

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th January, 1956

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Hon. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.,

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the 29th November and 6th December, 1955 have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection, these Minutes will now be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection these Minutes were taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Commissioners of Highways for the parish of Christ Church a Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the half year ended 30th September, 1955.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor to lay the following:—

Message No. 1/1956 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House of Acts

assented to in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen.

MESSAGE NO. 1/1956.

*His Excellency the Governor
To
The Honourable The House Of Assembly*

The Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the following Acts have been assented to in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen:—

The Adoption Act, 1955 (1955—19).

The St. Joseph Highways Employees (Special Pensions) Act, 1955 (1955—20).

The Income Tax (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1955 (1955—21).

The Protection of Wages (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—22).

The Electricity (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—23).

The Emergency Powers (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—24).

The Currency (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—25).

The General Loan and Stock (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—26).

The Trustee Investment in Barbados Government Securities (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—27).

The Technical Assistance (Taxation Relief) (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—28).

The Parochial Employees Pension (Cost of Living Allowance) Act, 1955 (1955—29).

The Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) Act, 1955 (1955—30).

The Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—31).

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1955 (1955—32).

The Pensions (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—33).

The Savings Bank (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—34).

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 3) Act, 1955 (1955—35).

The Barbados Development Act, 1955 (1955—36).

The Transport Board Act, 1955 (1955—37).

The Landlord and Tenant (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—38).

The Security of Tenure of Small Holdings Act, 1955 (1955—39).

The Housing Act, 1955 (1955—40).

The Wages Council Act, 1955 (1955—41).

The Public Accounts Act, 1955 (1955—42).

The Employment Exchanges Act, 1955 (1955—43).

The Seawell Airport (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—44).

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 4) Act, 1955 (1955—45).

The Representation of the People Act, 1955 (1955—46).

The Parochial Employees Pensions (Cost of Living Allowance) Act, 1955 (1955—47).

The Local Government (Amendment) Act, 1955 (1955—48).

The Anglican Church (Partial Suspension) Act, 1955 (1955—49).

The Commissioners of Health of St. James (Denny Gratuity) Act, 1955 (1955—50).

The Griffith Pension Act, 1955 (1955—51).

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,

Governor.

Government House,

Barbados.

7th January, 1956.

Statements showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados and the amounts received from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act for the periods ended on the 30th June and 30th September, 1955, in respect of the several schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1955.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1955.

The Registration of Electors Regulations, 1955.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the following:—The British Caribbean Meteorological Service Annual Report for 1954.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by His Excellency to lay the following:

Statement of Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 30th September, 1955.

REPLIES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to lay a reply to Question No. 19 asked by the hon. junior member for Christ Church regarding the salary of the Headmaster of the Boys' Foundation School.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to lay a Reply to Question No. 46 asked by the honourable senior member for St. George regarding delay in carrying out a post mortem examination at the General Hospital.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to lay a Reply to Question No. 47 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Philip regarding the grant of a gratuity to Mr. James Weekes, a former Casual Labourer of the Department of Agriculture.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to lay a Reply to Question No. 59 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph regarding the rehousing of persons who lost their homes during the hurricane.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to lay a Reply to Question No. 64 asked by the hon. senior member for St. John regarding the payment of Production Bonus.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 12 Order, 1955."

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 13 Order, 1955."

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$15,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate, 1955-56, No. 57, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$21,683 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 58, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$17,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955-56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 59, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Bill to amend the Juvenile Offenders Act, 1932.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I had expected to hear the Government give some form of Notice seeking the concurrence of the House in Message No. 38/1955 from His Excellency the Governor which was received last Tuesday, and if that is not done I think some Private Member should be told so that he can give notice of something to deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will act.

Mr. LEWIS: How is it going to act? The House was informed last Tuesday about the matter and it is very regrettable that Government has not brought in some form of notice because some private member will have to do it.

3.25 p.m.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, the Bill to amend the Immigration Act 1952, was read a first time.

On motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:—

Bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1921.

Bill to amend the Juvenile Offenders Act, 1932.

REPRESENTATION AT THE FINAL CONFERENCE OF FEDERATION

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House begins, I understand that the members of the Opposition desire to debate today the question of the sending of a Delegation to the final Conference of Federation. I am asking leave to deal with the Resolution for \$17,500

which is a Resolution covering the expenses of the Delegation in case the House agrees with the sending of the delegation. I shall therefore ask leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 & 89 in order to deal with that Resolution in all its stages today.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is asking leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 & 89 in order to deal with a Resolution for \$17,500. Unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Premier. [Pause]. There being no objection, leave is granted.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I was not in my seat at the time when I should have asked the Government if they intended to bring down a Resolution for us to concur in, relative to the sending of a Delegation to the United Kingdom. I intended giving notice of my intention to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor on the same question, as it is my intention to deal with it today. I was speaking to the Hon. Premier when I should have done that; and I am now asking that we deal with that Resolution after this Address has been dealt with. We have to discuss the sending of the Delegation before we discuss that Resolution. I am therefore asking leave to move the passing of this Address.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is true that it is not down in black and white, but I would like to remind the hon. member that we have so far persisted in the system of passing Addresses to the Governor on matters which, with the present constitutional set-up of Barbados, is not an Address to him in the proper sense of the word, but an Address to the particular Minister concerned.

I do not suggest that the hon. member should not go on with his Address, but I would like to make this suggestion; if I am given leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today if the House concur in sending this Delegation, we should proceed with the Resolution straight away. The House is at perfect liberty to question the sum proposed for the sending of this Delegation.

I suggest to the hon. member that we are prepared to abandon public business at least, in order to allow that Item of Private Members' Business to open the proceedings of the day. When I say "abandon" public business, I mean postpone the consideration of public business, or course. However, I suggest that the House, if they concur with the sending of the Delegation, will agree to the passing of the Resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the Message which was laid at the last meeting of the House and the last paragraph of that Message says this:—

"The Honourable the House is invited to concur in the appointment of the Delegation."

It does not say "when the money Resolution comes." Suppose you want to decrease or increase the members of the Delegation, you will deal consequently with the Money Resolution. In my opinion the first thing is that we should concur in the appointment of the Delegation; the Governor did not tell us that we are invited to concur by a private letter, or something like that, in the Delegation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition ask leave to proceed with the passing of his Address?

Mr. GODDARD: I will do that, because the matter is a very important one. I am asking leave to proceed with this Address as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, on the 22nd November, 1955, a Message came from the Governor to this House acquainting us that a Delegation would be leaving the West Indies for the United Kingdom for a final conference on this question of Federation. It stated that the House would be asked to concur in the nomination of that Delegation. That Delegation would be going to England with plenipotentiary powers; it would not be the ordinary Delegation which has been sent in the past, and it would settle once and for all how we would enter Federation, if we go in it. It is so important a matter that I thought we should have full liberty in debating this question.

It is unfortunate that we did not have these Reports of the Commissioners before; they are so full of facts and there is such a departure from the old plans, that they are not of a type that we can read once and assimilate. We have to read and re-read and discuss them in private before we can do justice to them in the House of Assembly. 3.35 p.m.

I agree with the Hon. Premier that a week is not enough to discuss these reports; and although it is to be done before the delegation leaves at some future time, that is not what we are concerned with today, but the constitution of that delegation; and I get back to the Message that came from the Governor telling us that we would be invited to concur in the delegation. Well, sir, it is past history that we replied to that Message formally through a Report, and in that Report we asked the Government to take in mind that all parties in the Opposition should be represented. That Report was laid here on the Table of the House and it was passed unanimously; no one questioned it, no one spoke against it, and nobody left the House. It was the unanimous wish of the House at that time that that reply to the Message be sent to the Governor.

As I said, in that Report we expressed the wish that Government would seek fit to select one from each party in the Opposition to be in London on this important mission.

It was to our surprise when we heard the constitution of that delegation, ignoring completely and entirely the fact that there was an Opposition. No matter how it may be split up, there is an official Opposition there are two or three other persons who could be selected if possible at this time. I cannot reconcile the attitude of Government in selecting as they said in their own paper a Government Delegation to represent the entire House, and for that reason we are passing this Address to His Excellency the Governor, which I will now read, Sir, as you have not got a copy. It reads as follows:—

THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

1. The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your Excellency's Message No. 1/1956, with reference to the appointment of this Colony's Delegation to the forthcoming Plenipotentiary Talks on Federation scheduled to take place in London next month.

2. The House desire to express its non-concurrence with the Delegation selected, and insist that the "Opposition Parties" be given the right to nominate at least one member for inclusion in the Delegation.

Mr. Speaker, every other Legislature in the West Indies, from Jamaica back down to Trinidad, (I will not even say British Guiana, because British Guiana is not an interested party in the true sense) has seen fit to send some member of the Opposition. I do not

speak of the small islands, I speak of Jamaica and Trinidad. In Jamaica the Leader of the Opposition was given an opportunity to go, and I understand if he did not see fit to go himself, he had the right to nominate some one from his party to represent him. In Trinidad where there is not any defined party system, they have selected someone whom we and the Trinidad public consider in the Opposition, to be sent to this Conference. In the small islands there is only one delegate, but in many cases the advisers have been selected from people of different political views, but here we come to Barbados where we have three delegates, and the three delegates are part of the Government.

We come to the advisers and we see that one of the selections from the Upper House as an adviser is more of a Government spokesman than he can be for the Opposition. We are left completely out, not only of expressing our views but also of what is going on around the Table. For that reason, we are most dissatisfied. I have no individual or any personality in mind but the exclusion of the Opposition in its entirety.

We are amazed to know that today when we are supposed to be running this country's affairs democratically, that such an attitude can be adopted, and I think the Government has lost a golden opportunity of coming down or not coming down and asking the parties in the Opposition through the official Opposition if they could not select one delegate from among themselves. The fact is that we in the Opposition have quite able persons who have from the inception in Jamaica been looking in on Federation, who have been keenly interested and who have contributed a great lot in this House. It is not that we have not have the ability or the will, because members who are well qualified to be at this important conference have expressed a wish and a desire to be there if selected. With that, Sir, I formally move the passing of this Address, and I invite members on both sides to express their opinion.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the Address which was moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would like first of all to impress upon this House that there are certain aspects in this matter which have a force of their own, independent of Party or of faction. In any conference such as the one which is to take place in February, there are certain things you must expect to see. One of these things is, that any Government which is to take part in a plenipotentiary Conference has the right to carry two of its own members if it wishes to. That is a right, Mr. Speaker, which you must concede to the Government if the Governmental delegation has to take part in a conference.

The second thing is, that if the conference is a conference of plenipotentiaries, the Government which is being represented at that conference should not run the risk of not having the voice of the people thoroughly represented. And that means in effect that so far as Parliament is concerned, the voice of the Opposition should not only be heard, but heard in a most effective manner, and that is by the inclusion in the delegation of a person who is charged with the Opposition's point of view, what ever that may be.

3 45 p.m.

The third thing, Mr. Speaker, is that when delegates representing a community are empowered to sign agreements which bind their community, it is essential that all who have that power should themselves be representatives of the people; so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize these three cardinal aspects of this matter and I repeat them here and now before I continue: (1) that the Government should

have a free and unfettered choice in its own delegation; but (2) that if the matters to be discussed at a particular conference are very important, when other points of view cannot be left out, then the Opposition Parties in Parliament ought to be asked to make their voices and their views effective by their inclusion in the delegation; and (3) is that, if the delegation has to put its signatures to agreements which bind the community to follow a definite course of action for the future, then of course it is in the interest of the people that such a Delegation be composed of persons who have been elected by the people and are therefore responsible to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you accept those three points (and there is nothing in them for any right thinking person on either side of this House to quarrel with) you can now take the three principles and apply them to the Delegation which His Excellency has informed the House has been appointed and which this House has been invited to concur in.

First of all, with reference to the Hon. Premier and the hon. senior member for Christ Church, here the first principle holds good that the Government Party should not only choose the delegation in the sense that the Government Party is the Majority Party, obviously, it has more members in the House than the Opposition Party. Therefore a case can be made out for the inclusion of a second member of the Government Party.

Now, let us take the second principle. There are, Mr. Speaker, about 14 Members of this House who give unqualified support to the Government; there are 10 who are not so committed. If we are to argue, Sir, that the points of view of 14 members of this House can be represented by two persons, he will be a very bold man who would go on to argue that the points of view of 10 members should not be represented at all. That is the issue. The Government is not required to search its own brain or to turn the matter into a puzzle or conundrum to discover which of the Opposition Leaders that should be included; it has a more simple duty to perform. There is the honourable junior member for Christ Church on this side of the Table and he is the person whom they recognise as Leader of the Opposition. They pay him the salary. He is the person whose recognition they so much underline and underpin that it was he who was asked to dine with Princess Margaret and he was asked because he is the Leader of the Opposition; so that from everything they have done so far and from the Message which this House received, the honourable junior member for Christ Church is the person whom they recognise as Leader of the Opposition.

Of course, if they want to say that because in their view he cannot lead a Government or might not lead one in their lifetime, and for that reason they do not recognise his competence to lead the Opposition which they previously recognised, they can say so. They say that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has said something different; they will soon know what ever he says.

Now, the matter was quite simple if Government wanted to act with constitutional rectitude. All they had to do was to tell the Leader of the Opposition that they wish to take him with them or that they wish him to summon a meeting of the Opposition Parties or persons in this House for a person to be chosen by them to be recommended for inclusion as a delegate and another person to be chosen to be recommended for inclusion as an adviser.

In some countries things are done much more differently and much more decently and I wish to quote to the House a letter which Mr. Norman Manley wrote to Sir Alexander Bustamante. It is true

that he did not send it on the issue of the delegation going to London but I am quoting it to show the attitude of a real Prime Minister towards a House of Parliament which he represents and of which he is a distinguished member. Mr. Manley in his letter says:—

“Dear Sir Alexander,

In keeping with the assurance I have given the country and you personally that I would adopt a bipartisan attitude in matters relating to Federation I think it right to advise you of recent developments.”

“If you think as I do that some useful purposes might be served” (he is here representing that certain aspects of problems might be discussed on a confidential level between the Parties in the House before the delegates go to the London Conference) “by having such a conference I will be very glad to meet you and any other officers of your Party who are members of the House you might care to bring with you at some time convenient to us both.”

This letter appeared in the *Jamaica Gleaner* on January 5th, 1956.

There is no question in Jamaica that Sir Alexander Bustamante cannot win or can win the next General Elections. There is no question even in Great Britain about the relative merits for winning the next General Elections between Sir Anthony Eden and Mr. Hugh Gaitskell. What is necessary, so to speak, to the working of a parliamentary system is that the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition generally have their places in the whole Parliamentary set-up; and all those people who want to by-pass the accepted conventions of Parliamentary Institutions are doing a great dis-service to democracy, because if you cannot work a two-party system properly, you cannot work parliamentary institutions at all.

No matter what the Government says, its members have been guilty of a grave disservice to Parliamentary Institutions in this country as well as an unpardonable insult to this House because they have not consulted the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, to ask him to call the Opposition Parties in this House and other persons together for the purpose of seeking the inclusion of a delegate of their point of view for the London Conference.

Now, for the third matter. Sir, I would say that Sir Archibald Cuke is a very distinguished Barbadian and no member of this House would wish to rob him of that praise for his service to the Island and to the Caribbean which is certainly his due.

3.55 p.m.

And we could go further and say that it is certainly one of the blessings attending Barbadian representation at these Conferences that Sir Archibald Cuke is a member of the Delegation, because it is on him and on him alone that will fall much of the arduous task of arguing the Barbados case at this Conference. But, Sir, Sir Archibald Cuke is not a member of this House; he has not asked anybody in this island for a vote and therefore his voice, weighty and valuable as it is, is not in any direct sense the voice of the people of Barbados or ever of any small section of them.

Had the Government really cared about constitutional proprieties they would have seen the unwisdom of including a member of the Other Place as a Delegate, but they would have got and retained his services as an Adviser to the limit of his and their capacities. The principle is sound; he who signs on behalf of the people of Barbados to bind them to something which will affect their future for many decades hence, must be a person who, at least is answerable to the people of Barbados.

The only thing which is wrong with Sir Archibald Cuke's inclusion on the Delegation is that he is a Delegate and not an Adviser. He has to be a Delegate because he is the only person in the Government who knows anything about anything at all, and they will have to lean on him heavily. This island as an island has been grateful in that they have been big enough to include Sir Archibald Cuke on this Delegation; but he is not a member of this House and as such, a representative of the people of Barbados. Therefore, they stand condemned that when they had a chance to make the representation of the people in this House a worthwhile thing, they have ignored that chance, partly through their narrow prejudices which they have imported into their politics and partly through the fact that they run the kind of Government that they must always have a Conservative with knowledge to do all or partly all of their work for them.

Turning now from the establishment of these three principles and the fact that this House has been asked to concur in the sending up of this Delegation, I would like it to be known that an insult has been delivered to this House, which is one of the many which it has suffered from this Government in recent years, and this is really unparalleled because of the matter under discussion. What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? His Excellency the Governor was gracious enough to send a Message to this House informing us officially that the Conference was to take place in London in February of this year. No member of the Government, not a Minister, thought it worthwhile that a Reply should be sent to His Excellency's Message. It was on the initiative of His Honour the Deputy Speaker, (the honourable junior member for the City,) that a Select Committee was appointed to draft a Reply to the Governor's Message. Included in the personnel of that Select Committee were the Hon. Premier and the Honourable Leader of the House. One of them, it is true, could claim that he was too ill to attend the meeting of the Select Committee, and the other, I think, has claimed that he had only just arrived from abroad on that morning, or later in the day, or on the next day; but at any rate, he could not attend the meeting.

That is unfortunate, but they cannot claim that they had no part in the Select Committee because they were put on it. But even if they were prepared to claim that, not having taken any part in the Select Committee's discussion, they were not bound to anything which the Select Committee said, they had their chance of making their views known to the House when the Select Committee's Draft Reply was being debated. In that Reply the House specifically said that it wished to see a Delegation which included a representative of each of the political Parties in the House. But when the Draft Reply was before the House for its consideration, there were three of the five Ministers present, and the Draft Reply was passed in this House; therefore, it became the Reply of the House of Assembly to His Excellency the Governor without criticisms from the Ministers and certainly without a division of opinion upon it. His Excellency the Governor was therefore fully apprised of the feelings of this House and he has therefore ignored the feelings of this House. He could only have done so on the advice of the Ministers who sit in Executive Committee, and certainly on the advice of the Premier. It is interesting to know that rumours concerning the personnel of the Delegation had been floating around in public long before His Excellency had replied to this House.

4.05 p.m.

I certainly heard in my own house who was chosen, and why such and such a person was not chosen; and so their contempt of the House is shown by the fact that not only do they ignore the House's recommendation, but they take care that the facts of the case should be known outside of the House, and that the House's recommendation has been ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I have no matters to mince in this issue and I leave it to other members to express their minds. If it is to be that the Opposition's point of view is not represented in this delegation, only one thing can result. We shall have to let the people of this island know that the delegation which is supposed to represent them and which has the power to sign in their name, is not the one in which we have the fullest confidence, and we have the right to repudiate it by public demonstration, and to see that the other delegates in London know that the Barbados delegation under these circumstances will suffer from the handicap of not being able to speak for all Barbadians. That is the notice which we wish to serve on this Government; and I wish to condemn most strongly their attitude towards this House, and the attitude which they show to a Conference of momentous proportions.

Again, Mr. Speaker, nobody in his right senses could believe that a delegation is going to London to commit this island to God knows what without the people of this island being first made aware of what is likely to be spoken and written in their names; nor, with the exception of Sir Archibald Cuke, have we got the assurance that the other persons who are delegates are well versed in all those matters which so vitally affect the future of this island.

So far as the honourable senior member for Christ Church is concerned, no matter how much praise we give him for the way he administers his department, we do not fool ourselves or fool him that he is so conversant with the whole history of federation that at this last minute he can pull his weight in the United Kingdom. And therefore, if he be at all conscientious, we can imagine how even now at this late hour, he is trying to do all his reading which he has been neglecting for the last seven or eight years on this very important matter, in order to be able to assimilate in three weeks what has taken the West Indies some seven or eight years to understand and grasp. That is no reflection on him, but it only goes to show not only the importance of the matter, but the lighthearted way in which it is being treated: that is the point about it. The three pre-Federal Commissioners' Reports have been laid in this House and have been put before us for our study.

It is not too much, Mr. Speaker, to prophesy that no member of this delegation or the delegation as at present selected has either studied all of them or will be in a position to give minute attention to them, although those of us who have read them or any part of them, know full well that they open up aspects of the matter which very few people in the West Indies had thought of before. And so once again, we might possibly find ourselves being represented by delegates who, whatever their worth, have not digested all of the material at their disposal and have not put before the people of this island their own views about these important matters, and therefore, have not ascertained from the people of this island the people's views on these important matters.

I wish to make my position clear, Mr. Speaker, and it is this: we cannot advise the Ministers on their own duties; we can only advise them about the people's interests. What they have done so far and what they have recommended that His Excellency

should do is not satisfactory to the Opposition members of this House. It is not therefore for us to bandy words with them or to try to reach any sort of dishonourable compromise on the matter if they have done something that they know is wrong. It is for them to find honourable means of putting right the wrong they have done and of re-adjusting the balance. But I wish to repeat that members of the Opposition need not and will not be bound by anything that may be done by a delegation which does not represent all the points of view which exist in this island; and they will hold themselves free to repudiate them and to stress the want of confidence which people in this island have in it, if only the need for that arises, so that in London as well as in Barbados and the West Indies it should be known that the Government of Barbados has forsaken all the well known traditional parliamentary conventions, has ignored the Opposition, and has treated this important matter as if it were a mere normal routine Governmental Conference and not a party of delegates with full powers to do whatever is to be done on behalf of the West Indian people.

It is the importance of the Conference, Mr. Speaker, which the Opposition realises; and because we recognize that it is important, we insist that our point of view be given its due weight.

We feel thoroughly ashamed that a debate of this nature should take place in this House of Assembly, because the Premier has made it known not only in this island but abroad, that we have the best of constitutions, and that he himself exercises an authority in the constitution of this island which is of a similar authority to that which Sir Winston Churchill once exercised in the constitution of the United Kingdom.

If the models are the same as the originals, then the people in the outside world would expect that if he goes to such lengths to model a constitution which he works on that of Great Britain, he ought equally to be bound to follow such conventions. One such convention is that in important national matters the voice of the Opposition is given its full weight, and in National Conferences the signatures of the Opposition ought to assist in binding the nation.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against will please say "No". I think the "Noes" have it.

A VOICE: Divide.

ANOTHER VOICE: Ring the bell.

The bell was rung.

Hon. R. G. Mapp, Mr. J. A. Haynes, Mr. O. T. Alder, Mr. F. L. Walcott, Mr. A. E. S. Lewis, entered the House and took their seats.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The question has already been put, Mr. Speaker. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas nor any of the other honourable members from the other side who have just entered the Chamber cannot vote on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those honourable members who have come in the House since the question has been put would not be able to vote on the question.

The question that the Address do now pass was decided in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

"Ayes": Mr. TUDOR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT and Mr. GODDARD—4.

"Noes": Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY and Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN—10.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MR. BARROW

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the honourable senior member for St. George who has asked me to request this honourable House for leave of absence for himself for 10 weeks as from to-day.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 & 89

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am moving that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended in order to proceed with the Resolution for \$17,500 of which notice was given to-day.

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

The question was put and decided in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY and Mr. ALLDER—13.

Noes: Mr. TUDOR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—6.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply and that it be an instruction of the Committee to deal with the Resolution for \$17,500 of which notice has just been given.

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

The question was put and decided in the affirmative without division and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Supplementary Estimate, 1955—56 No. 59 Final Federation Conference

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I propose to deal with the Resolution for \$17,500. I feel sure that I will not be led into the temptation of saying some of the things which I have in mind for another debate. The House having refused just now to concur in an Address relative to the composition of the delegation, it has become necessary to find the money to send the delegation.

Let me tell honourable members at once that if the money voted for the Conference Vote in the Annual Estimates was enough, this Resolution would not have been before the House at all because the Conference Vote is voted for this purpose. It is voted to defray expenses for such Conferences as you expect to take place in the financial year.

Let me say now that I hear whatever happens in Executive Committee is known in some people's drawing room. Be that as it may, the Colonial Office has thought it necessary to have this Conference in February. Had we known that this Conference was going to take place in February this year, which is in this Financial Year, this vote would have been made already. I say that because I would like this Committee to know the position of the Government on this matter.

4.25 p.m.

The Conference vote will not cover the other Conferences at which Barbados has to be represented; this is one of them and therefore this Resolution has been sent down in this way specifically and not con-

nected with the Conference vote. This is not ordinarily supplementary to the Conference vote.

We have been invited to send this number of Delegates with Advisers and we have sent the minimum number so as to save expense. We might have done like Trinidad, sending every member of the Executive Committee who happens to find his way to London, to attend the Conference as an Adviser; but the resources of this Colony are in no way comparable with those of Trinidad; therefore, we are sending the minimum number of Advisers; we are sending six people in all.

As to the breakdown of this Resolution, it must be remembered that when you deal with travelling and incidental expenses, this amount is not necessarily going to be spent. We are providing against the possibilities, I might even say probabilities, but this is the breakdown. We cannot control the cost of passages. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Are you going by Pan American?] We find that Pan American finds it very difficult to fly straight. I will deal with Pan American in due course.

The subsistence allowance is at the usual rate, except that we do not follow the Colonial Office practice of giving the amount of £5 for attending these important Conferences. The Colonial Office has a rule that Advisers get less than Delegates; we feel that that would be rather insulting to the Advisers, although a Delegate has to entertain people more often than an Adviser who is only a Civil Servant.

Hotel expenses are, of course, an estimate. We have been getting some rather urgent telegrams sent to us saying that London will be very full in February and hotel accommodation is very difficult. The Trade Commissioner is backing hotel accommodation. The cost of hotel accommodation is estimated at a moderate figure; at the kind of Hotel at which the Financial Secretary and I have stayed, the Charing Cross Hotel, which is a third-rate Hotel.

Obviously, the sum of £5 will not cover a person's hotel bill if he takes tea or a couple of drinks before meals; the sum of £5 is the absolute minimum. The average lunch is 14/- as far as I remember and dinner 17/6 so that if honourable members will add that up, they will see that the sum of £5 does not adequately cover what one can expect might happen, and what more than likely, must happen, with a Delegation of this sort.

Travelling and incidental expenses, including hospitality, must be an estimate. It is conceivable and we do expect that Her Majesty's Government will provide us with travelling. Persons going on Delegations have had to pay their own taxi travelling, and although I hope that travelling will be provided by H.M.G. we have estimated a sum for travelling. Incidental expenses include and are mainly for hospitality. It is known from past experience that we are going to be the guests, sometimes we have been the victims at Cocktail Parties as West Indians. We cannot always get out of them as we would like.

From past experience after these Delegates are entertained, they themselves give Cocktail Parties to those persons who have entertained the several Delegates. This amount is extremely moderate and we may have to approach the House again. In 1953 I had to send a cable to Barbados asking for an additional vote of £50; and the Crown Agents later informed us that that amount did not cover the expenses and we had to look for a further £25.

I am showing honourable members how ultra-Conservative we are going to be; in spite of what some honourable member or members or the public might think, if Barbados is to prevail in persuading

some of these Delegates to vote for Barbados as the Federal Capital, we cannot be too stingy. [MEMBERS: Oh no; that cannot buy it.] 4.35 p.m.

Hon. members will agree with me that it is essential for Barbados to be opened to American Emigrants, yet member after member will get up in this House and say that it is essential to do this or that and raise criticisms wilfully. In short, Mr. Chairman, I think that even members of the Opposition will agree that it is possible that we are underestimating the cost of the Conference. I must remind members that it is revelant, I think, sir, for this debate.

It is suggested that this Conference might last more than ten days or a fortnight with all these reports before us. Though there is no parliamentary agreement among Caribbean delegates as to how much we are going to discuss, it is true that only major issues will be raised and discussed; but members know that the Chief Minister for Jamaica will raise the points which we find ourselves discussing, whether or not we are going to allow this or that debate to go on, or whether we are going to be bound by the 1953 Report, modified by their Freedom of Movement Conference in Trinidad, and modified by any suggestions that have been made by the Fiscal Commission on the basis of the Customs Revenue we agreed on. Hon. members will see that it is not likely that the Conference will last only for ten days. For that reason I am asking members to vote for this \$17,500.

I do not think I can give honourable members any more information. I should mention that we have included in this \$1,445 the sum of £100 which is being placed at my disposal as Leader of the Delegation for hospitality which you should not expect could be easily met from their subsistence allowance. That £100 is of course on behalf of the whole delegation while the £300 is on behalf of all the Ministers. If it is not spent it will be returned; but I mention that only to emphasise the point I have been making as to if anything it is underestimated. I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that with such an important Conference such as this that those who are living (or who will never have an opportunity like this again in our whole life time, because we are putting an end to this sort of Government,) should know more about the proposed Conference in London. I should say at the outset that if I had any advice to tender to the sponsors of this Resolution, I would have taken the opportunity not only to let posterity know what we feel so far as this important Conference on Federation is concerned; and there would be no question that the Government had won by a method of tactics. Those of us who have heard today, (and if we have any offspring or relative in years to come) should know what the House of Assembly has decided about the delegates with plenipotentiary powers for such a West Indian Conference; but I thought the Premier would have taken the opportunity when that motion was introduced to have adopted such methods to let the people of Barbados know of the Government's views on Federation, because the Premier knows more about these Reports than any other member of this House. He is the one man who has been dealing with this matter of Federation continuously from the time it was started apart from certain other members of the Government who attended the Caribbean Labour Congress when it held a Conference in Barbados in 1947.

4.45 p.m.

He is the one man who has met all the people who have dealt with this thing. What I thought the Premier would have done would have been to take this opportunity to let the public know today who are going as our delegates, why he has selected those persons, as well as how he feels on certain of those issues which the delegates will have to deal with. I say that posterity will know of it.

If the Opposition brings in a point and you have won out in a debate on it, that may be alright for political tactics, but on an issue like this political tactics are not necessary. There is no person in Barbados who can say that the subject of Federation is something which he does not believe in and therefore I think the Hon. Premier should have put himself in the position to say why he has chosen that delegation as apart from any other.

I want to say at this junction that I do not subscribe to some of the views which I have heard expressed by the Opposition in respect of the delegation, especially when it comes to the selection of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture because I feel if the Hon. Minister of Agriculture as a member of the Government has any political philosophy, in keeping with the Government's Party, he has more right to be a delegate on that delegation than the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke because the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke does not subscribe to the political ideology of the Government Party. The Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke does not owe any allegiance to the Party in power, therefore, there is no reason why he could not be left out. As a matter of fact, he should not be chosen as a delegate: he should be chosen as an Adviser.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member not to discuss the personnel of the delegation.

A VOICE: Who said so?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not in the Resolution. The Resolution is for the passing of \$17,500 to send the personnel and I am not entertaining in the debate any talk with reference to the personnel. That has been passed already.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman. I have the greatest respect for the Chair, and I am sure that the Chair has the greatest respect for common-sense.

Now, Sir, I am not attempting to criticise the Government for the choice of its delegation. The Government has that right; but surely, as I have said earlier, you Mr. Chairman, must realise that as a result of Federation you will not have the opportunity to preside over a debate such as this in this Chamber in the future because we are changing every phase of our country and people to nationhood by what we are doing today. What we are doing today is not something for the building of a road in St. Andrew, or in Mahaica, or in Barracks Road.

This Resolution is dealing with the constitutional development of our country and for those of us who want to shake off the shackles of colonialism, this is one of the things which must be done. If we look at this matter in its wider sense, I am sure that the Hon. Premier will be bound to realise that he should not stultify a debate such as this on the eve of the London Conference because so doing is the antithesis to any democratic process. Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that we are giving up our constitution when we enter Federation. This House will only be a sort of parochial body in the next 20 years; this House is going to be a glorified Vestry in the next 20 years. Do you think we should give up our rights easily? Do you realise that in the next couple of years you will not be sitting there with such powers

as you have now? The Government by their action today will be giving more powers to a Federal structure. The Hon. Premier knows that. I can show you what the Hon. Premier has written on Federation and I can tell you that what he has written on in 1947 gives even greater power to a Federal Structure than the power which is to be given to the Federal Structure which we are getting; therefore, you can take it that if he is a member of this delegation to London he is going to ask for even greater powers for the Federal structure which we are getting than what Colonial Office is now giving.

Let me say that Sir Archibald Cuke would have been an excellent choice for the Government if they had taken him as an Adviser because he is not an elected member. I will say again that I do not subscribe to the view that the honourable senior member for Christ Church who is the Minister of Agriculture should not be a member of that delegation; as a member of the Government Party, he has a right to be a member of that delegation.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. Your Honour has ruled. All I am telling honourable members is that I hope the Federal Reports will not be debated today. I will confess that I myself am not thoroughly satisfied with my reading of those three reports, so I am asking honourable members, let us not debate the Reports now; let us get further knowledge of their contents by reading them further.

However, I do suggest that it is a vast difference between that and discussing the personnel of the delegation. After all, Your Honour has ruled that we should not discuss the personnel because that question has already been decided by the House. Why should the honourable member go on speaking on that matter!

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Premier should know me by now. The analogy that I was making was to show why I think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture should be on the delegation. If it does not please the honourable member I cannot help; I am doing what I feel the Government should have done.

So far as they are concerned, I feel that they should have said something so as to let the public know why they had selected one of their members other than the Premier on the delegation and I say so because the honourable senior member for Christ Church is the one member of the delegation who has received the greatest criticism from the public. What I do say is that on an important Conference like this, I can very well appreciate the Hon. H. A. Cuke going as an Adviser and the Hon. Premier reserving the right for members other than his Party to go on a delegation.

Now some honourable members have said that they are going to ask for a reduction of this vote; but I am going to show you, Mr. Chairman, how parsimonious it is. One of the reasons why I would not reduce it is because the Government has back pay for me when I went on a Conference at Geneva. The Government offered me \$12 a day to live in a country like Geneva and that could not pay Hotel Expenses there.

An honourable member has said that hotel expenses and subsistence allowance seemed to be the same thing. The question which I think should be answered is why is it that subsistence allowance and hotel expenses can be estimated at the same figure when hotel expenses are not fixed figures. You can give a fixed subsistence allowance and you can say that the subsistence allowance is so much but it does not follow that that subsistence allowance is going to be enough per day for hotel and expenses. I do not

like your view when you say that the subsistence allowance and the hotel expenses are likely to be the same because if a delegation is going to Charing Cross Hotel, the rates which are charged at that hotel are likely to be something like 50/- per day with breakfast and you have to provide yourself with lunch and dinner outside of that charge.

The Hon. Premier says that the Colonial Office has agreed to five pounds a day as subsistence allowance and I want to make it clear what the Colonial Office means by £5 a day as subsistence allowance. When they pay £5 per day as subsistence allowance, it means that you can pick a hotel for yourself to stay because if they pick a hotel for you, when you have finished paying your hotel expenses and getting all the food you want, you will have to put money along with the £5 to make up the expense.

4.55 p.m.

I would like to know if he is saying that if you go to the Charing Cross Hotel and pay £2. 10s. and pay all the other expenses, with that £5 you will have to look for the cheapest restaurant to get a meal. The Colonial Office does not give you £5 in the same way as the Jamaica Government gives you £5. I feel that if the Hon. Premier is putting up a subsistence allowance for this Conference, it should be based on a figure so that one can say: "This is the allowance; no matter who you are, you can go to any Conference," so that you would not have to be debating the question whenever you are going to a Conference. I do not agree with the Hon. Premier when he says that we do not have the finance of Trinidad; because a man comes from Tortola and not from Barbados, the Government decides that you are living in England and when a man comes from another country therefore you have to give him a different allowance.

The Hon. Premier has not said what the subsistence rate is; it is expected that if you send a man to a Conference you should pay his hotel expenses and not ask him to walk around with a bill. For the Hon. Premier to sign a bill and bring it back to show that he ate today at this hotel and the bill is so much, that is the sort of nonsense which the Government has been subscribing to, and it is some thing which must go.

I do not think that any honourable member who goes on a Delegation should have the indignity of locking for a bill. I said this when I was a member of the Executive Committee. I do not believe in the cheap rates which people get when they are sent out on Delegations because people come here and get better rates than we receive when we are going out. I can give a personal example. I went to Trinidad as the Representative of a Trade Union; I called for drinks, and the bill was \$8.59. When a fellow is calling for Scotch Whisky you have to pay the price of Scotch. I tendered \$10 and I could not call back for the change because you have to feel big! [Laughter].

The Hon. Premier says that we want to be conservative; but he has said in this House on one occasion that we need not be conservative when we are sending out ambassadors from this colony because we want to look big, not like the Premier at the Coronation asking for a drop! [Mr. CRAWFORD: He had a subsistence allowance.] I do not know what kind of allowance he had; I was told by people in London that the Premier came there and travelled in a tube; sometimes you have to go by tube; on other occasions you have to travel by limousine. Do you mean an allowance of £5 on the basis of paying for hotel accommodation — [Mr. CRAWFORD: Hotel accommodation is separate] and the food must be separate too.

If travelling is part of the expenses which you are going to have, I cannot see why the British Government should not be providing the travelling for the Delegates. The particular country in which the Conference is held is expected to be the host and therefore it takes on the expense of providing travelling for people. As regards the hospitality vote the Premier said that £100 is put at his disposal to be spent just as you spend the Ministerial vote; but you cannot spend that sort of money in England as is spent under the Ministerial vote. The sum of £100 is chicken feed, if you are having a hospitality vote. We had a party for somebody the other day at the Marine Hotel and it cost more than £100.

You have the sum of £300 for the Delegation and there are six members of the Delegation; having regard to the size of the Delegation, would £300 be an adequate amount for a hospitality vote? If you have a Delegation of six people and Trinidad is carrying a Delegation of six and the Barbados Delegation is "throwing" a party you have to go to a proper Hotel where you can accommodate people. You cannot go to the Howard Hotel which people cannot find, and you cannot call for a mauby there! [Laughter]

I am suggesting that it is not necessary to come back here for more money; if the amount is to be \$20,000, let us say so now. What is the idea of coming back for more money when you know that you have been to London and you know what having parties is going to cost. We cannot be the Federal Capital of the West Indies on such a low plane that we bribe it on the basis of the money which we are going to spend. 5.05 p.m.

This is what I know not from the inside but from the outside—that the Colonial Office is desirous of having the capital in Barbados. [A VOICE: Don't say that!]. It is true but the Colonial Office are better lobbyists than the six who are chosen to go to England.

The delegates who went to the meeting at San Francisco had more money in their pockets because it was a Government Conference and it was an important matter to the people that went there. Do you think that the British Government is going to say that they are going to invest over £1½ million in the Federal structure without some word as to where it should be?

The point that the Premier raised in saying it is going to be cheap is nonsense. The Premier said, that the attack we made is the surest way of keeping the capital from Barbados, but I will tell him—and I am speaking as a Barbadian and a responsible Barbadian—that my only agreement for the Capital to be in Barbados is that I would be regarded as selfish and partial not to agree, because if the capital of the Federation comes to Barbados, the added distribution of the income would mean more to the colony; but with the social aspect as it is, Barbados is the worst place to put the capital because we still have to fight the barriers that we do not have to fight in Trinidad irrespective of what you say against the Government there, and Barbados is not a very good society for men to live in.

I am sure that people would agree with me, that if the Premier had an important personage or his counterpart to come to this island, he would have to drive the man to the Yacht Club and come back out as if he were a mere driver; but you want me to agree that we do not have this semblance of stark racial discrimination in our community, and you want all people to believe so too.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The honourable member must remember not only has it appeared in the Press that I said so, but legislation is to be passed to put an end to racial discrimination in places open to the public; and I hope to get the assurance from the Attorney General that before I leave here it will be

on the Statute Book. [A VOICE: Don't mind you!]

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to go slowly. Tourists go to Jamaica and I would say this: if there is one of the things that Mr. Bustamante has done for the West Indies it is to make people realise you are in Jamaica and you have to respect Jamaica and Jamaican institutions.

Now, I say that, and I do not pretend that I am saying something that I have a referendum of saying, because I am confident that my fellow Barbadians are a bit docile and a bit slow on these issues and whenever we raise them an attack is being put on our heads. But I tell you, Sir, we do not have any more advantages—and I want to say this! do not let us fool ourselves that we have any more advantages for the Federal Capital than the other places that have been suggested. The Federal Report says, it should be in a place with harbour and airway facilities. I am not bringing back the Airport Debate, but what I am saying is a fact. Moreover, if as the Premier said, it is his desire that these men should be treated on a better footing than they have been treated in the past, what I ask is this, do you expect on this occasion that the rates you laid down are going to be standard rates, apart from the hospitality grants which are necessary on occasions like this? Would the Government say these are going to be standard rates or are they going to come back to the House when they find the amount is inadequate? With this Government if you go out and spend three cents you are afraid you spend too much money. When you send a delegation away you have to give them money, because when they are leaving the Hotel they have to give heavyweight tips. You cannot give the people a shilling a day. If you have been served by waiters you have to tip them commensurate with the position which you hold. Mr. Chairman I do not subscribe to the view of cheapness as regards the Federal Capital, and because when you have an ambassador or a delegation going somewhere, you have to spend money in these things. You will pardon me if I say that the one person who is responsible for the attitude of making people of Barbados believe that you are spending too much money on this, is the Premier and it is coming back like a boomerang. The British Government is the cheapest Government to send anybody anywhere in the world. They give 25/- a night to a person and they must find a hotel at 25/-, drink coffee on mornings, and if they eat an egg they have to pay for it out of their own pockets. [A VOICE: Stop quoting Colonial Office rates.] Yes, he then drinks a cup of tea at breakfast, tea at lunch and keeps his hands by the fire to keep warm. We have to get a heavy meal. We cannot send people to do that sort of nonsense and giving you potatoes every time they look at you.

So I feel, Mr. Chairman, that looking at this vote as it is, the Premier should be big enough, if he feels the amount should be \$25,000 to say so now and let us be finished with it. He had a golden opportunity today to have discussed the reason why he has chosen a delegation without bringing the Opposition and I do not think that the delegation, considering the debates they are going to have is satisfactory. It is not the Opposition we are dealing with; it is the public of Barbados. Apparently, it does not seem to matter if the public get the information they are deserving of. I am a member of this community and I travel among the people.

5.15 p.m.

I am going to tell you again that you should give the reason why the three people whom you have selected as delegates should go in preference to any member from the Opposition. You should say that these are the reasons why the Government has selected these persons as delegates. If you hold reasons why those persons should be selected and the

Opposition does not agree with you, well, that is their function to disagree.

However, no honourable member should be tempted by pique or spite to say that he is not going to vote for this Resolution owing to the absence of any information by the Government as to its reason for choosing that Delegation which is to go to London, although I would say that Government should state its reason. I ask again: why should the Opposition be placed in the position that it cannot be given the reason why you have chosen such persons to be members of your Delegation? You find in Barbados where there is a higher system of Government than any where else in the West Indies that you do not get in a debate on Federation the sort of information or the sort of debate that you would expect to emerge from such a matter. The Delegation will be leaving here on February 3 next. When are you going to debate this question in the light of what is contained in the Pre-Federal Reports? Honourable members should have been given the opportunity of discussing that aspect of Federation to-day and I think no harm would be caused in doing it on this Resolution. What does grieve me about this matter is the way in which this whole question was dealt with to-day and I feel sure that we cannot be proud of our actions to-day on this matter in the future because they were unnecessary.

I do not see that the Government has done anything on the matter which it could not explain to us. What is wrong with the Delegation that it cannot say anything on it?

However, I feel so far as some honourable members have said that they are not going to vote for this Resolution because Government has not explained why it has chosen that Delegation that that would not make sense because you have to vote for it at some time or the other. To reduce the vote, as some honourable member has hinted, would not help the Delegation; it would only reduce the personnel of the Delegation from the small number which it is at present. To my mind, the Delegation should be stronger; it should be more fully representative. [Applause] I go further by saying that it is not too late now for the Government to decide in its mind that it should strengthen the Delegation. [Further Applause] After all, we are not going to have any more opportunity to discuss Federation.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the Hon. Premier attended the first Federation Conference at Montego Bay, Jamaica in 1947. It is true, that the honourable senior member for St. Philip was a member of the Government then. What I want to say is that it is not a question of fighting against one another when one from the Opposition goes on the delegation. I like to give to Jack his jacket. The honourable senior member for St. Philip is an excellent debater; therefore any contribution which he can make on Federation would be helpful to Barbados. The best opportunity for Barbados being made the Federal Capital is for the Delegation which we are going to send to be united with the Delegations from other colonies on certain principles.

No man can push any honourable member out of this House on the question of Federation. As a matter of fact, in Barbados the idea of Federation means a fight. When you hear a man telling you that there is Federation outside, he means that the dogs, the pigs, the cats and everybody else outside are in a fight. Any honourable member in here can vote as he likes on Federation because he cannot lose even half a vote on it. No one outside would say that he is against anyone in here because he did not vote for

Federation. Few people outside know what it even means. Those of us who know what it means and who have the responsibility should lead the people into the goal which is higher than where we stand at present. That is all to it.

I feel the Hon. Premier should have used his position to have included in the Delegation such elements of the Opposition that exist and who would mean more to Barbados and more to his Party by their addition. If he were in the Opposition, I doubt very much whether anybody would have objected to his accompanying the Delegation. The reason why we are here to-day as Representatives of the people is because we protested similar actions by those who belonged to a certain class and who wanted to hold on, not only to economic but also to political power. That class has lost its political power through its failing to be liberal to the masses and this Government is following in that footstep by not allowing itself to be liberal in its outlook and to give to others what they should have. You will lose in the long run if you are not more liberal to others. It would have done the Government no harm if it had included the honourable junior member for Christ Church in the Delegation. I heard that they asked the honourable senior member for the City to be a member of the Delegation but that he did not accept the offer of going. I understand that he said: "Oh no, that is not for me, England is too far for my health." [Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not true.] Speaking for myself personally, I doubt very much that he was asked; he might have been asked on another occasion.

What I am going to say is no secret. On one occasion when a Sugar Delegation was being sent out of the Colony, the Hon. Premier regarded that Delegation of such importance that he made attempts to ask the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. J. H. Wilkinson, to accompany the Delegation. I objected as well as other people objected because we felt it was not a national issue; we felt it was a matter concerning the Government. So important that Delegation appeared to the Hon. Premier on that occasion that he sought to acquire the assistance of the then Leader of the Opposition and I may say that the then Leader of the Opposition had no more chances of forming an alternative Government than I have of being the Vice Pope of Rome.

I also would say that on that matter which is infinitely smaller than this matter of Federation, the Hon. Premier thought he should ask the then Leader of the Opposition: but on this matter he does not think so. I do not see how it should occur to him that the Opposition should be ignored on the basis that it cannot form an alternative Government. They cannot form an alternative Government on the basis of the nonsense which you read in the *Beacon* that you are soft pedalling them with. However I will deal with what they write in the *Beacon* sooner or later. I accept the view that the Opposition cannot form an alternative Government if it has that sort of mentality that when you make positive statements on behalf of labour you get somebody telling you that is reprehensible conduct.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member. This is a Conference vote.
5.25 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I feel that on this occasion it is far more important that other elements of the House should be asked to accompany the Delegation because it is a matter dealing with constitutional issues which we cannot undo after we have taken part in this Conference.

I feel that there are the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the honourable senior member for St.

Philip, who attended the Conference at Montego Bay, and if you take the two of them along with any Delegation the extra cost of the Delegation would be infinitesimal. My plea is—I can afford to say it,—in the interest of commonsense and in the interest of the community. The Hon. Premier should see that it should be representative of other elements on this occasion because it is not a matter of a Party issue; it is a national issue. If therefore, consideration is given to this matter, it is not too late for persons like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the honourable junior member for Christ Church, and the honourable senior member for St. Philip to accompany the Delegation.

The last bit of information which I would like to have on this Resolution is this. The Hon. Premier has said that the sum of £100 is going to be placed at the disposal of the Premier, is he saying that £300 is the amount that they are putting in for hospitality? I want that question answered. The other question I would like to ask is this: What kind of flight insurance can you get for a Delegation of six persons which could only produce \$49.44? It is not that we want to preserve all the lives of those who are going on this Delegation; we would have to sing a nice Requiem Mass when they are taken into Eternity. [Laughter.] Are you insuring public men's lives on a standard that you are taking out a £5,000 insurance? On a Trade Union basis we would ask for so much a year for so long as you have served. This sum of \$49.44 must represent something. The Deputy Clerk of the House says that it may be the luggage which they are insuring. This is an important matter; in the Colonial Office they have a habit of saying that they cannot give you this amount because the Premier does not get any more than that. I will say this: I know that the insurance from here to Trinidad for £10,000 is something in the vicinity of \$12 and I cannot see how in taking men to London and back you could produce this amount of \$49.44, unless they are paying for £5,000 insurance.

I ask this question because other people may be travelling and they will find themselves very much embarrassed in having to pay charges which they did not know they had to pay. Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is the desire of honourable members to adjourn for tea, and I therefore beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

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

The CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
5.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just before the motion for the adjournment is made I want to read a Rule on procedure. Just before we went into Committee and the decision was ordered to take the voices on a question of a vote affecting the Resolution made by the honourable member the Leader of the Opposition, notice of a summons for members to reassemble was indicated by the ringing of the Bell at the Clerk's table. I now want to regularise a matter of procedure. At that time I was under the impression that according to Rule 143 members who were then absent when the Order to take the voices had been given, could not afterwards resume their seats and declare their votes. I must now point out that according to Rule 287, such a position would be meaningless and I now therefore redirect that the procedure of taking the voices on this motion be now regularised. The voices will again now be taken.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS. On a point of order. That Rule has literally never to my knowledge in the 20 years I have been here acted on. We are copying House of Commons Rules and not acting on them. According to the words of the procedure in Great Britain, if the Speaker's declaration is challenged, he then rings the Bell and then puts the question again. The Rule reads as follows:—

“Immediately before any question is put in the House, but not in Committee, it shall be the duty of the Clerk or the Deputy Clerk on the intimation of the Speaker to give notice thereof by ringing an electric bell placed in the lobby of the House and no question shall be put from the Chair until the expiration of one minute from the time of ringing such bell.”

But if the members are outside when the question is put, even bringing them into the House by ringing the bell does not permit them to vote. You cannot take this Rule which was applicable before 1941. With the greatest submission Rule 287 was applicable to Barbados 40 years ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, I do not at all agree with the Hon. Premier. Whether this Rule is applicable or is inapplicable now, it remains a Rule; and I seem to have a different reading. Rule 287 reads as follows:—

“Immediately on a division being called for in the House, not in Committee, it shall be the duty of the Clerk or the Deputy Clerk if the Speaker thinks fit to direct him to do so to give notice thereof by ringing an electric bell placed in the lobby of the House and no questions shall be put from the Chair until the expiration of one minute from the time of ringing such bell.”

Well, the question has been put and a division called for at this stage. I myself was under the impression that only a member then present could vote. But the idea of ringing the bell to summon people into the House is to enable them to register their vote, and I still maintain that the vote should be taken again.

The question that this Address do now pass was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ALDER, Mr. TUDOR, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, and Mr. GODDARD.—7

Noes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. G. H. ADAMS, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. M. E. COX, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. R. G. MAPP, Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. VAUGHAN.—11

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.50 p.m.

On reassembling.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House adjourned it was in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew act as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Chairman of Committees.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mrs. BOURNE being in the Chair.

Federation

MADAM CHAIRMAN: On the adjournment, the honourable junior member for St. Peter was speaking. He is not in place. The honourable senior member for St. Philip seconded the motion that the Committee report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Madam Chairman, I want to invite the House and the public to regard it as more than passing strange that we are actually voting the money to pay the cost of the Federation Delegation to London even before the House has concurred in the selection of the Delegation. The Addendum to the Resolution states that in Message No. 38/1955 the Honourable the House of Assembly was invited to concur in the appointment of the Delegates and Advisers selected to attend the final Conference on Federation which is due to begin in London on the 7th February, 1956. It is therefore to be assumed that the Government itself thought when this Resolution was being dealt with that the House would have already concurred in the selection of the Delegation.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I take it that the House has concurred in the selection of the Delegation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: You are taking it wrongly.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: The House has concurred in the selection of the Delegation by the number of votes which were taken on the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not surprised that you are misinformed by the people who should have told you better. The House has not concurred in the selection of the Delegation and I am submitting at this stage (1) that the House should not agree to the passing of this Resolution before it has concurred in the selection of the Delegation; and (2) that the House should not concur in this Resolution before it has no knowledge of that stand which the Government and the Delegation which it is proposed to take, have on the controversial issues which will be settled at the London Parley.

It might be true to state that the Reports of which mention has been made by the Government's spokesman earlier today have not been before us sufficiently long enough for us to discuss them in detail, but certainly other issues have arisen which are just as important and on which this House and the country should be given some explanation of policy by the Government before we confer in these appointments.

It is well known that the Chief Minister of Jamaica has submitted certain proposals to Colonial Office which he wants discussed when the Delegates meet in London. It is also well known that the various Colonial Governments have been circularised by the Colonial Office on those proposals which are very controversial in themselves. Last month when we discussed this question of Federation I suggested that it might be necessary to hold a preliminary West Indian Conference before the Delegates actually met in London to resolve those issues and I noticed since then that my suggestion has been endorsed by other people in the West Indies and by

the most influential newspaper in the West Indies, the "Jamaica Gleaner."

6.30 p.m.

So that even if the Government has the excuse that it was not yet prepared to discuss the three Reports, the Fiscal Report, the Judicial Report and the Report of the Civil Service Commissioner, there was enough to be discussed in the Memorandum submitted by the Jamaica Government at the Colonial Office to ask the Island Governments to express their views upon it. In my opinion, the Government is not prepared to make public its views on any of these controversial issues because it almost says that those views will not meet with public acceptance. All it wants to do is to secure concurrence in this Resolution and then —

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I wonder if I give the honourable member an assurance whether he would accept it. I want honourable members to speak with the utmost strength on the matters on which they differ from these Reports. I am almost saying what I said in 1953 when we discussed the matter here. In 1953 I was in a position after the discussion in this House of Assembly to say that the House of Assembly is solidly against this, that and the other. The honourable member knows that that happened in 1953 and yet he makes the suggestion that we have something to conceal, that you can give us the money and we will do what we like.

I am imploring honourable members to talk as strongly as they like on what they do not agree with. The Government will disclose its attitude on everything that is likely to arise there, including the Chief Jamaica Minister's seven points and will invite the rest of the House to give their views on whatever matter that crops up. We have more to lose than anybody else in this Federation; we want our hands to be strengthened on what we said in 1953.

Mr. CRAWFORD: From past experience we know how much weight we can attach to that assurance.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In spite of that solemn assurance which I have given, the honourable member gets up and says that we are not going to keep our word. Well, that is the honourable member's business.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The records of this House are replete with assurances which have been given by the honourable member who then acts completely different from what he has said. [Hon. M. E. COX: Name one.] The honourable member knows fully well that there is no excuse at all for failing to state the Government's views on the Memorandum at this stage. I will concede that the reports might take more time to study, but the only important Report, or rather the most important Report, is the Fiscal Report. It is as important as Mr. Manley's proposal for Constitutional Reform and up to now, a bare three weeks or so before the Delegates will be leaving for London, the House does not yet know how the Hon. Premier stands or how the Government stands in relation to these proposals. The Government itself impliedly admits that in principle the House should concur in the Delegation before it votes this money, and that this is a matter of putting the cart before the horse. There is no hurry in voting this money; if the Premier has a majority vote, he can get the money on the day before he leaves for London and therefore why should he hesitate to state publicly how they stand in this matter rather than endeavour to secure the money you want for the expenses of this Delegation first. That should come afterwards.

I am not prepared to support this Resolution as it stands and I am therefore suggesting that it should be postponed. Previous speakers have discussed this Resolution in terms of the inadequacy of the amount which has been earmarked for allowances and hotel expenses. To me all that is immaterial at this stage; there are more momentous matters to be dealt with. I merely want to say in passing that the subsistence allowance for three people works out at \$500 each, plus another \$500 for hotel expenses. There is \$1,000 each for hotel expenses and allowance. If the Government approaches this matter on the presumption that this Conference will last for ten days, then this allowance works out at \$100 each per day. It may be that this Conference will be prolonged for more than ten days; to quote what was given by one of the Government Spokesmen on this Resolution, this allowance will work out at \$100 each per day. If that amount is not adequate for ten days I do not know what will be.

With regard to the hospitality vote of £300 of which the Premier claims that £100 would be for his own personal expenses, all I want to say incidentally is that I am amazed that he should think of speaking of utilising this hospitality vote of £300 in terms of acquiring the Federal Capital for Barbados. I am amazed that he should think in terms of that matter at the time when he was speaking about this hospitality vote. I am amazed to think that he should be of that mentality to believe that a little cocktail party would have the remotest influence on the responsible West Indian Delegates who are going to London to settle this question of Federation and of the Federal Capital of the West Indies.

6.40 p.m.

The honourable member, Madam Chairman, who has for years shown personal antagonism to many of the most important figures in the West Indies, dissipated almost every chance we have had of being the Federal Capital, now on the eve of Federation, talks nonsense about a cocktail party and its possible influence on the selection of Barbados as the Federal Capital. If he were interested in securing Barbados as a Federal Capital, why the unpardonable contumely to the then Head of Jamaica. (Mr. Bustamante), why the hostility to Albert Gomes of Trinidad, why his uncompromising attitude towards the people who count in the West Indian scheme of things? I have heard from Mr. Bustamante that all along he prefers Barbados as the Federal Capital, and when he came here and had dinner in the lobby of the House, attended by some of us, and most of the Government members were conspicuous by their absence, he repeated it there. But we have frittered away every chance we have had of becoming the Federal Capital, and now that we are almost out of the running we hear this idea that a cocktail party may influence the selection of Barbados as the Federal Capital.

Now, I am suggesting, Madam, that we refuse to support this Resolution on the grounds that we do not concur with the personnel of the delegation. The Barbados Government has been given three seats on the delegation and if for these three seats the Government had decided to elect two of its members, nobody could object; but not a thing of the sort, bearing in mind many of the pronouncements of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy who has put the case for the Opposition in Parliament as logically and as concisely as it could be put. There can be no justification at all, Madam, for the omission of the officially recognised Opposition from this delegation. I am sure that all of us are aware that the Opposition is just as much Her Majesty's Opposi-

tion as the Government is Her Majesty's Government. The position of the Opposition is signified by the fact that we pay the Leader of the Opposition a special salary as Leader of the Opposition, and we are supposed to be modelling our Parliament system on the U.K. constitutional lines, and so inseparable in the British Parliament system is the Opposition with the Government, that when Parliament waits on the King or the Queen as the case may be in the House of Lords, the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition walk side by side, and behind them the successive members of the Government walk with their corresponding members of the Opposition. The two comprise the Government, and I am proud to say that in every other island in the West Indies it has been recognised in this instance. In Trinidad the Government has gone so far not only to give voice to the Opposition of the delegation but to give voice to every racial section of the community, lest the views of any important section of the community may not be heard at this important Conference; and as the honourable junior member for St. Lucy has said, in some of the smaller islands like Grenada where there is no party Government, a place has been found on the delegation even for persons outside the Government. In Grenada Mr. Renwick has been brought in as an adviser on the delegation, in order that no section of Grenada cannot claim that its view will not be heard. What is happening here? Here we have two members of the Government on the delegation and a member from the Other Place. Now, even the Hon. Premier himself will hardly claim that his views on the constitutional requirements of the West Indies will coincide with those of the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke. I should be surprised to think that the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke and the Leader of the Government of Barbados have similar political views. Mr. Cuke is being put there I believe.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I rise on a point of order. The Chairman has already ruled out discussing the personnel of the delegation and I suggest that the honourable members do not quarrel.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Madam Chairman, I wish you would inform the honourable member that when you wish his assistance you will call for it, because the honourable member is not going to tell me at this stage how to conduct a debate, and I am opposing a Resolution and giving reasons why I am opposing it, and I go further and move a reduction on the grounds that certain members are superfluous and as I said earlier in my remarks about the Resolution, the Addendum makes reference to our concurrence in the selection of the delegates. This we have not done, and since the Government has not seen fit to say what it has done, we are at liberty to speak on non-concurrence of the Resolution. But perhaps I was mistaken in my original idea about the honourable member for St. Joseph; it may be that he and Mr. Cuke have the same political views.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I think I have allowed you to stray from the Resolution. That should have been said in reply to the Message, and if you have lost that opportunity, I will ask you to leave out Mr. Cuke and to stick closer to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Resolution deals with \$17,500 for three delegates and three advisers and I am going to suggest, Madam Chairman, that the amount be reduced by \$1,000; because I see no reason why the delegation should consist of both Sir Archibald Cuke and the Financial Secretary. Mr. Cuke owes his place on a delegation to the fact that—

MADAM CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the personnel.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you can tell me, Madam Chairman, how I am going to express my views to the House on the voting of money for the delegation without saying who is going to be taken along with the delegation I will gladly listen to you. But I am saying that we have to reduce the vote because Sir Archibald Cuke and the Financial Secretary are superfluous on this delegation. Sir Archibald Cuke is going because of his economic knowledge of the island, knowledge which has been denied others of this island; the Financial Secretary is going to do the same thing, and if the honourable member talks of saving the island's expense and being careful of expenses in this matter, why carry Mr. Cuke and Mr. Burrowes?

If Mr. Cuke were a member of the House with accountability to the public, one could understand it, but he is not a member of the Government Party. Presumably, on the Executive he expresses their views but in the opinion of the public he is not a delegate who should be speaking for Barbados on constitutional issues.

6.50 p.m.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I will ask the honourable member to give the deserving honour to Sir Archibald Cuke.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Can anybody see the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke and Mr. Norman Manley expressing the same political views? Oh no; so you can see that if Sir Archibald is diametrically opposed to the Nationalist Leader of the West Indies in view and you are carrying him—[MADAM CHAIRMAN: Am I?] You and your colleagues are carrying him. They promised you a trip at the Coronation; they should give you one this time.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I beg to say that that is not so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am glad for the information. However, Madam Chairman, I am submitting to the Committee that we can afford to reduce this Resolution because we do not need the Financial Secretary, Mr. Burrowes, and the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke on this Delegation. The other advisers of the Delegation whose expenses are included in this Resolution, (The Hon. Acting Attorney General and the Hon. Dr. Cato) neither one has the slightest accountability to the public of Barbados in this matter.

Madam Chairman, I say this with no desire to be personal, but the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will admit that for some time his physical health has been indifferent.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: What has that to do with the Resolution before us?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is so obvious that only you cannot see it, Madam Chairman.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: This Resolution is for \$17,500 to meet expenses of the Delegation to London. Speak on that, or you can take your seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Madam Chairman, I am sure that that ruling comes from your profound knowledge of how the affairs of this House are conducted. I am submitting, Madam Chairman, that honourable members of this House cannot sit here lightly and support this Resolution when certain facts stare them in the face.

As previous speakers have said, we are committing this country for some time to come to a system of Government which almost completely negatives the individual power which we have enjoyed as a colony with Representative Government for many years. If it is not important that every phase of this matter should be discussed in its widest possible aspects this afternoon, then we may as well abolish this Assembly and bring in a military dictatorship

so as to allow it to be run like some South American Country.

We are voting this money to send this Delegation to London, and that in truth and in fact means a lot to this country. I said that one of the people who are going to sign for us is the Leader of the Government and his health for sometime has been indifferent and the other outstanding member—[A VOICE: That is not true.] I will be delighted to know that that is not true, because I have been very worried about the reports which I have heard of his health. If that is not so, I can only come to the conclusion that his prolonged absence from this Chamber was due to slacking. If he were not sick, I can come to no other conclusion than that he has not resumed office in the Ministerial Buildings because he is malingering.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Does that concern this Resolution?

Mr. CRAWFORD: It concerns it as much as his *sotto voce* remark concerns it.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I thought you were addressing the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Since by your remarks, you have seen fit to call him to order, I will proceed by saying, Madam Chairman, that I am thinking in terms of the future of this country. I want, if and when controversial issues arise in this matter of Federation, that there should be some person at this Conference who was in good health, so that when that person has to face the Electorate he would be able to explain what led the Barbados Delegation to take the decisions they took and I am submitting that so far as that is concerned, that will not be the case both in the matter of the Delegates and the Advisers.

I want to submit further that a Committee which has not yet concurred in the section of the Delegates cannot with equanimity agree to the passing of this Resolution before it has an idea of what those Delegates would say. Barbados has been regarded in times past as being one of the most outstanding colonies in the West Indies. We have set standards which many other islands would have been glad to follow. In Jamaica, over a month ago, the Government thought fit to take the public into its confidence as to how it stood on matters which would be discussed in London next month. There is no point in honourable members in this House just sitting here—

(Mr. SMITH entered the Committee. MADAM CHAIRMAN left the Chair and Mr. SMITH took the Chair).

I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that there is no point in honourable members of this House just sitting here and expecting that the position of Barbados will not go by default in London next month.

7.00 p.m.

I am glad to be able to state from the views I have heard expressed outside, that important sections of opinion in Barbados are worried as to the position which this peculiarly constituted Delegation will take in London. Here we are asked to vote the money for the Delegation without knowing what they are going to do. Can you imagine the Chief Minister demanding wider constitutional powers, and rightly so, with the entire question of the financing of the Federation to be reconsidered, with the Federal Government to be given complete control over the economic development of the area and insisting that the British Government agree to a greater grant to finance the Federation than that previously agreed to? Can you imagine the member of this Delegation from the Other Place for whom we are voting expenses here agreeing to give wider constitutional powers to people like the honourable

senior member for St. Joseph, to Mr. Gairy in Grenada, to Mr. Bradshaw in St. Kitts and Mr. Bird in Antigua? I cannot see it.

The Premier himself is not even at one, so far as we know, with the Chief Minister of Jamaica on the question of financing the Federation; because where you have the outstanding Nationalist Leader in the West Indies demanding greater assistance, you have the honourable senior member for St. Joseph getting on the floor of this House and saying that we have to wait and see what the British Government will do by way of a grant or loan. That is his attitude.

This is not the time to point out the absurdity of it and therefore we are looking forward to this promised debate on Federation, on the Manley Memorandum and on the three Reports to which I have already made reference, in order that the country might have some idea as to how the Government really stands on the matter. This is not the time for coming in here and talking about Legislation to curb racial prejudice, although we know it needs to be curbed, and although if you search the records of this House you will find that for nine years it has been said that this question of racial prejudice should be curbed by Legislation and the Hon. Premier has refused to act on it. This is the time for telling the country what the people who are going to spend this \$17,500 will do for Barbados in London, what steps they are going to take so that the views of this country will be well expressed, although when the final Federal set-up has emerged, we will demand by right what our Parliamentary institution and our general standard of living entitle us to. Incidentally, I should like to thank the previous speaker, the honourable junior member for St. Peter, for the kind references which he made about me, but I merely want to say that, thank God, I have never been afraid to work hard, and therefore if I want to go to London nobody has to think in terms of giving me a trip because, although I have never been there, I am capable of paying my way.

I am a firm believer in Parliamentary principles and development; to-day for the Government, to-morrow for the Opposition. When the Government is in power it is entitled to the plums of office and the responsibilities of office; and when the pendulum swings and it is out of office, the same thing applies to the Opposition. Therefore, personally, I am the last person in this Chamber to think that a Government comprised as it is, will view a question like this in the manner suggested by the honourable junior member for St. Peter. However, I certainly do repeat that in view of sentiments expressed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in connection with the selection of these Delegations and the authentic voice of the people in these islands, the Government Delegation is going to be hard put to in London to explain the composition of the Delegation for which we are voting this money.

It need not be thought, Mr. Chairman, that the people in this Chamber as responsible people, capable of expressing the views of the people of this Colony who have put them here, are going to sit here and allow them to get away with this sort of thing. They have been given the opportunity to regularise the position, because we have felt, and we still feel, that in a matter of this sort there should not be any dissentient voice to that heard by the official Delegation at this Conference. If the Government in its perversity feels and decides otherwise, they have

themselves solely to thank for any further developments.

7.10 p.m.

When the time comes, Mr. Chairman, for the public in general to ratify the position to which this proposed delegation has committed it, one will wait to see whether the authors of that position will be in the position they now occupy and will be here to explain why they were left in that position. Any member of this community, any responsible member, will agree with nothing but dissatisfaction that the likelihood is that the case of Barbados will not be stressed as it should be in London next month. I am not at all surprised that to-day, rather than replying to the accusations made by the Official Opposition that the best Parliamentary practices have not been adopted in this matter, the Government has resorted to stratagems in order to escape the responsibility of explaining to the country why it has acted as it has.

I cannot think of any Parliament in the world in which a national issue is debated, in which the Opposition gets up and accuses the Government of following eccentric Parliamentary standards, and the Government, instead of explaining their position, sit mutely, Sir, and resort to Parliamentary tactics in order to avoid replying. In the course of debate on issues of no importance, these tactics may be permissible, but certainly in an issue of this magnitude not only the people who are living in Barbados to-day, but generations to come will judge the manner in which the question has been tackled, and will pass their verdict, Sir, as to whether or not the people who represented the colony then acted in the best possible way. But I should like to say, Sir, that these manoeuvres, while they may appear to be temporarily successful, have a way of boomeranging on those who commit them and the perpetrators of that particular manoeuvre to-day, Sir, may well rest assured that the time will not be far distant when they will regret, Sir, having adopted such policy.

Mr. Chairman, the presentation of this Resolution to-day to this Assembly indicates the entire manner in which the Government has approached this question of Federation. If you trace the history of the Government's policy in considering Federation over the last six years, they are for it to-day and against it to-morrow. Therefore we can come to no other conclusion than that one of two things will happen. The Barbados Government Delegation will go there merely for a joy ride, and they will be regarded as a mere count when the voices of the West Indians are to be heard; and I am submitting, Mr. Chairman, that the action of the Government to-day will go a long way further than they think at the moment in making the position of the Barbados delegation at this Conference even weaker than they normally would make it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this Addendum, Sir, to the Resolution for \$17,500 is a very important one, in so much as when this is passed, I suppose like most Resolutions, history will be made; but the history which this will make will be of paramount importance to this colony and to our children. I have always felt, Sir, that delegates from Barbados going abroad attending conferences of any sort should represent Barbados in the fullest form.

About the year after I came to this House, I made it quite clear that regardless of what party one might belong to, you must see that any person travelling abroad should have enough money to spend, and therefore you should see that they are

given an allowance sufficient to allow them to live up to a certain standard with other delegates from other colonies regardless of the wealth of the colony, because Barbados has been among the colonies of the West Indies that West Indians have looked up to, as well as people in the United Kingdom and other places.

7.20 p.m.

Now, Sir, before I get into any hot water with you, I want to make my position quite clear; and if you are going to stop my debating the personnel of this Delegation I want to make this most humble appeal to you; it is that I cannot discuss this Resolution unless I refer to the Delegates because as the Addendum itself to this Resolution states:—

"In Message No. 38/1955 the Honourable House of Assembly was invited to concur in the appointment of the Delegates and Advisers selected to attend the final Conference on Federation which is due to begin in London on the 7th February, 1956."

Mr. Chairman, I am sure now that it is drawn to your notice, you will appreciate what I am saying.

The Addendum to the Resolution goes on to say:—

It is estimated that the sum of \$17,500 will be required to meet the expenses of the delegation and this amount is made up as follows:—

Passages			\$ 9,957.00
Flight Insurance			49.44
Subsistence Allowance			3,024.00
Hotel expenses			3,024.00
Travelling and Incidental expenses (including hospitality)			1,445.56
TOTAL			\$17,500.00

Mr. Chairman you know as well as I do that I am among those who like to obey and bow to the rulings of the Chair especially when the Chair is reflecting the feelings of this Chamber. I am quite confident that if Your Honour had read the Addendum to this Resolution before, you might not have intimated what you did.

As the Addendum reads, it is impossible for you to ask anybody to vote this \$17,500 for sending the personnel of this Delegation to the final Federation Conference without their making reference to the Delegates. Let me give you an example: if you came in here and said you want \$17,500 to send a Delegation to the London Federation Conference and the Members of that Delegation were members of the Chamber of Commerce do you think honourable members would entertain the Resolution? If therefore it appears during my discussion that I am making reference to the Delegates, I want Your Honour to believe me that I am not rude or attempting to disobey the suggestion which you gave earlier. I am sure you will agree with me when I say that it is a rank impossibility to begin to talk on this Resolution unless you make reference to the Delegates who have been selected.

Mr. Chairman, I am among those people who call a spade a spade, and if I have anything to say about anybody I do not have to look to see if the Government Party or the Leader of the Government Party is annoyed. First of all, as this Resolution strikes me, let me say that I find no fault with the actual breakdown of the Resolution and I do not intend to go into anything with respect to the \$1,445.56 for Travelling and Incidental Expenses (including hospitality) or the £5 a day for Subsistence Allowance. I may disagree politically with members of the Government Party but the minute that any one of them has been selected to do something for Barbados, I feel that he is selected to do it on my behalf and the people who vote for me.

What I am taking the opportunity to say on this Resolution is that apparently, there seems to be a great amount of selfishness in the selection of Delegates to this Conference. It is not ignorance at all, nor is it any departure from any constitutional propriety or anything of the sort but I view it as a great amount of selfishness.

I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. Peter is not in his place because I want to say now that there is no truth in his statement when he said that I had been offered a chance of going to London in place of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am not among those people who want to go to England or would like a passage to England. England would not appeal to me. I would say "No" if I were offered a trip to England. There is no truth in the statement that I was ever suggested as one of the Delegates to this Conference. I am not saying that because I feel myself incapable; were I selected as a Delegate to express my views, no matter whether on that Conference there were such people as Mr. Norman Manley, Sir Archibald Cupe, Sir Anthony Eden or anybody else, I would talk West Indian talk. You can believe me that I would be a West Indian and you can subscribe to the view that I would talk; therefore, it is not because I feel in any way inferior that I say so.

Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, I feel that the Government is absolutely correct in selecting the majority of the Delegates from the Government; I think that is fair enough. I will put it as strongly as this: who can think if the Opposition were in a position to select delegates that they would think of selecting the majority of members for the Delegation from the Premier's Party. You must grant a man what is his; you can disagree with a man but you should be big enough to say that while you disagree with him in doing so and so, he has done what seemeth him best.

I am going to say now that when the Hon. Premier goes on that Delegation that I wish him well and I wish him good health and I do it from a good heart; so when I come to criticise any aspect of this matter I am criticising it according to the way I feel about it. You must be big enough; you must be lacking in selfishness to see things in that way. I say again that the Government is absolutely correct in selecting two of its members to go to London on the Delegation. According to our set-up in this country, which is an agricultural community the Hon. Minister of Agriculture should be one of the members of that Delegation. Here again, I disagree with the honourable junior member for St. Peter when he said that he heard members of the public were criticising the inclusion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture as a member of that Delegation, because I have not heard anybody disagreeing with that selection. I think his is a correct selection.

What I have understood, is that the Hon. Premier expressed the view that the reason why he did not select the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is because he felt that it was impossible for the Leader of the Opposition to capture or run the Government. I wonder if the Hon. Premier in his saner moments has ever read the Proverbs of Solomon. It is written in that Book: "There is no chance of boasting of to-morrow because you do not know what to-morrow will bring forth." What goes up comes down! [Laughter].

7.30 p.m.

Anyway, I am saying this: I have not heard of any dissatisfaction with the selection of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I look at it in this way; however you think of the West Indies and its development regionally, you must think in terms of Agriculture. I understand that the Delegates are limited

to three and the Observers can be as many as you want. The only time I have seen Sir Archibald Cuke the Hon. Premier and the honourable senior member for St. Philip together on a platform was when the three Political Parties went to Queen's Park and discussed the question of Federation. On that occasion the Hon. Premier said: "I have come into the den of lions." The Hon. Premier, the honourable senior member for St. Philip and Sir Archibald Cuke were there when the matter was discussed for the benefit of the community. I understand that the Barbados Workers' Union had a similar meeting when matters relative to Federation were discussed.

When we are dealing with the question of Federation, we should forget all about Party Politics. I cannot help saying that when you refuse to see the point of view of having from this Chamber a member outside the Government's Party on this Delegation, it seems to be a matter of selfishness to me. It is not ignorance; to me it is absolute selfishness. Suppose the Hon. Premier used the argument that Sir Archibald Cuke—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am appealing to the honourable member not to discuss the personnel of the Delegation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am appealing to you, Mr. Chairman, that if that is your attitude, to send for Mr. Speaker to rule. I cannot discuss this Resolution unless I discuss it in this way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have read the Addendum to this Resolution to me, therefore let me read it to you. [*Laughter*]. The Addendum reads as follows:—

"In Message No. 38/1955 the Honourable House of Assembly was invited to concur in the appointment of the Delegates and Advisers selected to attend the final Conference on Federation which is due to begin in London on the 7th February, 1956."

I take it that the honourable member has already agreed [Mr. MOTTLEY and MEMBERS: Oh no, Sir.]

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No vote in the negative is Parliamentary. I say that we have not agreed to anything. What happened was that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition put forward an Address saying that the House desires to express its non-concurrence in something. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Delegates have been appointed.] When we want a referee, we will appeal to you. The House has not yet agreed to that.

If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition puts forwards an Address like this one, has anything been put up to say that the House has agreed to anything? Mr. Chairman, do not let them put you in hot water all the time; the Government has sent us a Message and in paragraph 4 of that Message, this is what is stated:—

"The Honourable the House is invited to concur in the appointment of the Delegation."

Have you seen any Resolution here to be concurred in?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have seen that the Address which has been brought forward by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been voted against as to the non-concurrence of the House in the selection of the Delegation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Did they vote for the concurrence?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If they voted for the non-concurrence, I take it that they voted for the concurrence.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: That does not follow.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If I may interrupt, Mr. Chairman. The Governor of this Colony appointed

this Delegation and obviously, out of politeness the House is asked to concur in the appointment. If you have the power to prevent this Delegation from going altogether, then say so. I am sorry that I did not have the chance to reply on the original matter. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: You did not have a chance to reply? You are making sport!] Let me say this: if the Opposition had one-half the knowledge of Parliamentary tactics as they have speech, a lot of things would not happen in this House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not have the opportunities which you had. When my colleague raised the question today that this was a matter in which we should reply to His Excellency's Message, well, in actual practice I say that the actual selection of the Delegates is a matter for the Hon. Premier; but this Message which came to this Chamber came from His Excellency the Governor, and this is the Message in which we are supposed to concur. When you say that we have concurred in it already, I say "No." As to whether it is a question of politeness or they have to send it down to us, that is a matter for us. I contend that we have not concurred in it.

7.40 p.m.

If you think I am in any way trying to disrespect and disarrange it, let us go no further, let us get a ruling on it. I do not want to make it appear that, you having made a suggestion, I want to disarrange it; and so I declare most politely that I cannot discuss the matter. I would like to know this: why does the Government want to stifle any criticism upon the selection of the delegation?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will remember that I tried to stop the honourable junior member for St. Peter from discussing the personnel of the Committee and he refrained from doing so.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: No, he discussed it. Everybody discussed it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He did not. He refrained from doing so, and if you are against the personnel or the selection you have it in your hands to vote against the Resolution as a whole.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: But am I not entitled with this Resolution for \$17,500 to show why I moved the reduction?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as the Resolution is concerned you can do anything.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: But how do you know I am not going to reduce it? Am I not in a position to criticise it? How can you avoid it? In the Resolution the Message 38/1955 tells you that the delegates are The Honourable Premier, The Honourable Sir Archibald Cuke, the Hon. C. E. Talma, the Hon. Dr. A. S. Cato, the Hon. the Acting Attorney General and the Financial Secretary. How on earth can I reasonably move for the reduction of the vote without telling you why? For all that is reasonable how is it possible? I am not suggesting that you are attempting to stifle it, but I know that the Government wants to stifle it. [A VOICE: They are doing that.]

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not get hot.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But I must get hot.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not care how long the debate takes. If the Opposition were in their places and had won the vote against the Government, there would have been no further discussion.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What is the Hon. Premier speaking on? I would like him to tell me.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The Message has invited honourable members to concur. . . .

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, is he speaking on a point of order?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The point of order is this: "the Hon. House of Assembly is invited to

concur," so that they can comment on the Resolution but this House cannot amend those names in our constitutional system. This language is carefully chosen, "is invited to concur" and these names are submitted for approval. That is why the honourable member is out of order. Because it is not competent for this House to change the composition as set out in the Governor's Message, just as every time in the Other Place, you invite members to concur. You invite members to agree but you do not invite a man to exercise a right that has been submitted to him. Everytime we ask the Other Place to concur they cannot amend, and therefore, I suggested that the honourable member is out of order. The composition of the delegation is distinct from the sending of the delegation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What he has said is playing with words. It is more necessary for this House to be able to reduce this Resolution if they want to, than to get up and reduce the Resolution in this manner that is not before the House. This only came up incidentally. I am prepared to agree that we cannot in this House put a vote for A, B, or C to be a delegate; but while that is so you cannot prevent me in this House from saying that we do not think A, B or C should be on it; so instead of concurring to this we can say we do not agree that so and so, whatever the cause may be should not go. While I agree to the fact that we have this Resolution here for \$17,500 for the purpose of sending these delegates, this is not a Resolution telling us who comprise this delegation. Is that right or wrong? This is a Resolution for \$17,500 for sending delegates and these are the members of the delegation. I contend: the Premier, yes; the Minister of Agriculture, yes; but I am not at all in agreement that a delegate who is not a representative of the people should go as a delegate. I say so now and I would say so on the house-top or anywhere at all. I agree with the honourable junior member for St. Peter, but the Premier has argued that Sir Archibald Cuke who is not a member of his party nor a member of his Government should go. I am only taking a leaf from the book of the Premier; you cannot select a man from the Other Place to express the views of the country. Sir Archibald Cuke had acted on behalf of the Government.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: In correcting the honourable member—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: This is the Government's position in my view, and it is so. You sit down.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know why the honourable member would think that I want to prevent him expressing his view; it often lightens a dull debate. How many Houses of the Legislature are there in Barbados?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There are two, but I want to ask the honourable member this: why could he not have taken Sir John Chandler and two from the Other Place and one from this side of the Table? I say it is selfish. In the early delegation you had Sir Archibald Cuke, and (if the Premier takes no objection to my views) the Government has to lean on Sir Archibald Cuke for his knowledge of the economic background of the island. After all, the Premier has got to lean on somebody for some particular thing; he must have somebody to lean on for certain things that is where I feel Sir Archibald Cuke could be an A1 adviser, and let me say the first name to come to any reasonable thinking Barbadian would be Sir Archibald Cuke.

7.50 p.m.

One of the first names you knew all along would be a member of that Delegation was the name of Sir Archibald Cuke. I have heard the Hon. Premier to say some of the finest things of Sir Archibald Cuke. Al

though I cannot remember his exact words, they are to the effect that there it is you have a man although he is not of your political persuasion is a man who is a valuable asset to take on any delegation. With all that, I say that Sir Archibald Cuke should be in my humble opinion an Adviser to the Delegation in view of the fact that the Government has limited the Delegates to three. Do you think I would be so erratic as to say that if you are limiting your Delegates to three, send the Hon. Premier, one from the Democratic Party and one from this Party? I would be an idiot if I made that suggestion. You are right in carrying two of the delegates from your own Party.

When the Federation talks first began, the honourable senior member for St. Philip was a member of the Delegation. I am sure that if any honourable member of this House from this side of the Table were selected as a member of the Delegation that he would not be the type who would say: "I do not like the Hon. Premier, therefore I am going to London and make a fool of myself". Every member of this House is interested in Federation and what it would mean for Barbados; therefore there should be no thinking that if you selected two members from your own Party and one from the Opposition that the person you selected from the Opposition would not be interested in what you were doing. Let me say at once that I am not saying so because I want to argue a case for the inclusion of the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, you have selected two members from the Other Place as members of the Delegation and you have also selected the Hon. Acting Attorney General and the Financial Secretary. Nobody in this world would say that the Premier who is responsible for making this selection would go to a Conference such as that without having the Attorney General to tell him of the legal technicalities surrounding any matter that may be discussed. As the last member who spoke has said, if you were to take a plebescite of your carrying the Financial Secretary, Mr. Burrowes and the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke or were to ask any man in the street—even a man who borrowed his friend's newspaper he would say to you that he has read in the *Jamaica Gleaner*, the Trinidad Newspapers as well as in the English Newspapers that they have placed the Hon. Sir Archibald Cuke on a pedestal by himself when dealing with the economy of Barbados and that if you have to economise on the personnel of your Delegation there is no justification in your carrying Mr. Burrowes and Sir Archibald Cuke on the Delegation; you should only carry Sir Archibald Cuke.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am again appealing to the honourable senior member for the City not to refer to the personnel of the Delegation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I know what happens. A lot of honourable members in this House feel if you get up and start to criticise a few Officials that you should not do it. They say: "please do not do it" I am going to tell them that when I feel like criticising any of the officials in this country I am going to criticise them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you addressing your remarks to honourable members of this Committee or to me? I stopped the honourable junior member for St. Peter from being personal on this matter.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: There is nothing personal about this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am saying that you should refrain from dealing with the personnel of the Delegation.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am asking, why are you carrying Sir Archibald Cuke and the Financial Secretary? The Hon. Premier has said that it is a matter of courtesy to ask this House to concur in the Delegation. I am inclined to view it in the same light. It is a matter of courtesy and we must appreciate it. Sometime in November last, this Chamber passed a

Reply to a Message from His Excellency the Governor which dealt with the subject matter of this Conference to London. In the Reply to that Message this House said that it felt that all political Parties should be represented at the Conference in London, so it does appear as if it is really a matter of courtesy that this House has been asked to concur in the Delegation. Let me say that this House passed the Address contained in that Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Message and there was no question of a division on that matter. It is for that reason that I look with amusement and amazement at what some honourable members have said on this matter. At the meeting which we gave consideration to that Reply, the Hon. Premier was not here and I think that the Hon. Minister of Communications left earlier but there was not a dissentient voice on it. In the Reply it was stated that this House felt that all Parties should be represented on the Delegation. Now today, we see in Message No. 38/1955 that the opinion of the Honourable the House regarding the composition of the delegation has been taken into account, but after careful consideration the Government has selected the following: etc., etc.

I must agree that it is purely a matter of courtesy and I appreciate that under the set up which we have it is the right of the Hon. Premier to make the selections. However I am saying that it is selfishness on his part to choose that Delegation; it has not been chosen through fear nor has it come from ignorance.

8.00 p.m.

If this Address went to the Governor or if the Hon. Premier tells us now that it is a matter of courtesy to send down this Message, he is letting us know that it is a matter for him. He says: "I am the Premier, and I have this selection to make." Therefore we are only making fools of ourselves if we do not think that this selection is the Premier's. He must have seen the reply which the House sent up; he might have said: "My Party did not discuss this matter and therefore we were not apprised of the true position." But the Premier himself has said that the views of the Opposition will always be given weight and consideration.

If this House has expressed its opinion and you have no reason to fear that anybody at the Conference will overshadow anything, show me the justification for not saying: "I will carry a member from the Opposition and the Attorney General along with me." Could you imagine the honourable senior member for St. Philip, if he were selected to go on this Delegation, talking nonsense when he gets to London? Then you have the honourable junior member for St. James. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: He does not believe in freedom of movement.] However a member over here might have differed or be in disagreement with the Premier, can you imagine well, I do not believe that there is one man who, when he gets to England would differ from the Premier; the only thing he might differ from would be that it is a question of the people of Barbados, and then the people of the other West Indian islands.

Posterity will brand this selection as absolute selfishness in the Premier in not seeing the wisdom of selecting a member of the Opposition to be included in this Delegation which is going to England. Posterity will say that to select Sir Archibald Cuke was the greatest asset at this Conference; but the Premier would not be leaning on Sir Archibald Cuke. When you have Mr. Manley, the Premier and Mr. Hannays, three legal luminaries to work up the Constitution, Sir Archibald would not shine there. When you are looking for advice as to the economic background of the island then you will have to go to Sir Archibald;

but let me ask you: do you think that anybody like Mr. Burrowes could tell you anything about any development? I say that it is a reckless expenditure of this money to carry Mr. Burrowes and Sir Archibald Cuke as members of this Delegation. The Hon. Premier has said that he does not want to spend all this money and makes the people generally believe that you are trying to be as meagre as possible and still in the same breath you cannot justify carrying on this Delegation two men, one of whom is a square peg in a round hole.

It is amazing to me that just now the Hon. Premier tried to argue that the negative vote on the Address which was introduced by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, meant that we have agreed in that matter. I will ask the Hon. Premier to see this; let us suppose we had never debated this Message. It is a matter of courtesy to send down this Message to the House. I hope that the Press will publish this; the Hon. Premier himself has said that the Colonial Office reads these things. He inferred just now that if we put forward this Address and it was agreed to, that would have been the end of the matter. I do not believe that; I do not accept it; tell that to the Marines! [Laughter]. The Hon. Premier would still have given notice of this Resolution and it would be passed.

8.10 p.m.

Whenever an Address is being passed in this House, the Premier, and his Ministers walk out, but on this occasion, feeling it would not pass, the Premier and his Ministers sat down. When the Address was passed to send a Message to the Governor asking to put a member of the Opposition on the delegation the Minister of Communications was in the House. He left; but now on the occasion with the House passing an Address to show its non-concurrence on the matter the five Ministers sit down, because they want to carry a vote. Why do they sit down?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Because we want money.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Because they want money? If we were going to pass a vote about P.A.A., it is through the door they would go. How can you get over that? Next week they will sit down and tell the public: "We will not agree to so and so." But these are tactics which I believe you have to use occasionally in politics when you see things not as nice as they should be, when you realise that you made a blunder.

Mr. Chairman, I must suggest, it is not for this Chamber to say that we can select any composition of delegates, but I do suggest that the Premier and the selection of the Minister of Agriculture is the best one; and I do feel that the selection of a member from the Opposition and Sir Archibald Cuke would have given him a most important body, and to have Sir Archibald as adviser and avoid inevitable expense by dropping the Financial Secretary because you know that that sort of thing would not have been alright in 1934 when he came into the House. But people will say that one is going for a joy-ride. You cannot justify it. Do not feel yourself that if I had to say Dr. Cato was going for a joy-ride I would not say so; but I do not think so.

The honourable member made a parliamentary speech in his contribution to Federation. Are you endeavouring to put a man of Dr. Cato's ability in the same category as Mr. Burrowes? You should rise above that. You know what I am saying is true, only too well. And, therefore, sir, my own contention is that while Sir Archibald Cuke should be on the delegation, he should be as an Adviser and not as one of the delegates, because I have so often heard before they were elevated to power, that they would not

agree to having the views of this country or the representation of this House put in the hands of people who are nominated, and not elected. I cannot see how they can say that Sir Archibald Cuke should not be an Adviser on this occasion. I know only too well that there is a certain amount of optimism on this side in saying that you have to lean heavily on this honourable gentleman for his knowledge of the economic background of Barbados, but I maintain that he should be carried as an adviser. The advisers are not those who would speak at such general conferences.

Finally, I say this, and I want the Premier to believe me from the depths of my heart: the reason why I agree with the selection of the honourable senior member for Christ Church is because I understand the Hon. Minister of Agriculture will certainly be able to tackle the affairs from the point of view of development in England. None of us knows what will happen. I say this: when you leave Barbados for a Conference, just as the United Kingdom will select a delegate and an alternate delegate with strength, force and knowledge—You will appreciate the fact that I have not come in here to fight a case for the junior member for St. Philip. I made my own position quite clear that when you go on a delegation like this, always select the next person with strength and knowledge enough of the whole set up and background that they will be able, if anything did happen to fill into the breach.

Now, finally, Mr. Chairman, I say this: maybe the Premier feels he should not make the necessary alterations in favour of the honourable junior member for St. James who will be the most knowledgeable person by his experience from the Conference at Montego Bay. What about the honourable senior member for St. Philip? Yes, he disagreed on many occasions, he is in the Opposition, but you will grant this that he is absolutely knowledgeable of things West Indian and that he would be a great asset and a good man to go to England to represent Barbados.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What Party does he represent?

8.20 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: He does not represent any Party. It is selfish in you, sir. It is said that sometimes there is no sense in dealing with the Premier: he is like a bull.

However the people of this country realise that he has done something for them. None of us are here forever; while we are here we have our duty to perform so that when we are about to pass away we can go on contentedly that we have made our contribution. You will never get everybody saying good of you nor will you get everybody saying bad.

Sir I have no intention of moving any reduction to this vote. I never intended to be parsimonious. I would not say that because a member from this Party is not going that we should seek to have a reduction in the vote. As a matter of fact, I would like to see the Barbados Delegation being given a suitable subsistence allowance to enable them to stay at the Ritz Hotel which is the best Hotel in England. They should also be given out-of-pocket expenses sufficient to allow them to represent Barbados. I would like to know why on an occasion of a Conference when there were some Delegates with the Hon. Premier and he was forced to stay at a certain hotel that some of the Delegates with him did not have the integrity and decency to say that they were not going to stay at another hotel and that they did not come and stay with him. If I were either of those Delegates I would tell whoever they were that if they insulted him by saying that they could not carry him at that Hotel, they could not

carry me. I may disagree with the Hon. Premier when it comes to politics, but as you see the fingers of my hand and as you see that they cannot be separated from one another it is just the same when it comes to insulting the Hon. Premier: for if you insult him you insult me. I will tell you something, Mr. Chairman, and of course you know it is true. Barbados has never been able to forgive the story which came out in the Newspapers as to how the Hon. Premier was told that he could not stay at a certain hotel and was taken to another hotel and at the same time the Financial Secretary went and stayed at that hotel.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, in common fairness to the Financial Secretary I must say that he did not know what was happening to me and I did not think it was necessary to tell him. Of all people I cannot conceive if the Financial Secretary knew what was happening to me that he would have gone to that hotel; he would have asked to allow both of us to stay together. He would have said: I am not going without Mr. Adams.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Why when he knew, did he continue to stay?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We stayed at the hotels only overnight.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: He should never have stayed at that hotel at all.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We left the next day. He never knew at all that I was not at the same hotel as he. When I telephoned him he asked me what was the number of my room; he thought that I was at the same hotel. It is not fair to him. If I had that knowledge of him I would be the first to complain. Let me repeat that he did not know and he did not stay at that hotel any longer than that particular night.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am only saying that if they could not take him at that hotel, I would not go there. However, that is only by the way. Why was that not said before?

Mr. Chairman, at this stage, I am asking that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. Speaker who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

8.30 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. ALLDER rose to speak.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I expected that especially after dinner.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, all hon. members of this House know that I was not a converted Federationist when the discussion was being carried on in 1952. It was not because of my disinterestedness in Barbados, but because I noticed at that time that when the regionalisation of industries was being discussed, Barbados was at a disadvantage in view of the fact that Trinidad and Jamaica were trying to attract all of the industries. I felt at that time that due to our limited land acreage, we should have been made the industrial hub of the West Indies, even if these larger countries had to concentrate on Agriculture along with other natural resources.

Since the matter has gone so far, I will give Federation my blessing. I regret that the discussion of this Federation had been carried on so long ago that at this final meeting before the Delegates would have gone to London for final discussion, we have not approached this matter with greater unanimity of purpose and action. I must express my regret at what might have gone on, because the matter has reached a stage where the Delegates have been already selected, and the only thing for us to do is to refrain from giving the impression to those Delegates from the other Colonies who will meet our Delegates in London, that we are divided as regards the selection of Delegates and the general approach to Federation.

Sir, I feel that the Government is not to be left out from the blame which I am going to lay. If the Government had vision, it would not have done in the selection of the Delegates just what it thought. With all hon. members of this House, regardless of political differences, there should be a spirit manifested for the good of Barbados, regardless of what happens. In that case, the Government would have seen to it that hon. members like myself and others who sit on this side of the table and who, fortunately or unfortunately, are not members of the Government, should have been included in the Delegation in view of the fact that the Legislature was asked to reply to His Excellency's Message and they were also told that their opinions would have due place in any decision reached by the Executive. Today we are presented with a list of names and while I am not willing to say that none of those persons who have been included in the Delegation should have been left out, because even if I said that it would still be too late, I still feel that there are a few hon. members on this side of the table who, by virtue of their position here, would carry great weight at the discussions in London.

Personally, I have no such ambition, but I still feel that this is a case of bargaining or of selling Barbados, and the insular feelings which we are to engender would cause us to try and see that we get the best of the bargaining. In view of the fact that the Hon. Premier was unable during the past number of months to maintain contact with these Delegates who will be going to London from the small Islands, I feel that the next alternative would be to have a bunch of salesmen of Barbados on the Delegation.

I am going to make a suggestion which I hope the Hon. Premier will take in the spirit in which I am going to make it. The only salvation left for us now in this great task upon which we are entering, is to see if we can salvage for Barbados the Capital of the Federated West Indies. In order to succeed with that, Mr. Chairman, I repeat you must have salesmen. Because of the rancour which might have gone on for many years between the Hon. Premier and the hon. senior member for St. Philip, I feel that although the hon. member might have been sitting at a previous Conference at which Federation was discussed sometime ago, the relationship which obtained all along and which still obtains now, would

prevent him from being a good associate on such a Delegation.

I feel that we should not send any body of persons who because of past estrangement would find it difficult to sit at tea or beer on one day and attend the Conference on the next day. I hope that the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, does not have any feeling that he would be most suitable to be included in that Delegation.

9 25 p.m.

As I said, I am not trying to flatter any honourable member in order to deny any other hon. member, but I feel he is not the most suitable and I hope that my statements would not be misunderstood. If I felt otherwise I would have said it, and I hope my statements would have some effect on the decision of the Government.

Everybody knows the hon. junior member for St. James when he was for sometime the Leader of the Government. He is famously known as a good advocate, and I think he would be big enough to sink the differences which I consider minor when compared with a big and broad issue like Federation which may have existed between himself and the Hon. Premier or between himself and the Government, and even at this late stage for the sake of Barbados to grasp the opportunity which remains to bring Barbados that benefit which it deserves out of this Federation, so that the Government may be strong and bold. If you have made a mistake, well, every human being has and does make mistakes; but you are greater and bigger when you recognise them and when you attempt to remedy them.

The Government is still in a position to say, "Well, Mr. X, you have been selected as one of the delegates already;" but Mr. X knows, as you also know, that he would not be the best advocate. He might have a useful purpose; we are not all capable of pushing, some of us have to pull. You either change up the places which have been already suggested and say, "Well, instead of your being a delegate I will make Mr. Y that delegate, because he is more suitable while you can still go as an adviser". The Premier would know how to handle that situation. But I am not thinking of the promotion of any individual. I say this is our only last chance of putting Barbados in a beneficial position by letting us get that capital, and the reason why I say that is this: there was a tendency at one time in the small islands to look towards the Premier for leadership, at another time to Mr. Gomes, at another time to Mr. Bustamante, and now they are looking to Mr. Manley, and if it is one thing that I regret is that the Premier has been indisposed through illness and was not able to maintain that contact (and I know how important it is to maintain such contact in places like this); and because of that, I feel that the Hon. Premier and his delegation are going to be put at a disadvantage, because they are not in the same position as those other West Indian Leaders. That is why I feel too that he should have people, who, when they get up at that Conference—And I feel that the influence which the Hon. Premier has been able to maintain in London and among the West Indian islands, and the ability and prestige of the hon. junior member for St. James would stand this delegation in good stead, along with the hon. Sir Archibald Cuke and the association with the West Indies and, I believe, the astuteness and sociability of the Hon. Dr. Cato. This is one occasion when there is no limitation set by me as regards the amount of money that should be spent. While some hon. members may sneer, I have my reasons for saying so. Everybody knows how important it is, and how successful it makes any occasion when you can entertain your guests.

I am not saying that those persons who may be at the Conference are going to be influenced by bribery, but we do know that more is done around the dining table, and in the cocktail lounge than is done in the Conference room; and I have all reasons to believe that the other leaders of the West Indies intend doing such, and we are not so poverty stricken or so tactless and shortsighted as not to do it. It is purely a war for the survival of the fittest, for him who can stand to benefit greatest. We may be Barbadians, but we are also West Indians; and therefore I regret there might have been a certain amount of fear in making the Resolution look more handsome. In this case however, every Barbadian should be willing to sacrifice whatever else there is at his disposal for the existence of this island so that it would be able to compete as efficiently, economically and politically as any other island going into Federation with it, and though I am not unduly patronising the Government on this particular issue, I would regret to know that Barbados after entering Federation and with the heavy cost it would entail, did not at least have the Capital which would increase—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Capital is not coming here; so stop that.

Mr. ALLDER: You have been saying that for months. For months I have been hearing that the Capital should not be here. I am saying what I heard and I regret very much that a responsible member of the Barbadian community travelling all around the West Indies and meeting leaders should express things like that. But we must try to salvage something or other. Those are purely my views and I am not thinking of myself. I am thinking of Barbados.

What I would also hope, sir, is that the American and British Government are very active in this Federation issue and that they are conscious of the fact that our stability and continuity of decency and tolerance will permit them to use their influence, whatever the means or cost, to see that we get that Capital. I hope that they are in this particular instance, and I know that as a Government constituted as such with national interest in whatever happens even within our gates, I have reason to feel that they are also interested in where that Capital may be put.

9.35 p.m.

It is not a question of stability and whether there would be that prevention. While we know that in some countries there is the infiltration of certain ideologies which may not be acceptable to this Government or that, that is what causes the American Government to be interested even in the results of an election in another country. One must be practical and realistic.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my few remarks will have an affect on the decision of the Government. It is not too late. You are in a position to change if you want to change; and if those delegates who have been already selected have Barbados at heart, I am sure they will compromise and agree to the change which I feel is necessary.

What I have observed is that four hon. members from the Other Place have been selected while there are only two members from this Chamber. The members from this Chamber are responsible to the masses but those from the Other Place are not responsible to anybody else but their group.

The twenty-four hon. members of this House who have the destiny of the 230,000 people in this Island in their hands can only boast of having two representatives on that Delegation and I consider

that as short-sightedness on the part of the Government. It is definitely short-sightedness and tactlessness. You have two persons to represent 230,000 people and four persons from the Other Place to represent a small minority group. I can carry it further than that because some hon. members of the Other Place tell you that they represent their personal views and are not obligated to represent anybody else's. That is why I say that there should be a magnanimous approach by the Government, and Government should show that it is big enough to take one honourable member (the most suitable to them) from amongst those hon. members who are not members of the Government for inclusion in the Delegation. If that were done it would have avoided certain remarks which have been made in this debate this afternoon. What I do hope is that much publicity would not be given to this matter.

Although I do not want to muzzle the Press, for the sake of Barbados I hope that much publicity would not be given to this debate, because I want when our Delegates go to England that they should feel that we are strongly backing them in whatever they do.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, it was as long ago as October, 1937 so far as I know, that we first discussed this question of Federation in this Chamber. At that time there were members in this House of whom they are tonight only three survivors, namely, the hon. and learned senior member for St. Joseph, (the Hon. PREMIER), the hon. and learned junior member for St. James and myself. It is a far cry from those days when we had only four members speaking on this subject of Federation of the British Caribbean of whom two are deceased, the late lamented Mr. Christopher Braithwaite and Mr. (Charlie) Elder. The other two were the Hon. Justice Vaughan and myself. The four of us were the only people who thought it worthwhile to have anything to say on this subject of Federation of the British Caribbean.

Tonight we see that there is no member who intends to go home or to his destination without making his contribution on this question and it is heartening to see the Item which we are discussing refers to the Final Federation Conference. It suggests that we at last are eventually arriving at finality on this subject.

Now, Sir, this Resolution is for the sum of \$17,500. The Addendum has already been read aloud by the hon. senior member for the City and you yourself were good enough to read it for us with the clarity and attention which you always do and you made it crystal clear what are its contents.

When we consider the first paragraph to which reference is made that this Honourable House of Assembly was invited to concur in the appointment of the Delegates and Advisers selected to attend the final Conference on Federation, I would in passing say it is not often that the Hon. Premier is in the fortunate and enviable position of having me with the choice of all those whom he is taking with him. Before he becomes exuberant let me say that I am not referring to his choice of his Cabinet member who is the hon. senior member for Christ Church because we look on that hon. member as one of the exceptions in this Island. There is universal satisfaction with that particular selection. After all, I endorse the principle which has been endorsed by the other distinguished West Indian Leader, Mr. Norman Manley, in selecting two elected members from the Government Party as delegates on this non-party issue and one elected member of a non-government Party.

If of the two members from the Government Party one must be the Hon. Premier, the other, I feel, should be a member of the Cabinet; and not because agriculture is the life blood of the country and not because the hon. senior member for Christ Church has handled his Ministerial post of Minister of Agriculture with such great efficiency but because of the legal background which he has, he certainly would add a great deal in strengthening the legal element of that Delegation and there can be no doubt about it.

As you know, Sir, the Attorney General of this colony has resigned his position and an Attorney General has not yet been appointed. We have to see that so far as the position of the legal element in this Delegation is concerned, it is as strong as we can possibly make it with the material that is available.

9.45 p.m.

Therefore, Sir, that is where I pay tribute to the selection of the Delegates. The fact that Sir Archibald Cuke should undoubtedly be a member of this Delegation, does not entitle him to the position of a Delegate as distinct from an Adviser. There is no doubt about it, he is the financial genius of Barbados, if not of the British Caribbean. Our Financial Secretary may be good enough to carry along his portmanteau; but the position of a member of a non-elected Chamber in a matter such as this, irrespective of what Party Sir Archibald Cuke belongs to, is such that he should be put on the Delegation as an Adviser and his advice would be indispensable. At the present time of our history there is none who is his equal or superior; but that does not justify a non-elected man to be in the position of a Delegate because he has not been sent there by the voice of the people, but as a nominated man of Her Majesty's Representative in this Island.

We know that the Hon. Dr. Cato is a West Indian; not merely was he born and bred in one colony, but he is making a very good living in another colony. Therefore, that helps us to consider him in the light of a full West Indian and none would deny his ability; and the fact is that on a Conference of this kind he would be able to pull his weight in more ways than one on the composition of this Delegation even if it is not recorded. I say that because of his general ability to mix and create a favourable impression with people of all types and classes. This is indeed a happy choice. Of course, the Acting Attorney General, in the absence of the Attorney General, I presume, has to go.

In so far as Mr. Burrowes is concerned, he is the Ex-Labour Commissioner who now holds the office of Financial Secretary. I make no further comment, and I do not think it is necessary as to the personnel; but the hon. senior member for St. John made a very excellent point and it is that on a Delegation of six persons you have two who are members of this House, and four who are members of the Other Place; three definitely—Sir Archibald Cuke, Mr. Field and Hon. Dr. Cato. Mr. Burrowes is in and out, [A MEMBER: He is more out than in] [Laughter] when he is acting as Chief Secretary, and there are those who are members of the Executive Committee. It should not be that when the choice is made by whomsoever it is made, there should only be one-third of the whole Delegation who are members of the elected Chamber, and only two-thirds of the Delegates being members of this House. I think that that is the weakness of this Delegation and it is something which we must deplore.

As a Parliamentarian I will always and will ever deprecate any apparent ignoring or overlooking of the views of this Chamber which passed a

unanimous Address relative to a non-Party Delegation with regard to this Federation Conference. I do not feel that there is the slightest or the least justification for overlooking the subject matter and the point and the sentiments contained in that Address. What Jamaica did in that respect was wisely done; it must give the outside world the impression that an all-Party Delegation or a Party Delegation representing the Government two thirds and the Opposition one-third was chosen, that this Federation issue is one which is regarded in this country as being completely above Party and a purely national issue.

I have no comments or quibble to make about the actual amount which is proposed to be voted. I do not see that any useful purpose will be served in attempting to whittle down the amount. I am not justified in arguing that the amount is anything but reasonable and I do not propose therefore to make any comments about that. However, when the hon. junior member for St. Peter was speaking earlier this afternoon, the Hon. Premier interpolated that before he leaves for England or before the end of this month, legislation would be introduced and, he hopes, passed to deal with racial discrimination.

It is being said—and I heard it is being said in Trinidad—that the objection to Barbados being the Federal Capital is because of discrimination being practised in this island. It is being canvassed freely in Trinidad that we have the practice of discrimination in barber shops, in hotels and clubs. The Hon. Premier spoke of places being open to the public and he mentioned clubs. I cannot agree with him that a club is something which is open to the public, unless I did not understand his phraseology. A place ceases to be a club if it is open to the public; but that disgraceful incident which occurred in this island gives a lot of material to the Trinidadians to talk about discrimination and the unsuitability of this island to be the Federal Capital, when we remember that a distinguished son of the Caribbean was refused a shave in a barber shop. I do not think that that gentleman would like his name to be mentioned in this Chamber, but he is one who has received one of the highest honours from the Throne of Great Britain which a Colonial has ever received. And if he was refused a shave simply because it is not known that he is Sir So-and-So (that took place in a barber shop in Broad Street), that again shows you how weak that proprietor is and how Malanesque he must be. He says: "I did not know that he was Sir So and So; I only refused because he has a colour which I in common with Dr. Malan, happen to abhor."

9.55 p.m.

Anyhow, sir, as I said there is no apparent justification and no argument has been adduced why this amount proposed to be voted should not be voted, and I support it, because, as I said, it is the final Federation Conference; and after 18 years, Sir, I think it is high time that we should be in sight of finality in our goal for Federation. I trust that the delegation will, while they are in England, do all they can to pave the ground for the Federal Capital in Barbados by going all out to ensure that Seawell should at least become an open Airport.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to contribute my small quota to this final voting of money to send this final delegation to this final Conference to erect this structure of a Federal Government for the West Indies.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the position of each and everyone of us hon. members here, if we really and truly are representing the people of this island, should be that we should not be snarling all night over the selection of the delegates. Our duty should

be to give them advice which they could themselves use in London in contributing to the reaching of this structure, and we should be wishing them "bon voyage". I deplore the snarling because it conveys to the outer world, to our brothers in the other islands a bad outlook; it shows that we in Barbados, this unique and enlightened island, have not made up our minds finally to build this West Indian nation. This is not time for snarling. It is actually over 18 years since this question has been stirring the minds of the people in this island as the last hon. speaker, the senior member for St. Lucy, said. In 1937 this generation was actually engaged in thinking out this scheme, and I feel the time has arrived when we should have our minds made up.

These men that we have selected are men from the island of Barbados, who have interest in Barbados, and I think we should have enough confidence in them that they will go there and utilise their best ability to see that Federation is a fact. I say it is deplorable to have this snarling, but I would still like to offer a suggestion to the Hon. Premier, if he feels it is not too late to make a selection so as to placate the snarling by hon. members, I hope he will. I have no objection to the selection; and if Government feels that these men are capable, why should we cast aspersions upon their character and their ability? This is a time for unity, a time for putting our strength behind them and giving them our blessing.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see why there should be such snarling over the few cents here; there is no need for it. I would not say that this Government has the greatest amount of brains, but I would say this: if we as true representatives were putting our brains and interest behind this Government instead of pulling away from it, I believe it would do better, especially when the majority of the members of this Government are black men, representing 95% of the population of this island. I do not see why we cannot demonstrate a greater spirit of unity and show the other people of the West Indies that we know what we want and are going for it.

With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I offer my support and best wishes to the delegates that are going over yonder to decide, and may God go with them and allay the fears that they will not achieve anything.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate, but I would like to reply to a remark, because there was a remark made by the Premier (or perhaps it was an aside, but it was a loud aside), and it was on the basis that I disagreed with the Freedom of Movement. This was totally incorrect and I have reason to remind honourable members of the fact of what I said. In 1952, when we were debating the issue, I particularly drew to the attention of the House of Assembly then dealing with Federation these words which I take from the Official Debates of 2nd September, 1952, in dealing with the values of Federation to us.

I now read from the debate which is dated 2nd September, 1952:—

"Let us take one issue; we, in Barbados, can plead for a release at 2,000 every year. We ourselves with 212,000; we find ourselves in 10 years with probably another 40,000; we find ourselves as one little unit perhaps with Ministers. We find ourselves with Trinidad setting up Labour laws, preventing our labourers from coming in; and St. Lucia, Jamaica and British Guiana doing the same thing. We find ourselves with no good reason for not allowing our own experts to go free as between one another; you can realise our position as finding ourselves unable to sell our produce, unable to talk

with England, the United States of America, Canada or anybody else. It is almost childish to say other than that we must federate, not necessarily to accept all that the Rance Report says. We must federate even if we do not succeed at first; other places are keeping out our people and we will starve here. We cannot afford to have our population increasing every year with our people starving, and can we afford to stand out from Federation? Do we not stand to get as much as other people or more? The very idea of unity would prevent other people from treating us as strangers and foreigners.

I hope that whoever we choose as our delegates will not allow the intention of British Guiana or any other colony even Jamaica, to stand out, to prevent us from federating with those who are desirous of federating. A start could be made with some colonies, provision being made for others to come in if they want to do so. If we get our politicians to do what I believe they will do, (work for the unity of the whole unit) it would not be long before British Guiana found out that it was unwise not to have come in. I do not think that any colony would stand out if it saw that Federation was coming."

10.05 p.m.

The point that I was making at the time was strongly in favour of the value of Federation to us because there were some among us, as there were even later, who were against Federation. I have had the opportunity of going to Montego Bay with the then delegation from this Island as Attorney General and on hearing the debates, I did become convinced of the absolute necessity of Federation for the good of this Island and for the good of the West Indies. In addition to that, after the London Conference, when the debate was taking place in the Other Place on that Report, at the time I was ill in my bed and one of the members of the Other Place telephoned me and asked me why I was so strongly in favour of Federation and I did my best through the telephone to tell him why.

Now, you will see in the Debates, and honourable members will remember, that I have always agreed with the Hon. Premier in the viewpoint that as far as possible, all restrictions should be removed. I have always agreed that for Barbados to go into a Federation without there being freedom of movement between the federation would be a fallacy. I will continue to argue that, but I believe the tide has turned sufficiently since then that everybody feels now that if you ask for it you will get many of the hitherto restrictions removed.

Now, there were those honourable members (some of them are not present to-day), who dealt with limitation of freedom of movement in the debate which took place in this Chamber on Federation in 1954. The Debates were reported on June 15th, 1954. There were some honourable members at that time (and I think they were the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for St. George) who drew to our attention that freedom of movement did not necessarily mean in the full sense of the term that it would prevent us from federating and my advice given to the Committee then was that since we were faced as units with restrictions which we would not be able to remove as units, it was bound to be better, wiser and safer to go into a Federation where we would be able to persuade other members of the unit that it would be impossible to maintain what I would call this keeping out of people, something which has been happening in many other colonies during the War particularly in Trinidad. These were the words I used in trying to say that I hope they would be able

to work out the equivalent of a compromise. I first agreed with the Hon. Premier that of course it was necessary to keep out undesirables and unhealthy people from another unit and that that be removed from the discussion on freedom of movement. I went on to say (and you will see it in the debates of June 15, 1954 on page 149) the following:—

"I again want to counsel those who are against the limitation of freedom of movement in the federation to accept the Preamble in the spirit in which it is given." (the Preamble was to deal with the freedom of movement by the delegates at the London Conference and my suggestion at the time was that we should accept the Preamble in the spirit in which it was given.) I went on to say:—"Whether it appears on the Exclusive or the Concurrent Legislative Lists, it would still be a question that the Federation itself would be able to overrule the units because in every federation—and in the suggestion for a West Indian Federation—it is laid down that where a subject has within the power of the Federation to pass laws, those laws which are passed if different from the laws of the Federation, that the laws of the Federation must take precedence. Because of that, while I agree that we should aim at the highest for ourselves, I hope that we will not allow the question of certain restrictions in the movement of people to prevent us from entering federation.

As the Hon. Premier has said, undoubtedly, each unit is going to claim the right that those who are of bad characters and those who are likely to affect the health of the community should not be allowed to enter; but, on the other hand, we have got to realise that we should enter federation not doubting those who are going in the federation itself, or with the belief that they are going to be hostile to our own ideas, but we should enter with the full belief that not merely by force of arguments but by our ability as statesmen to persuade others that what is for the good of a unit is for the good of the federation; we must try to persuade others that if one part of the body is suffering from a malady that the whole part of the federation would be suffering from the equivalent disease."

All I have said from the beginning to show that I was trying to help to persuade those to-be federationists both inside and out of this Chamber that no matter how we look at it we should try to get some form of freedom of movement to be able to export our people in every sense of the word. Our population is composed of artisans. At one time we stopped people from being trained as artisans because it was said that there are not enough jobs for them here, and we were not in a position to obtain for them places and positions in other parts of the West Indian Islands. Therefore at the beginning of this talk on federation it appeared to me—and it still appears to me—that we with our increased population which goes on from year to year, and with the limited resources which we have, will always be faced with a serious problem unless we can persuade other members of what would be units of the federation to accept our people as citizens of the community which would be a federation community.

10.15 p.m.

I do not want to say much about the other points which have been raised today because they have been argued almost *ad nauseam*. One feels very strange to hear a member of another political Party suggest that he himself should go; one brushes that aside. There are others, such as the honourable senior member for the City, who suggest that the honourable senior member for St. Philip, who functioned at the last Conference at Montego Bay, would be able to assist in this matter. I think that the Government, I mean the Hon. Premier and his colleagues, have missed a glori-

ous opportunity by not including on this Delegation some member other than those who now represent the actual Government Party; and even if they had gone to the members of the Labour Party who sometimes vote against them, or to the Democratic Labour Party, they would still have had the several parties, because they would be getting the advice and consent and agreement of persons who would be able to bind not only themselves, but others here in agreement with them in this Chamber.

I think we have made a mistake again in not taking the three Reports which have been handed to us and dealing with them first; because, although we have been promised a debate on the matter, I think that they should not have chosen the Delegates before we had threshed out these Reports and had been able to see whom they thought fit would be proper persons in the circumstances. It is useless suggesting that we should be so unanimous that we think that the concurrence took only the Government members even before we have discussed or dealt with these new proposals which I myself have not had the opportunity of reading through and digesting. The financial amounts in question are much greater than before and are likely to cause some reflection.

The honourable junior member for St. Philip said something about our giving instructions to the Delegates; we cannot give instructions to the Delegates, because the moment the Party system is established, then it is a question for the Government of the day. We are supposed to be sending plenipotentiaries and whenever one is sending plenipotentiaries—I do not care in what country it may be—there is usually the Opposition Party or the equivalent of some persons other than those sitting in the Government being asked to nominate some person so that they will have unanimous agreement. The bi-partisan policy which is followed throughout the world, and which other Governments, such as Jamaica, have adopted, is one which should have been adopted in the circumstances. The elected representatives of the peoples are only two and from the Other Place there are three. Although you may choose to call them Advisers, their responsibilities are entirely different and it is therefore regrettable that the Delegates were not chosen entirely from here even if they were chosen from the Government Party itself.

I would draw to your attention—and I think I am correct in saying—that Jamaica used to include, certainly at Montego Bay and also we were told that in the Rance Report, Jamaica used to include Mr. Judah from the Upper Chamber as one of the Delegates. As I understand it now, if I am wrong I hope I will be corrected, they have only used their Advisers in this case and they have left out Mr. Judah. [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: That is correct.] You have got to remember that today one set of persons may be in power and tomorrow another set may be in power and they are supposed to be as plenipotentiaries. With the new facts which have been placed before us, the new costs and the new ideas, it is regrettable that we did not deal with them first.

That is all I feel like saying in the circumstances, that the opportunity was not taken, at any rate, to choose one member from this side of the Chamber without necessarily going as far as the last four. I quite agree—I cannot help agreeing—that although the value of Sir Archibald Cuke would be great at any Conference which was going to discuss finance and matters of that nature, when it comes to determining the true principles of Federation, his place should be rather that of an Adviser, and a valuable Adviser at that, than of somebody who would be acting as a plenipotentiary and binding the people of this island.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I merely want to emphasize at this stage, a statement made by the Premier which was alluded to very briefly by the last speaker. I expect to hear repeated outside by people who may not know any better, that statement which was made in here to-day. The honourable senior member for the City, in commenting adversely on the selection of Sir Archibald Cupe on this Delegation, said that no member of the Other Place should be included on this Delegation as a Delegate, and in characteristic fashion the Premier asked in reply: how many Houses comprise the Legislature here; thereby implying that since the Barbados Legislature is comprised of two Houses, therefore both Houses are entitled to representation on the Delegation.

I merely want to scotch at this early stage the resort in the future outside of this Chamber by the Premier to a retort like that; because of all the West Indian Colonies which are participating in this Conference, only Jamaica and Barbados have bi-cameral Legislatures. All the others are, more or less Crown Colonies—Grenada, St. Lucia, Dominica, St. Vincent, St. Kitts and Montserrat have single-Chamber Legislatures.

10.25 p.m.

As I said earlier, in Grenada one of the advisers is not a Parliament member at all; but of the two colonies with bi-cameral legislatures it must be emphasised here and now that Jamaica has not included a member from the Upper House in the delegation. Here we have the Premier endeavouring to exculpate himself from the charge of including a Conservative in the delegation by insinuating that since there are two Chambers both must be represented. If by virtue of the Montego delegation Sir Archibald Cupe,—then Mr. Cupe—was a representative, we must remember that in those days we had no Ministerial Government; we had no party system. Therefore, with a joint meeting of both Houses to represent the delegation there was an excuse for conceding to the Other Place the right to send a delegate; but now we are balking the question and going beyond what is expected under our present system of Government by including a representative a member of the Other Place as a delegate of this House.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise again like the hon. senior member for St. Philip to clear up a misconception because I have spoken on this point earlier in the day, and my views are very well known by Government. But I could not let this debate close without making some attempt to set the facts of this discussion straight.

It has been suggested very volubly and quite often by inference that this House has already concurred in the appointment of the delegation by His Excellency the Governor. I wish with all the emphasis I can command to say that this is not so, and that the facts are as follows:

A Message came to this House from His Excellency the Governor informing this House officially that a plenipotentiary Conference would be held in February, that the three Pre-Federal Commissioners Report would be placed before this House for the House's consideration, and that the House would be invited to concur in the appointment of the delegation. The House replied to His Excellency the Governor stating among other things that it wished to see in the delegation a representative of each party. His Excellency replied to this House stating among other things the names of the delegates (and their names have been mentioned in this debate) and that the delegation will be advised by three other persons. The Opposition members of this House got leave of the House to move the pass-

ing of an Address this afternoon to His Excellency the Governor stating their non-concurrence in the appointment of the delegation. That motion as you know, Sir, was defeated, and they, especially the Premier, are trying to argue that because the motion for non-concurrence was defeated that this House has therefore concurred, although no motion for concurrence was brought before us. This is counterfeit logic: and in any case if the Governor has asked us or intimated to this House in the Message to concur, it is for them to bring the Resolution or motion before this House inviting its concurrence. Therefore I have to emphasise to them that they have to do this, and then, in any case to ask us to vote the money for the delegation.

I wonder when we are going to hear or see the last of the Premier's attempts to befuddle and confuse this House, and I sometimes wonder too if he regards it as being probable that he will not be returning to this House after it dissolves at the end of this year, and so that what injury he inflicts upon it will be, as it were, a parting gift. It is due time that some stop be put to this. It is not enough for the Ministers to do things in the House of Assembly which reflect upon its dignity, but they go even further than that, even to the heights of absurdity, and use arguments which they should be ashamed of using to justify whatever they have done.

I am filled, Mr. Chairman, by a kind of animal terror that these big issues which have to do with West Indian Federation are really being left aside, not because the people of Barbados cannot grasp them, and not because the members of this Chamber are not interested in them, but merely because we happen at this time to have a Government in power who are quite capable of fiddling while Rome burns. And therefore, in all these important issues, there is almost callous neglect of public interests in the fact that even the level of this debate is not what it should have been, and that the Head of the Government, in all that it has said and done so far today, has given the impression that even he himself is not as interested as he should be.

10.35 p.m.

I am going to make my own position quite clear. I cannot make it clearer and I cannot speak with greater emphasis than I have spoken. As a member of the Opposition I do not feel myself in any way committed to anything they may say or do to enable Barbados to be represented at this Conference; and I am not particularly interested in how many hundreds or thousands agree or do not agree with me. But they may be surprised to discover that a lot of the opinions they now despise and overlook might gather enough momentum and throw them down in London.

How many people in this island realise that if half of the things recommended in the Fiscal Commissioner's Report become realities, we should all have to pay a Federal Income Tax as well as consumption taxes on five or possibly six or a dozen items which we use in order to support Federation? Those are matters of great importance and they are matters of life and death to all the people in the Caribbean. How many people know, at least in this island, that the Chief Minister of Jamaica is going to make a determined bid to see that as much self-government as possible is given to the West Indies?

Does our Government share Mr. Manley's views? Is he going to receive the support which is rightly his due? To what therefore are we committed? If the people of this island want to see the Federal Capital come here, surely it is enough to realise that

it can only come as a result of some bargain. Can we not, therefore, have the assurance that the Barbados Delegation would at least support the Jamaica Delegation in its plea for self-government in order that the Jamaica Delegation might throw in its weight behind the Barbados claim in our quest to have the Federal Capital? That is the way how things are done; but they must at first inspire sufficient confidence in the people of Barbados that they as a Delegation would think and act along those lines. Therefore, when it comes to giving them the money and whatever else they want, nobody would quarrel with that if we felt that they were taking their duties seriously, but they are not. That is why members of the Opposition Party have reserved the right to define their attitude by, if necessary, repudiating the delegation and refusing to be bound by anything they may say and anything that they might sign.

Mr. Chairman, if you had listened, and I think you did, as carefully as I did to whatever pronouncements were made from the Government side on this most important matter, you would have come to the conclusion, as I have done, that what the Hon. Premier has said all today was as meaningful as if an illiterate had written with a Post Office pen on top of a fire engine.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and those against please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Is the Hon. Premier going to reply or is he playing a part? He said earlier today that if he had opportunity he would have made a reply. I do not mind how sleepy any hon. member is, the Hon. Premier has a right to reply. Apparently, he is willing to exercise that right but some hon. members over there are telling him to disregard us and say nothing. If he does that, he will see how strong the Opposition is.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am telling the hon. member that I have already put the question.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I did not hear you put the question. With the greatest respect to you, Mr. Chairman, it was not audible. I am sure the Resolution has not yet been passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It has been passed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, after all, you are dealing with a very important matter. I started to get up and as soon as I saw the Hon. Premier was willing to get up and give a reply, well then I had no intention of speaking further.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave of the Committee to recommit this Resolution after hearing all the things that have been said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier is asking leave of the Committee to recommit the Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I maintain that I have not heard the question being put. If you got there and mumbled something, I am prepared to say that the Resolution was not passed. If you get away with this, where would we be. This side of the House has not heard when the question was being put. I am sure that no hon. member over here heard.

Hon. M. E. COX: The question was put.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do not mind what that hon. member says. He wants to be Premier. Chairman and everything. With the greatest respect to you Mr. Chairman, I was going to speak when I saw the Premier get up to speak and I thought it my duty to sit down. I did not want it to be said

that we are trying to prevent you from putting the question. I could not imagine that the question was put.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier is asking leave of the Committee to recommit the Resolution. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, no doubt I have seen the difficulty under which you have laboured after your ruling about discussing the personnel of the delegation, although some hon. members tried to their satisfaction to get around your ruling by bringing in the question in another way.

Whatever has been said we have to bear in mind that we cannot clamour for self Government and for having constitutional development and then not accept all the implications to it. So long as you have a Government with a majority vote, until that Government loses the confidence of the Electorate, that Government is entitled to govern with the knowledge that it thinks best. Sir, if all that I have heard today were repeated I would make the same selection. 10.45 p.m.

If all I heard this afternoon were repeated two hundred times, I would still make the same selection. There are many reasons why "A" should be carried and not "B". In respect of the Deep Water Harbour we voted that money without knowing who was going on that Delegation. I make bold to say that it would be difficult to find three other men who could have presented the case for Barbados as the three who went on that Delegation. Each did what the other could not do; each contributed in his own particular way.

I am not following the crowd in debating this question; I merely say again that the Government, so long as it has the confidence of the majority of the Legislature, is entitled to use its judgement consonant with its policy; and in a case of this sort, to choose those who, for reasons better known to the Government than to non-members of the Government, are, in the Government's opinion, persons to be chosen.

I will make this one departure from what I think should be my reply. I do not think I should attempt to deal with the personnel of the Delegation, but if I were not afraid of the recollection of who first said it, I would be inclined to say: "What I have done I have done." The Chief Minister of Jamaica might, in the circumstances, be perfectly right and so the Executive Council in Trinidad might be perfectly right.

There are numbers of things which I would like to say but I cannot say them. The Chief Minister of Jamaica and his party have never made any imprint on Federation because they were not in power. What Mr. Manley is doing now is what some of us fought for from the S.C.A.C. Report to the Trinidad Conference. Who wants to have any Governor General writing laws for Barbados? Who but a lunatic of a Barbadian would agree with that? All that has to be discussed when we have taken these Reports and read them. I hope hon. members will really study these Reports because Barbados has infinitely more to lose than any other West Indian Colony.

In 1953 I asked the House to put strongly their points of view; and as I have already said this afternoon, hon. members should not have any half-baked discussion on points tonight without reading these Reports. I would be prepared to say that you cannot read them and digest them thoroughly in one day.

I have discussed these Reports with the three Officers while they were writing them, and in spite of that I am not satisfied with them. We could start

at 10.00 o'clock in the morning and go on until 10.00 o'clock at the night discussing them. Do not let us get away with the idea that the Government is complacent with these things or anything of that sort; no hon. member facing me today is as concerned as I am in the matters which are facing this Conference.

I do not want to say anything which would stir any hon. member to wrath to make any speech, but as far as the hon. junior member for St. James is concerned, if it were not for all sorts of other circumstances, I would be inclined to say what I said in an aside earlier.

I say it with great respect to everybody because of the hon. member's profession, because of the Montego Bay Conference, if it were still our duty to show unanimity to the rest of the area, he would have been the obvious choice. In 1953 the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. James said: "For God's sake, let us not have any more Conferences; let us get on with Federation." Do you tell me that anybody in the Caribbean area thinks that the Government and the Opposition do not agree with that? They know it. [MEMBERS: That is not what we argued.] Hon. members who have been to Conferences and who have heard or seen the reaction of other people, know better than I the reaction to that. Well, I am told that some fish bite before the bait gets into the sea. Sir Archibald Cuke is a Conservative and a strong Conservative. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: He is not a Conservative.] We, on this side of the House, are always amused by the references to Sir Archibald Cuke and this Government.

Far be it from me to say anything which would seem to be derogatory of Sir Archibald Cuke; there are few people in this Island who have started so low down as Sir Archibald and who have risen so high. He is the great man he is today without the assistance of friends or family.
10.55 p.m.

All that is true. But I would like hon. members to know that in spite of the remarks that they have been constantly throwing at us as to how we lean on Sir Archibald Cuke, if Sir Archibald Cuke in the Other Place does not agree with the policy of the Government and expresses that view, he ceases to be a member of the Executive Committee. The hon. members thought I would get up to object when they said we had to lean on Sir Archibald Cuke. But the Executive Committee is the Government of this island and the five Ministers whom you listen to but need not heed; and the day any member of the Executive Committee in the Other Place attacks the Government, he ceases to exist.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: You are coming around to it now. You have changed your course.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: But all that was by the way. The point which I want to make is that although I would not like the Opposition to feel that I am ignoring the points they have made, it is my settled conviction, conventional or otherwise, that so long as you have two Houses of the Legislature, you cannot ignore the Upper House. Whatever may be the powers granted to the Upper House you cannot act as if it did not exist. You make it exist in this or that matter; and I will give lesser or greater weight to the Upper House as in a case of this sort in selecting a member as a delegate or as an adviser, but in my submission the point is only of academic interest that this is the first time that we have heard one single word that Sir Archibald

Cuke should not be carried as a delegate. Sir Archibald Cuke was selected to go to represent the Government at Montego Bay and was invited to sit on S.C.A.C. At that time both of us were out of the island. What happened? Dr. St. John, another member of the Upper Place was chosen in his place, and on another occasion who was chosen, Dr. Massiah, another member. What is the point of making interjections. When the first S.C.A.C. meeting was held I was in Europe, Mr. Cuke was in England, neither of us attended and Dr. St. John was in his place. Later on, when I could not go to the second meeting I suggested the hon. senior member for St. Philip in my place, because he had been to Montego Bay. It was not a question of appeasing any Opposition, but to me it seemed the most natural thing that he, having been to Montego Bay, should go in my place. I had no more in my approach to this selection now than I did in those days when I suggested the honourable member as being the person closest to Montego Bay. Now, I say from every single meeting from Montego Bay down to the Freedom of Movement in Trinidad last year, not one single suggestion that Sir Archibald should not go as a delegate has been made. Honourable members who are not in these things should know we voted together for the Government of Barbados.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Then why carry him, as a mouthpiece? Let us reduce the vote and carry you alone.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is not even funny. What is true of Barbados is true of every other legislature. The Government has one vote and the Leader of the delegation gives that vote. In our case it is clear and in Jamaica it is clear. We have a party system, and honourable members at one time said you must have different points of view represented and the honourable members suggested that we should have one member; in that case I will be giving Government's point of view just as Manley. Apparently, honourable members pose questions and when they are answered they do not want the answer. I need not really reply to this or that point made by honourable members because from the collection of remarks made I could not choose a better lot. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture is praised as I expected he would be. Could there have been a better compliment paid to me than that? Because if you do not choose people who will be acceptable, why choose people at all! [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Although I do not feel good about the choice!] In view of what the honourable member has said, I sometimes feel inclined to say that if this House had gone on record as saying the position of Government, is "for God's sake get on with Federation, and stop the Conferences", how could the Government be blamed for the selection it has made? Then, I must say this: it is a long time since I dealt with the Rule of three (the rule of thumb) but faced with Opposition Parties when agreeing with the honourable senior member for the City, the Government should have at least two members and the Opposition Party one by a unanimous vote of the House. Some members think politics is a Sunday School class because honourable members make no objection to fantastical suggestions when they come up in the House. There are four parties in this House, and three Independent members.

I find it difficult sometimes to say how much seriousness I should put to some of the remarks made by the Opposition. Imagine the hon. junior member for St. James saying that there was universal acceptance that we should at least select a member from every Party on that side, even if we did not get as far as the last four members on that side. Is the Electors Association a dead Party?

My theory in the matter is that it is difficult to get a bi-partisan policy with four parties from the other side. Mr. Chairman, you have been very kind in allowing me to do the very thing to which I have been objecting earlier as regards the personnel of the Delegation, but I say quite plainly and bluntly that bearing in mind every possible scheme and what we are faced with, and how we must go about the different aspects of this matter, that I would not tomorrow, the day after nor a year after, make the slightest change from the delegation which I have made; neither adding nor altering the Delegates or vice versa.

Hon. members remarked upon one hon. member coming from the Other Place as a Delegate and of others from that Place who are Advisers. They wanted to know why you should have two officials as Advisers. Let me say that the Advisers of the Windward Islands in 1953 at a similar Conference were the Financial Secretary and the Attorney General. They made that number less at a subsequent Conference but they made up for that because there was in England at the time Mr. Eric Williams, a gentleman of economic prominence. However I do not intend to pursue that matter any further.

I wish, however, to say that as members on the other side have made the point that the Barbados delegation should go there to represent Barbados with at least a hope of regaining in the eyes of the Leeward and Windward Islands delegates the prestige which Barbados has had for many years and therefore, standing the better chance of being made the Federal Capital, that I feel is not impossible. To my mind, at the present moment, as far as I can see it is five all on both sides. We hope, going in the spirit with which we are going and being helped by admirable sentiments by honourable members on the other side and forgetting personality, I feel convinced that this Delegation will do its best for Barbados and that if under all these circumstances it is possible to get the Federal Capital here, it will come here.

I also wish to thank those honourable members who agree that we should not go away on important occasions without sufficient money to be able to entertain for saying so. I entirely agree with what the honourable junior member for St. Peter said on that score because, as he points out, it would not do for people to get that impression when there are other islands which want the Federal Capital. They look at things in a mingy way when a delegation comes out of a tube and when the Trinidad Delegation comes in a limousine.

Because honourable members feel in that way, I propose with leave of the House to amend the sum of money in the Resolution to \$20,000 with the assurance to the House that should there be any addition from the point of view of hospitality, that no money for hospitality will be drawn unless it is spent. I therefore ask leave of the House to move as an amendment to this Resolution that the sum of \$20,000 be granted from the Public Treasury in place of the sum of \$17,500.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I intend to be very brief. I rise more in sorrow and in sympathy than in any attempt to refute the remarks of the last speaker. I am really so surprised at much of what has been said that it is difficult even to venture to reply. The Hon. Premier has been guilty of such muddled thinking and such an attempt to confuse the issues that I can only hope that his thinking before he goes to London would be better or that

he sees a psychiatrist or some medical practitioner to pay attention to his mental state.
11.15 p.m.

He began by saying, (I only mention one point to illustrate what I am saying) that Mr. Manley is now clamouring for an advanced Constitution, and that Mr. Manley who is now in the Government, is trying to do what they have been trying to do all the time before. In other words, Mr. Manley now finds himself for the first time in Government, and therefore he has to begin to adopt the position which the Premier and others have been adopting all along. When I heard that statement, I really, really wondered if I heard it correctly.

I cannot imagine that the honourable member was thinking of what he was saying. Mr. Manley was not in power, it is true, when Federation was discussed before, but what is he doing now? He is questioning the Rance Report which was signed by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. You have to bear in mind that Mr. Manley is not going there to do what the Premier and the others have done. The S.C.A.C. Report is a document the basis of which would form the Federation discussions in London, and what Mr. Manley is doing now is completely repudiating that. He is saying: "I do not agree with that document which was signed by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, Mr. Gomes and others. I want to go further; I want the Rance Report completely repudiated; I want no official members of the Cabinet, the Reserve Powers of the Governor General must be reduced to a minimum," and so on.

Every single thing the Hon. Premier agreed with and has signed in the Report, Mr. Manley says he does not agree with; and the honourable member gets up in here and wants to tell us that his brain is functioning properly when he says that Mr. Manley is doing now what they have been trying to do before. Nothing could be further from the facts and his entire speech is guilty of the same muddled thinking, of not studying what he is saying and of not worrying to think whether what he is stating are facts or otherwise. It is alright for the honourable member to fool the people around him or to misinform the public, and I am not allowing him to misrepresent the facts and fool the entire House. I am really sorry, and I mean that, [Laughter] that a man of his political and intellectual stature could have come so low so suddenly.

If he takes that type of thinking to the Federal Conference, he should not attend the Conference at all. I would not waste the time of the House in replying to the other points which he made. With reference to the point about the Government in power acting, nobody in his right senses, when it comes to the question of the constitution of the Delegation, could be so silly as not to appreciate the fact that if we could question it successfully, we would be the Government. What we are questioning was his blatant failure to observe the composition of Parliament; he did not appreciate the fact that the Party system requires the recognition of the Official Opposition on all issues affecting the country as a whole. But the honourable member tries to becloud the real facts and tries to draw red herrings across the trail. I merely want to let him know that if this demonstration represents the standard of debate with which he hopes to influence this Chamber in the future, then he is living in a fool's paradise.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Premier did not answer all the points which I raised in connection with this Resolution; he was deflected from doing so. I raised the question of the flight insurance, whether this £5 subsistence allowance will be related to the old former £5 allowance and whether

this will be the standard policy of the Government in so far as the allowance of this Delegation is concerned, in the sense that you will have £5 today and £3 next week, if you feel that the Delegation is a light weight Delegation.

The Hon. Premier will have to reflect on the point; it is his firm conviction, that in so far as the Constitutional position is concerned, it rests with the Government where the appointment of this Delegation is concerned; but Barbados is not the only Parliament in the world which has this Constitution. After the War, there was the question of the building up of the U.N.O. Constitution in San Francisco, which was regarded as a national issue; and on all these issues it is a policy of the British Government to use whatever forces there are. [ASIDES].

I want to say that I am not a timid man. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY You are a vagabond.] And I will tell you that the vagabonds succeed in life too! [Laughter]. At one time Bonaparte was regarded as a vagabond too; it is because I am a vagabond that I get a lot of people keeping away from me.

I say that it is very important that the Premier should bear this in mind so that it would be a lesson to him. We are not aware of these matters and he knows that one of the things I have always insisted upon is, that when it comes to the appointment of a Delegation like this, as long as you have evolved the Ministerial Government, it should be the right for the Government to decide these things.

11.25 p.m.

But then you have the right to decide which is yours. There should be no question of ignoring certain circumstances that exist. The Premier has a very peculiar way of looking at some things unless there is actual danger. He made a composition of the elements that exist over here. So far as I am concerned he can call me an independent, a non-independent, or anything else, but I do not want to be so dependent on people that I cannot express my own view, and my view is that in an issue such as this I cannot see why the Premier could not have included in his delegation a member of an element that he would regard in the national issue such as this who would not do any damage. Where I differ is that I am of the firm conviction that a member of the delegation from the other side would do more on the Government delegation, because it would be symbolic of the Government of Barbados. I am sure he is aware of it, because he is aware of constitutional practice in Great Britain and even in matters apart from the delegation, the Government would not deal with this important issue like a person who is selling old iron. But I do feel that the Premier should not give one the impression that the question of including somebody else in the delegation is so alien to the constitutional system that it would set a precedent that would be a very dangerous one to continue; so I feel that it cannot have done any damage. I am not objecting to the choice, but I advocate that if you are a Government, you should decide in which manner it should go. In these circumstances if he had decided that anyone should go as a delegate from the Other Place there should not be any constitutional irregularity, and we could not claim that where you have a new system from the last Conference, you should follow a method of division as on the last occasion, and I hope that some explanation will be given to the points I have raised.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I must give credit to what other honourable members have said. I think the amount of \$49.44 is too small,

but I have to check up on it. It may be that the amount is very small and I thank the honourable member for making the point he has made. As regards the honourable member's other point, I think that this is an occasion when we might see how our expenses and our subsistence allowance go, because it is an excellent opportunity and the first time I am going to a Conference in Great Britain for which an individual subsistence allowance and a general entertainment allowance are given; and if the money given is more than enough or considered as insufficient for entertainment, we will of course have to decide whether we should follow the pound rule or some rule involving less money. Let us not allow anything to overthrow Federation; I think under the circumstances it is not good enough. Let me explain what I meant by my reference to the honourable junior member for St. James. I was surprised to hear the remarks that the honourable member made at that time in connection with the Freedom of Movement conference in Trinidad. What the senior member for St. John said does not matter, but when the honourable member for St. James with his authority and his being as firm a Barbadian as anybody else, suggested that I should tone down on the Barbados point unless there is freedom of movement, (the honourable member for the City stressed it too,) he does certainly fail. I am not calling names, but in Trinidad did I not stress that? I was being pressed by the other delegates not to stress that and that I would be putting Trinidad in a tight position as the Legislature of Trinidad was not as great as the Barbados one. We went to Trinidad and we stressed Freedom of Movement. Tea was taken and in that interval the Trinidad delegate came to me and asked me to back down. When we were about to back down he said, "If it is going to help you that Barbados will come in only if we relax our restrictions, I will agree to it." It is a fact that we were strong in saying that Barbados could not go in and not Trinidad. If we were not strong on that, we would have had a "wishy-washy" meeting of the Freedom of Movement Conference. But the last point, Sir.—I am sorry to come back to it but it may arise again—is, that it is not accurate to speak of bi-partisan views in principle. It suits the American democracy to say "all of us are fighting." What the honourable member says about San Francisco is true; the League of Nations had failed, the war was over. Should we start again by telling the Committee whether one single member of the Opposition is represented on the delegation?

Let the honourable member tell the Committee whether one single member of the Opposition represented Great Britain at United Nations. When I was there only Labourites were there, since then only Conservatives were there.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I only rise to say, first of all that the honourable member who has just sat down referred to the honourable junior member's suggestion when he said look how the American members went to San Francisco. One can very well see that when the Hon. Premier went to the United Nations Conference that all the Labourites were there, now he is not there all the Conservatives are there.

I have spoken enough on the debate, Mr. Chairman, I rose really to support the increase of the amount of the Resolution to \$20,000. I want to say in passing that the reason why I am supporting it is because I am somewhat surprised that for years since you have had Ministerial Government, I suggested in this Chamber that not only should members of the Government be placed in a position to

entertain when other people visit them but I suggested that His Honour the Speaker should be given an entertainment allowance also; and up to now my suggestion has not borne fruit. I say so now because the last time that United Kingdom Delegates visited this colony, His Honour the Speaker had to absent himself because he could not stand even a nip bottle of rum for them! [VOICES: Shame! Shame!] There is no shame in that. They should not only vote \$3,000 for entertainment allowance for themselves; they should also vote something for His Honour the Speaker. I do not think that His Honour the Speaker should be relegated to that position. You have said that of the last \$3,000 which you had voted for entertainment allowance that you returned \$1,000 into the Treasury. You return all of that, yet His Honour the Speaker could not stand a drink for the United Kingdom Delegates as Speaker of this Chamber.

In all seriousness I am saying that we should have some sort of Entertainment Allowance voted so as to allow His Honour the Speaker to use some part of it in case he has to entertain, or that you increase the amount of \$3,000 for the Ministers so that he can get some part of it.

I do not think my last point is going to meet with the approval of hon. members. Let me say that when the Opposition in this House raises any question, its members are fully conscious that it has a duty to perform and as a result of that we do not oppose for the sake of opposition. When we see a matter which calls for us to raise opposition, it is our duty to raise the question. I disagree with the hon. senior member for St. John when he said just now that he hoped the Press would not give this matter much publicity. Let me ask the Hon. Premier at this juncture when he proposes that we should come to discuss these three Pre-Federal Reports.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Thursday next week.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Let me repeat that it was the duty of the Opposition to raise the question as to the personnel of the Delegation and it was the duty of the Government to argue and show why it has done something; therefore I consider that all the publicity should be given to this matter: and nobody should try to suppress publicity on it, because when such a thing is done it is not good for the democratic set up of this country.

I hope I will not hear from friends or foe that the Barbados Delegates in England had to get in a tube when the Trinidad Delegates or the Windward delegates are driving in their Vauxhall cars; do not let the Hon. Premier fool himself that he is as strong as he used to be, therefore he should reserve his strength. However, though we on this side of

the Table might disagree with him, we know that when he leaves here on that delegation he goes as a Delegate for Barbados.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave now to make the amendment to the Resolution as I have aforesaid. I am told that I did not do so. I am asking that the sum of \$20,000 be inserted in place of \$17,500.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution as amended for the sum of \$20,000 do now pass.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee and the postponement of two.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case the Resolution was read a first and second time and then agreed to.

11.50 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will realise that we still have a lot of work to do. I am therefore going to make a motion that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next, in order to deal with the business on the Order Paper.

I therefore beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next, the 12th instant, at 3.00 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next at 3.00 p.m. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: A division was called for.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has a division been called for? I want to get that clear.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: All right Sir; we are not worrying with any division.

Mr. SPEAKER: This House now stands adjourned.

11.45 p.m.