangely get better as soon as he leaves. Every time I see a mouse I run to the nearest tree and climb up until the danger has passed. Nobody outside of Jamaica is afraid of Mr. Bustamante; when he is looking at an Election he may say anything. I am sorry that Mr. Bustamante has said what he has said because whatever differences exist between his political views and mine, I admire him as a man even although I do not admire him as a politician. He knows my views and he knows Jamaica's views—they are on the side of Federation. I have to say that the fact that Jamaica and ourselves saw so much eye to eye in London that it caused the people of the Windwards and Leewards to believe that Barbados was ganging up with the other islands and leaving them out. I said that the outlook and interest of Barbados were the same as the outlook and interest of the Leewards and Windwards and that called forth much cheering from Mr. Bird and other delegates. I may say that in London they were both Socialists and Conservatives fighting hard for Federation, compromising on points on which they felt very

keenly, giving in to Trinidad on questions on which they need not have given in if they wanted selfishly to make any claim, Jamaica being satisfied with 16 seats with Trinidad clamouring for 10 or 11 seats with a population not one half that of Jamaica. This is no time for West Indians if they are really conscious of their responsibility in the matter of Federation, to have any recrimination as regards persons outside this Island who may say things which are unpleasant to hear especially when you know that they are not true. (Cheers). I do not flatter anybody, but I think it is my duty to place on record what I would class as statesmanship, the way in which the Federation problem has been met at the London Conference; we really did a lot of work. We said that it is not good enough to say: "Let us have Federation without going into the question thoroughly". Some of the delegates did not see that we should fight for cutting down the 25% customs duty.

Having got thus far, if I say anything tonight criticising the honourable junior member for St. James, the honourable senior member for St. George or the honourable senior member for St. Philip, I think that this House knows me well enough to know that it is neither rancour nor spite, let alone envy or jealousy, if I make these criticisms. This is too important an occasion not to be careful with your utterances especially when they come from one who has been in politics for so long, who has had legal training and who is in the forefront of his profession being lawyer and politician. I hope the "Recorder" will not feel that it is because of any question of jealousy that I have made those remarks. When the honourable junior member for St. James began to speak on this question of Federation in this debate, it was obvious that he had not come ready to make his speech. How else can you explain that long quotation from Mr. Manley's speech? The honourable member was just warming up until his ideas came to him. Honourable members will remember what the honourable member said about Mr. Manley before we went to London; Mr. Manley made a fine speech and he made it well; he is a West Indian Statesman of whom any Parliament should be proud. When the honourable junior member for St. James says that that is the spirit in which we should approach this question—I am sorry that the honourable member is not here to hear me quoting him just before we went to London. He made points which I think the advocates of Federation must make. The honourable member joined with other honourable members in saying that whatever else you may agree to, you must stick to freedom of movement among the units. This is what the honourable member said of Mr. Manley and of Jamaica generally; he was doubtful of Jamaica because of its attitude in 1947 and he said that we should not let the question of whether or not Jamaica will come into Federation prevent us from proceeding because of the difficulties of distance because they will be overcome. The honourable member goes on to say this:—

"But while the Jamaicans are expressing themselves in favour of the Federation today, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can bear me out that they were rather hesitant at Montego Bay. Not only Bustamante, but Manley's sweet and clever tongue seemed to hide a sinister design. He appeared to me like a minister in the pulpit preaching a religion in which he does not believe."

That is the same honourable junior member for St. James who is now singing the praises of Mr. Manley! That is not good enough even in party politics. The honourable Minister of Trade, Indus.

try and Labour has already quoted from the honourable member's speech; I will not quote more of it because of the time. It is too late for me to quote some other extracts from the honourable member's speech in which he joined with other honourable members in preaching and insisting that the *sine qua non* of Federation is freedom of movement. He states that we should not spoil Federation by insisting on freedom of movement; anybody who says that is either profoundly ignorant or just playing politics. It is inconceivable for Federation to take place without freedom of movement.

Mr. Speaker, when we federate, naturally, we would be all West Indians. Why then should a Trinidadian have two passports — a West Indian passport, and a Trinidadian passport? It is a point that the average man in the street can see. We are all federating to become West Indians in the international field, but inside the West Indies we are Barbadians, Jamaicans or Trinidadians or according to the colony to which we belong, and as West Indians, a Barbadian should not need a special passport to go to Trinidad. That is sheer stupidity. Nobody could say that there should be a compromise on this. When we say that it is a condition precedent to our going into federation to have freedom of movement, we say so with all our hearts. It should be so clear and elementary by now that it should be unnecessary for me to say it again. I hope nobody misunderstands what I have just said. We should be associated with mental defectives if we compromise on the question of freedom of movement. Suppose these islands were not surrounded by water, would we be having policemen to guard the borders between Trinidad and Grenada? Even in the old days of the old Federal German Empire, people moved from one state to another freely. I am sorry I have spoken at so great a length on this question but I have had to do it because the honourable junior member for St. James said on the last occasion that it was a matter of indifference to us. He said so and it was repeated by the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for St. George in part.

The honourable senior member for St. John said, on the last occasion that he detected a new note in my speech, and the honourable senior member for St. Philip in his characteristic style of slandering me as often as he can, pointed out that I was not as lukewarm about federation as I had been since I heard that they were thinking of making Barbados the Federal Capital. Mr. Speaker, any human being can quote me at any time; but I can say that in the last 26 years I have not swerved for one moment from the feeling and the absolute conviction that it is necessary for these West Indian colonies to be federated. Of course, I have pointed out the difficulties. Whatever may be thrown at me, it cannot be said that I have made use of suggestions which seem to indicate that we should consciously hold up federation until there are all Socialist Governments within the West Indies. I could not be so stupid. What I do say is that in my way of looking at political life in the West Indies, in the interval between these colonies approving of this or of any scheme to be sent to the Imperial Parliament to be passed—it will take some time of course, even after the passing of a Bill to collect your Civil Servants, to get your administrative set-up, and to get rid of R.E.C.—we should have socialist views in the mixed communities and we should try to spread those views as much as possible, because it will not pay us with so many races to have class

and racial distinctions doing things political. We have a tremendous task before us. It is so in every settled community, let alone an unsettled one like British Guiana whose position we all deplore. As I have said, we have a hard task before us in order to weld ourselves into a West Indian nation; therefore, from my way of looking at public life it is the duty of Socialists in the West Indies to put an end to those things which will lead to the several divisions of races in the Caribbean area.

The honourable senior member for St. Philip not only said, but he accused me of having compromised, or said I would compromise on matters which in April 1953 I stuck out for. It is too late now for me to do it but I invite honourable members to pick up the *Official Gazette* of last year and read the speech which I made on that occasion. It comes just before the speech made by the honourable junior member for St. James—somewhere between pages 930 to 937. In that speech I made it clear what I have said two or three times already, and that is, that certain things I would stick out for, and one of the things I said I would stick out for is freedom of movement.

It might be held by some people that Barbados wants everything for itself. If honourable members were to take the trouble, they would see that of the resolution which was passed in this House and was taken up by me to London and made a conference paper, every important point made by Barbados was accepted. It looked almost as if we had blackmailed persons who were sitting around the conference table to agree with us. Everything that we put into that resolution was put into the report, even the very words I used about taking Item 24 from the Concurrent List and putting it on the Exclusive List.

The three main points of the honourable senior member for St. Philip were: (1) I agreed to compromise on the question of freedom of movement; (2) the question of reserved powers by the Governor-General; and (3) Legislation by Queen-in-Council. I quoted that from his speech which appeared in the *Advocate*. The *Advocate* might or might not have misquoted him but even if he did not say that I agreed in London to compromise, he said that I was going to compromise on those three points. If honourable members were to look at those three points, they will see that the London Conference agreed on all three points, in fact, the draft was almost made out of the Barbados resolution. If honourable members ever get a chance of looking at the Minutes of the London Conference on Federation, they will see that what we said was quoted. I made reference to the fact that if disturbances took place in Grenada or some other place, according to what was drafted in the previous report, the Queen-in-Council could make an order for the federation to prohibit meetings in any part of the federation. That was cut out. This was the point I made about that. I said, why should a meeting at Queen's Park be prohibited simply because it was reported to the Secretary of State for the Colonies that there was a disturbance in Grenada. I pointed out that there was sufficient legislation existing within the units themselves for dealing with disturbances in the Caribbean Area.

I am not going to tire honourable members now, but it would be more effective if I read the *Official Gazette* to show that the exact contrary is true to what the honourable senior member for St. Philip said, when he accused me of compromising on these matters. It is possible for Trinidad to

say that these small fellows gave away on several important items and were backed up by the British. As a matter of fact, I know such has been said. If honourable members remember, we said before I left for the London Conference that perhaps it would be necessary to put the question of freedom of movement into the constitution.

I do not think I can be reasonably accused of any thing when I say that Mr. Austin Winston supported me strongly on all those points and pointed out, as the honourable junior member for St. George pointed out, that if you put it in the Preamble it may not be strong enough, therefore, you should write it in the constitution itself. I have before me what I said in London but I do not propose to quote from it now. I would only like to remind you that it is not the British habit of writing general principles into the law itself. You will find in the Puerto Rican constitution that all men must have the right of liberty, as in the American Constitution, but nowhere would you find an abstract principle set out like that in the British Constitution.

As honourable members will see from the amended motion which I am asking honourable members to substitute for the present one, I am making suggestions that some means must be found whereby the Federal Parliament at a very early date can legislate for Freedom of Movement and it must be insisted on. There has been some confusion on Freedom of Movement and Emigration. Freedom of Movement is different, so to speak, from Emigration. When Trinidad talks about Emigration and Freedom of Movement, they confuse the two, thinking that Freedom of Movement in every case means "people looking for work." Emigration generally means "people looking for work" but Freedom of Movement means that everybody in the West Indies is a West Indian, and should move around as a West Indian.

Honourable members will see the very words I used quoting the attitude of the Barbados Legislature towards legislation by the Queen-in-Council—and they can see it in the *Official Gazette*. It is inevitable that the British Government being responsible for certain things, that those things must be reserved. We cannot supply an army and navy in the West Indies, nor can we defend ourselves; therefore, the question of external security is not a matter for us.

I am sorry that I must answer these points tonight but they are too important to leave out inasmuch as they came up in the debate. It will be seen therefore, that the Governor-General must have these reserve powers. I may say again that the things which we did not get were so trivial, that we could in fact call the London Conference a Barbados Conference. Honourable members would remember that we said "House of Assembly;" Jamaica said, "House of Representatives;" and we gave in on that point. The Hon. Mr. Griffith suggested that as Montserrat only has one representative on the Federal Government that a substitute should be appointed at the same time to take the place of its representative because in case he took ill or anything of that sort happened, Montserrat would not be represented. Now, if there were two representatives and both were ill, say with influenza, would that colony be represented? Is it not possible for both to catch the 'flu' at the same time? At any rate, we gave in on that question. It is things of that nature which we gave in on but we have not compromised on any

thing of importance. Again, everything which we insisted on we got.

On this point of Freedom of Movement, I regret to say I made a mistake which however strengthens the argument of Barbados. I made a mistake in referring to Mr. Hannays. I said we got acceptance on the point of Freedom of Movement and of emigration being put on the Exclusive List and that Mr. Hannays had made a reservation. I spoke from memory. He did not make the reservation about Freedom of Movement. Freedom of Movement and emigration are not put in the same sentence; as a matter of fact, emigration means emigration into the Federation, not movement between the units; it means somebody coming in from Mexico or Canada into the West Indian units, not a Barbadian going to Trinidad; that is dealt with in another part of Section 6. In the "Plan for a British Caribbean Federation" Section 6 deals with Part 2, Fields of Legislation. The first items on the Exclusive Legislative List, are:—

- (a) Audit of Federal public accounts;
- (b) Control of the movements of persons between Units, subject to item (XIII) of paragraph 7 below, provided that no federal law shall make provision for the restriction on economic grounds of the movement between Units of persons other than Aliens.

Item 13 of Paragraph VII, the Concurrent Legislative List deals with the control of the movement of persons between Units on health or security grounds.

As the honourable senior member for St. Thomas read out, that is what I mean by modifications. I said in London, and I say it now: we must be prepared to legislate for freedom of movement of West Indians. A Federal Parliament is empowered to legislate for freedom of movement of persons between the Units, but under federal law the right is given to a unit to make its own legislation to keep certain persons out for health reasons or on security grounds. I am no Communist but I do not believe you should bar West Indians of one unit from going into other units merely because you do not agree with their politics. That is by the way. As the honourable junior member for St. Lucy has said, it has been decided that immigration, emigration and deportation should be transferred from the Concurrent to the Exclusive List. When you get to 'L' on the Exclusive List,—immigration into and emigration and deportation from, the federation—there are two different things, one meaning people moving between the units, the other this provision, meaning people who are coming into or being deported from the whole Caribbean area.

A VOICE: Not a West Indian.

No West Indian should be deported. If a person is a West Indian and no unit takes him in, should he travel the sea all his life? What we insisted on, Mr. Speaker, is what is contained at (b) under the Exclusive List: "Control of the movements of persons between units, subject to item (xiii) of paragraph 7 below, provided that no federal law shall make provision for the restriction on economic grounds of the movement between units of persons other than aliens."

The honourable senior member for St. George accuses the Government generally of having restrictive legislation whereby people on economic grounds are kept out. Unfortunately, that is true. It is just as we in 1952, for the sake of uniformity

agreed to pass legislation to free pioneer industries from income tax for five years although we did not believe in it. Trinidad and Jamaica having done it, we brought in a Bill to do so also. I am sorry to hear that the merchants of Bridgetown have made use of that to keep out Jews, Syrians and Czechs who may become rival traders. If we are claiming that we should roam freely all over the world, we should not keep other people out. However, I am aware that it is a difficult problem in places where you have unemployment. That is a matter which will have to be settled at a round table conference. It may be that each unit should have the right to say: "we are going to keep a Labour Bureau and when we see that we have enough carpenters and tailors, we are not going to allow any more to come in to look for work." But you cannot stop a person from roaming about.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to withdraw the wording of the original motion in order to substitute the words of the resolution which has been handed to the Clerk and circulated to honourable members. It reads as follows:

The House of Assembly resolves that it accepts the principles agreed on in April 1953, at the Conference in London on West Indian Federation, as the basis for a Federal Constitution as set out in "The Plan for a British Caribbean Federation" such as (Cmd. 8895); and gives its unqualified approval to the early initiation by Her Majesty's Government of legislation based on this Plan.

The House however points out that the proposal to make Grenada (or any other island) the seat of Government of the Federation is inconsistent with Section 6 (u) of the proposed Constitution.

2. The House stresses that Freedom of Movement for West Indians among the federated units of which they are natives is essential to any scheme and suggests that some means be devised whereby Federal legislation designed to secure this object may be enacted immediately after the institution of a Federation.

3. The House therefore recommends that a conference be convened of legal and political representatives of the units to make recommendations for the enactment of legislation which will, within the context of the "the greatest possible freedom of movement of persons" be likely to meet with general acceptance of the units. This legislation, it suggests, should cover all aspects of the movement of all peoples into, out of, and among the units comprising the Federation.

4. The House further recommends that the Governments of the units request the services of the Comptroller for Development and Welfare to convene and be Chairman of such a conference and to make available to it the facilities of his department and secretarial staff.

If I may just briefly refer to points which may not be present in the minds of honourable members, I will say that the "Plan for British Caribbean Federation" is what I refer to as (Cmd. 8895) in the resolution which goes on to say: "It however points out that the proposal to make Grenada (or any other island) the seat of Government of the Federation is inconsistent with Section 6 (u) of the proposed constitution." That is a matter for the Federal Government alone. Any place that is made a capital now can only be temporary capital. The original S.C.A.C. made the mistake and the mistake has been repeated by changing Trinidad to Grenada. Both are wrong. Paragraph 2 stresses Freedom of Movement for the West Indies among the Federated units, and is saying that some means

must be devised to meet the possibility of writing it into the constitution within I say, six months of the coming into operation of a Federation. "There shall be enacted a Federal Law;" that means that they can force the Federal Parliament to pass a law. Something of that sort would be equivalent to writing it into the constitution. If you tell the Federal Parliament you must introduce a Bill to make provision for that within six months of the institution of Federation and they must stop debating any other thing and take a vote on that, then it must happen, and that is actually writing it into the constitution.

Paragraph 3 is as follows:—"The House therefore recommends that a conference be convened of legal and political representatives of the Units to make recommendations for the enactment of Legislation which will within the context of "the greatest possible freedom of movement of persons" be likely to meet with general acceptance of the Units. This Legislation, it suggests, should cover all aspects of the movement of all people into, out of, and among the Units comprising the federation." That paragraph covers everything; it covers Freedom of Movement inside the Federation between the units and it covers emigration of all people—West Indians and non West Indians into and out of the Federation. However, we agreed that any unit can pass its own law to keep certain persons out for health reasons or on security grounds—like people of the Al Capone type and people with infectious diseases.

Paragraph 4 "The House further recommends that the Government of the units request the services of the Comptroller for Development and Welfare to convene and be Chairman of such conference and to make available to it the facilities of his department and secretariat staff." That is the obvious choice because it is the only contact between the Colonial Office and the West Indian Colonies. We have been fortunate enough to have with us as Comptroller of C.D.W. Sir Stephen Luke, who was present at the whole of the London Conference; in fact, he took the Chair when Lord Munster could not be there.

Again, I must apologise for speaking at such great length. I will only say that it was as clear as daylight that the honourable senior member for St. Philip in his speech was trying to get something off his chest. When the honourable member read from the *Official Gazette* he hardly read one sentence straight.

The apparent words of wisdom of the honourable senior member for St. George sounded like unmitigated nonsense. He confused Freedom of Movement with emigration. He also said that none of the leaders in the West Indies tackled the problem of amendment. The honourable member is fresh from his law books and he wanted to show that he knew something of it and the rest did not know it. Even the great Mr. Hannays whom the honourable member praises so much and who is certainly equal to any Legal Draughtsman in the West Indies signed his name to the S.C.A.C. report with but one disagreement that is as to the choice of the Federal Capital and the placing of immigration on the Exclusive List. He would have you believe even the great Mr. Hannays signed his name to the S.C.A.C. Report without making any recommendations as to the amendment of the Constitution. According to the Australian and American Constitution, for there to be an amendment in their respective Constitution, a Bill for the amendment would have to pass, roughly speaking, by a two-thirds majority of the Legislature. The Cana-

dian Constitution makes no similar provision in the Act for an amendment. Of course, it may be done by the Imperial Parliament to amend by convention, the Canadian Parliament approaches the Imperial Parliament and says we want to amend such and such a part of our constitution, and the British Parliament because the Canadian Parliament asked for it does it. What S.C.A.C. proposed to do is just the same. The London Conference, however, recommends a method rather like that of the Australian Constitution, that is to say, an amendment to a Bill must be passed by a two-thirds majority. A little learning is a dangerous thing; it makes you feel like a cock of the walk ready to crow against what other people do. The honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for St. George accused those at the London Conference of creating precedent by putting emigration on the Exclusive List. Either they do not know or they forgot, or they did it wilfully to hit at me, but I ask them to read the Indian Constitution Act, passed in 1935. Why is this insistence by Trinidad of putting it on the Concurrent List? Let us see the reason why they insist on keeping it there. There is only one answer. When it is there we might never be able to pass a Federal Law, and the Trinidad Law would therefore remain in force. It is therefore the solemn duty of the Leeward and the Windward Islands, Jamaica and Barbados to bind ourselves together to find some ways so that the Federal Government would be bound to pass the law almost as soon as it starts. I would never take the chance of leaving it on the Concurrent List, because of the fear in my mind that there would be no federal legislation on it. We should do something to make it absolutely compulsory on the Federal Government to pass reasonable legislation as regards freedom of movement and emigration.

Mr. MILLER: Why don't you then acquiesce to my request by asking that it be written in the constitution?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I have suggested that one of the ways is to say in the Act that within six months of the coming into operation of the Federal Government that there shall be enacted a law. But if we put it in this general way, as our Resolution purposes, we cannot be accused of bulldozing anybody into doing it our way.

The honourable senior member for St. George also said that this should be the last conference, but we have to set up an administration and a

Secretariat and in doing so we would have to work by an organization like C.D. & W. who would necessarily have to see after all these things, including of course the winding up of R.E.C. so that it is meant to suggest that some of us want free plane trips and that these conferences should come to an end. All these things would have to be done first, so that when the law comes into operation, there would be an election and the representatives selected would walk into the Parliamentary House, hear a speech from the Throne, then elect their Speaker, and then hear a set of rules read out to them. All those things would have to be worked out before the Federal Parliament really begins to function.

I thank Your Honour for your patience while I was addressing this House on these last things and I also thank honourable members for listening to me. I can see the interest which they have taken because it is written on their faces. It was inevitable that I should reply at some length. Let us face up to the situation by doing all we can, by turning our backs on the Mecca of Mammon, and turning our faces to the light of Federation preferring to worship at the altar of a West Indian nationhood.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am going to second the motion for the passing of the resolution. I too, think that writing it into the constitution would be too dogmatic; it would look like trying to force our point. I therefore agree with the honourable Premier. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding this motion.

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

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I believe that the amendments to the Maude Bill will be ready by next Tuesday and I am suggesting that it might be right if we meet next week. Honourable members will be given the opportunity of proceeding with Private Members' Business. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 p.m.

Mr. Goddard seconded the motion.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.