

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 24th September, 1959.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. F. C. GODDARD; Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER; Mrs. E. E. BOURNE; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); Mr. T. W. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation by this House.

Mr. STRAUGHN entered the House and took his seat.

RESOLUTION re POLICY OF GOVERNMENT TO BE PURSUED AT INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution:- Resolution regarding the policy of the Government of Barbados to be pursued at the Inter-Governmental Conference to be held in Trinidad in connection with the working of the Federal Constitution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are well aware that on Tuesday last, day before yesterday, a Resolution was tabled, copies of which were circulated amongst hon. members, and a notice was given that it was the intention of the Government to proceed with that Resolution today. But before making my formal motion on the passing of this Resolution, I shall make a few remarks in connection with the substance of that Resolution.

Sir, I do not think I need read it. It was circulated and I think each hon. member should have a copy. Now, Sir, the first consideration of this Government with regard to Federation is the question: "Should we have a Federation on the same lines as exist now, or should we" - and when I say "we", I am not referring to the Government of Barbados but to the ten Unit Governments of the Federation

forming the Federation - "take steps to strengthen the Federation?" My observation along that line is that in view of the progress which has been made recently constitutionally by units of the Federation, particularly Barbados, Jamaica and Trinidad, since the inception of the Federation of the West Indies, it is imperative for us to consider a constitutional revision of the Federation. We cannot continue much longer in the abnormal position in which the constitutional position of the Unit Territories is higher than that of the Federation to which they belong. Barbados is therefore anxious to strengthen the Federation and press that it be given dominion status at an early date. A Dominion Government with the limited powers which the existing Constitution has allocated to the Federal Government from the units would be quite ineffective. It is therefore necessary that the unit territories should first give consideration to the giving up of more of their powers to the Federal Government. This would mean that the Unit Governments, of course, would have less powers; but to think that we can have it both ways would be a waste of time.

That, Sir, is the position of the Barbados Government with the Federation as a whole. I repeat that the time has come when we do want to have a more effective Federation with more power given to that Federation, and the units should, of course, be prepared to have less of their power in order to strengthen the Federation.

Now, Sir, the all important question is the sphere of control of fiscal and economic measures throughout the area of the Federation, and the most urgent step to be taken in this direction is the establishment of a Customs Union. This Government intends to urge strongly that a Customs Union be set up without delay. We accept the Trade and Tariffs Commission Report in principle, but there are several matters of detail on which we do not agree with the Croft Commission. At the conference, we will support a proposal that a working party of federal and territorial officials should be appointed forthwith to iron out the difficulties of unit territories in regard to the proposals for the Customs Union and to examine and report on the suggested common tariff.

It has been suggested that it would be possible to have internal free trade without customs union. Sir, this Government of Barbados rejects any such idea and considers that all the territories of the Federation should be prepared to take the rough with the smooth. At the same time, this Government is most anxious that there should be no delay in the free movement of goods and people. We are aware that certain territories have quantitative restrictions against the importation of certain goods manufactured even in other Unit territories. I am glad to say that there are no such restrictions in Barbados. Until all such restrictions are removed and we have a Customs Union, development will be retarded, particularly in the industrial sector. This Government recognises that we cannot hope to increase the number of persons employed in agriculture. The number has been gradually declining because of mechanisation, and land available for cultivation in Barbados is fully occupied. Some diversifi-

cation of agriculture might have a favourable effect on the number of persons employed; but, by and large, we must expect that there will be more and more persons who can only be employed by the development of industry (including the tourist industry) and commerce - either in Barbados or elsewhere in the Federation.
12.25 p.m.

Now Sir, we know that Jamaica is coming to this Conference preparing to urge that we should have internal free trade now, and Customs Union later. We, the Government of Barbados are not prepared to accept that idea. We feel that both of these things should go hand in hand. I do not want to say too much with regard to the question, but it is quite obvious that Jamaica is prepared, if we allow her to do so, to enhance her position as far as development of industries in Jamaica is concerned, and so protect herself with the present external tariff, while we in these islands with internal free trade, would be giving up a certain amount of our customs duties without any compensation in revenue which might be expected to come in by way of a common tariff.

I shall not labour that anymore for obvious reasons. This Government does not subscribe to that point of view. I am informed that the majority of other islands, exclusive of Jamaica, are prepared to take our stand. So, Sir, we want this House clearly to understand that that is the position of this Government on that matter.

Another question, Sir, is this question of zoning and our view is that in the matter of attracting industries we propose to press for uniformity in the Federation with respect to relief from taxation and other incentives; or else we may find industries moving from one unit to another after seven years, while on the other hand we feel that they should be free to decide in which units their industries are to be located. Therefore we will oppose any zoning of industries by the Federal Government.

I think that that speaks for itself especially as we intend to press for uniform concessions by way of legislation for tax holidays etc., throughout the area. In that way, Sir, a manufacturer who wants to come into the area will be free to decide just where he should locate his industry.

Next we turn to the question of finance. The Federal Constitution provides for the following revenue for the Federal Government for its first five years. (1) A Mandatory levy of \$9,120,000.00 in the following proportions, according to articles 91-90 and the fifth schedule. To refresh the memories of hon. members I will repeat the proportions as paid by each Government of the area.

Antigua pays 1.3374%; Barbados 8.5562%; Dominica 1.625%; Grenada 1.6969%; Jamaica 43.119%; Montserrat 0.2732%; St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla 1.7256%; St. Lucia 1.7400%; Trinidad and Tobago 38.6252%. That is by way of Mandatory levy.

Another source of revenue comes from currency profits, which are the main sources of revenue; and there are other receipts such as contributions from British Guiana, British Honduras etc., to services, and income tax of Federal Officials.

From the time of the establishment of Federation the Federal Government has demanded the maximum levy. In 1958 this resulted in a surplus of \$2.3 million. The Federal Estimates of 1959 are as follows:-

Head of Revenue	Estimate for 1959.
1. Currency Profits	1,100,000
2. Taxes	100,000
3. Contribution towards cost of Federal Services	920,434
4. Repayment of Advances	10,000
5. Miscellaneous Receipts	51,400
6. Mandatory Levy	9,120,000
Total Ordinary Revenue	11,301,834
7. Colonial Development and Welfare	499,032
Total Revenue	11,800,866

It will be interesting to note that the decision to set up the Federation with its chief source of revenue in the form of a Mandatory Levy arose from the insistence of the representatives of one Unit. As a compromise the amount of the Federal levy was made to correspond with the estimated yield of the consumption duties recommended by the Fiscal Commission. This compromise however seriously contravened the financial principles previously accepted.

The London Conference Plan contemplated other sources of Federal Revenue, in particular income tax, at a later date. That Conference however proposed that the Federal Government should have a proportion not exceeding 15% (instead of the original 25%) of Customs Revenue.

Now Sir, there are certain heads proposed in the Croft Report with regard to the raising of revenue by the Federation and there are certain duties connected therewith. With regard to gasoline, the maximum rate of duty is to be seven cents a liquid gallon and the estimated yield at maximum rates would be \$2,003,000.00. Initial rates of duty of the same item which were also recommended are five cents per liquid gallon, and the estimated yield at initial rates will come to \$2,002,000. With regard to cigarettes, maximum rate of duty recommended is 80 cents per pound. The estimated yield expected at maximum rates is \$3,101,000, and the estimated yield at initial rates is \$2,391,000.
12.35 p.m.

Another recommendation was that of beer which with a maximum rate of duty of 32 cents a liquid gallon would yield \$1,082,000 and the initial rate recommended was 25 cents a liquid gallon which would yield \$845,000.

Rum at a maximum duty of 80 cents a proof gallon was estimated to yield \$1,986,000 and the initial rate recommended was 65 cents a proof gallon which would yield \$1,613,000.

The other potable spirits were recommended at a maximum rate of \$1 a proof gallon which would yield \$138,000 and for a start which was recommended at 75 cents a gallon it would yield \$103,000.

These figures, Sir, at the maximum rate would yield \$9,110,000, and at the initial rates recommended would yield \$6,954,000. Now, Sir, the proportions of the amount to be paid by mandatory levy by the various territories under the Constitution were calculated by reference to the estimated yield of the proposed Federal consumption duties at the initial rates. As I have already pointed out, the share of Barbados is 8.5562%.

The mandatory levy took no account of the effect of expansion and inflationary trends which continued after the Fiscal Commissioner made his estimate in 1955. The revenue and expenditure of all the Unit territories have increased considerably, but a fixed levy, even with minimum and maximum rates, takes no account of increases in consumption on the dutiable articles. This Government considers that the Federal Government should not continue to be supported mainly by a mandatory levy, but that in its place power should be given to the Federal Government to raise revenue by Federal consumption duties direct on the lines recommended by the Fiscal Commissioner. This would make the Federal Parliament directly responsible to the taxpayers, and more fully aware of their responsibility for controlling expenditure and avoiding waste.

This Government feels that, as I said earlier, more power should be given to the Federal Government, and that this mandatory levy of \$9 million is unrealistic, and by accepting the recommendation of the Fiscal Commissioner the Federation would be placed in a much better and stronger position and would yield more revenue at that rate. As I mentioned earlier, I was not present at the meeting in London, but I have always heard that at the time the Committee which met at this Conference realised that it was really not the best thing, but it was a compromise because of the pending elections in a neighbouring colony, and they thought that the can-

didates who were present, or some of them, at this meeting would be in a better position if they went home with this mandatory levy of \$9 million than to tell the people they had to give the Federation certain powers which might have an adverse effect on their elections. So, Sir, I think the time has come when at this coming Conference opportunity should be taken to amend that position. That is our position and we are submitting it to the House.

With regard to income tax, the Fiscal Commissioner stated that if the London Conference of 1953 had not decided that the Federal Government should not impose tax in the first five years, he would have recommended that Federal income tax should be applied as soon as there was uniformity in the income tax law in the various territories. He recommended that the consumption tax should be imposed, and that, if necessary, the absolute prohibition of federal income tax in the first five years might be replaced by a suitable limitation in the standard of company rate of tax. The Fiscal Commissioner stated that the immediate introduction of federal income tax would be less easy than the imposition of consumption duties by the Federal Government. He wrote and I quote:

"The amount of revenue to be raised would not justify a separate basis of assessment for a federal income tax, but it would be inequitable to levy it on the somewhat differing bases of assessment now used for the Unit income taxes. Federal Income Tax would therefore only be fully satisfactory after the unit basis of assessment had been unified. I believe that would be a very desirable thing in itself, and a matter deserving of the very early attention of the Federal Government. It would be excellent if the principles of assessment, the system of personal and dependent allowances and the scales of graduation of tax were uniform throughout the Federation and administered by a common Income Tax Department, leaving the Federal and Unit Governments each free to determine the actual rates of tax to be collected for their respective benefits; but the preparation of a common Income Tax law as the basis of such a system would take time even if it had been agreed in principle, and it could not be in operation at the commencement of the Federation."

On this question of Income tax, Sir, we share the view of the Income Tax Commissioner whose comment I have just quoted, and we feel that first of all there should be a uniform income tax law applicable to the whole territory rather than, as we have now, ten different income tax laws which would be found very difficult to apply even if at this stage we had decided to let the Federal Government be responsible for the collection of income tax. So, Sir, we believe that a Federal income tax law is the first prerequisite to the imposing of federal income tax. As I said, that is our stand on this question of income tax, and we are going there with that view.

Further to that, I have said that the time which has already been taken by the Federal Government to begin the work of modifying and drafting a common basis of income tax, and which would probably be taken by Units to agree on a common basis indicates the extent of the technical difficulties to be overcome; but of course, Sir, that is the view here expressed, and in spite of all I have said about the common income tax law, I still feel that this Government is not willing to surrender income tax revenue to the Federal Government prematurely.

A proposal has been made by the Trinidad Government that the Federal Government should have two-thirds of the import duties of the Units, two-thirds of their income tax and death duties and all excise duties, and that the Federal Government should take over certain of our services. The Barbados Government has to bear in mind that unlike Trinidad and Jamaica we have no other major sources of revenue.

12.45 p.m.

The Trinidad Government estimates that it will receive about \$70 million from other revenue, (chiefly oil) in 1959. In Barbados we have no oil or bauxite or forests

from which we can obtain royalties, and if the Trinidad proposal were accepted completely we would face large deficits. We must therefore examine any financial proposal which may be put forward at the conference very carefully.

I have here, Sir, a document which I have received only yesterday and which I have not really had the time to peruse. I hope I will be able to read it before Monday. It is the memorandum which was sent out by the Office of the Premier and Ministry of Finance of Trinidad on the economics of nationhood. As I have said, I received it only yesterday and I have not had the time to consider it; but I have been told that there are income tax proposals in it in general. I have said a bit earlier, in connection with this question of income tax, I would be making every endeavour to study that document thoroughly before the Conference begins; but, while this Government has a common agreement with other territories on this question of income tax, yet because of our economic position, we have to examine these proposals very, very carefully and we are not going there to submit calmly to everything put before us. We have to bear in mind our economic position and what effect the impact of these suggestions put by Trinidad would have on our economy.

Now, as regards Federal expenditure, even with the oil of Trinidad and the bauxite of Jamaica, the islands of the West Indies Federation cannot be considered to be by any means wealthy. This Government does not therefore consider that large increases in expenditure by the Federal Government should be encouraged. The money which the Federal Government spends will have to be found by the taxpayers of these islands. Taxation is already high, and this Government wishes to avoid imposing further burdens on the taxpayers. We have no doubt that as the economy of these islands grows, the revenues of the Federal Government will grow proportionately, even if they are limited for the first few years to the consumption duties and the currency profits.

The interest of the people of the islands can best be served by the Federal Government setting an example of thrift and careful housekeeping. The future of our nation will depend more on the ability to restrain ourselves in the present than on any other factor. In this connection I hope I will be forgiven for quoting - perhaps out of its context - the final paragraph of the paper read by Arthur Lewis at the Study Conference in Economic Development in Under-developed countries which was held in Jamaica in August, 1959: I quote:-

"And now I have done altogether. The task of the economist *qua* economist in analysing the problems of economic development is very simple. There is no secret formula for economic development. Economists do not know anything more about this than is known to the man in the street. Development means building for the future by restraining ourselves in the present: very simple analytically, difficult politically. But when one says that though some policy is the right thing to do it is difficult to achieve politically, one is saying only that in a democratic country it is the duty of all of us who think we understand these matters to take part in educating our fellow citizens. In a democratic community the right thing can always be done if the makers of public opinion understand that it is the right thing. This is the challenge which now faces the West Indies. Our statesmen have to use all their courage, all their imagination, and all their powers of persuasion to make people understand that this is a job which has to be done, and which can be done. There are still people in the world who doubt whether we shall rise to this occasion. It is for us to prove them wrong."

Well, Sir, I think we Barbadians have all realised that it is very good to have these aspirations, industrial, economic and otherwise. And that is very often the position in which we find ourselves. Therefore, Sir, with that background we in our way - in a small way - would take up that position and continue to urge very strongly the attitude which was recommended here by Dr. Arthur Lewis. I am fortified in that position by the opinion

which was entrusted to me a couple days ago, on Tuesday last, by a gentleman who was visiting us from one of the islands of the North. He told me that not only in this country but all of the islands in the North, they were urging that position bearing in mind the position of the small islands; and while it may be a nice thing for the bigger islands who have a little more money to urge certain things, yet we cannot do so because of our knowledge of the background of our countries. This gentleman also said to me that they in the North will continue to look to Barbados because they knew that Barbados does not spend money foolishly. I think that is a truism. As I have said, we shall go to the conference bearing all that in mind and prepared to bargain with the richer and quite more powerful neighbours of ours.
12.55 p. m.

So, Sir, I come to the vexed question of representation. I think it is well known, the position that Jamaica has taken on this question. I think that as far as Jamaica is concerned, representation and the question of Customs Unions are major questions, and I know that generally the Jamaica request for an additional number of seats is going to be resisted.

As far as Barbados is concerned, we feel that it is somewhat disappointing so soon after the establishment of Federation - less than two years - to be called upon to consider this difficult question. It is a matter which occupied considerable time in the past, and the present representation was only agreed to on the basis of a compromise. Other Federations have at their inception encountered similar difficulty in regard to the basis of representation - notably the United States - difficulties which were only solved in due course of time. The difficulties which will have to be examined in Trinidad are:-

(1) How can the representatives of a territory be reduced without causing tremendous dissatisfaction?

(2) How can we avoid the House being dominated by the representatives of one territory?

(3) How can we avoid increasing the total membership of the House?

This Government certainly considers that we should avoid having too large a House of Representatives in relation to the total population of the Federation. It is really undesirable to alter the number of the members of the House of Representatives elected in each Unit Territory so soon after the establishment of Federation; but we would be willing to take part in any review of this question which may be undertaken at the Conference.

While we feel that it is preposterous to come forward at this early stage asking for further representation, and while we fear domination because of numbers, yet we are going prepared to hear all the arguments; and at this stage I do not know whether we would say that we have adopted a definite line. We have certain ideas which we might bring forward at the appropriate time while contributing to the debate. It all depends on the attitude in general. I will say that the reason why we are adopting that attitude is that while I believe most Barbadians I have talked to feel that we should resist any increase in representation, yet there is a fair number who have expressed the opinion that they believe that Jamaica has a case. To that view we of the Government do not fully subscribe. Bearing in mind that expression of opinion, however, we will wait and see the line that is adopted on this question.

To deal with the smaller islands, the Windwards and Leewards, I know that they are prepared to resist any increase in representation. I have been told that Mr. Manley came out with some fantastic number - I think 17 additional seats - giving Trinidad five and Jamaica the rest. I do not know how far these five seats will be looked upon with favour by Trinidad but it may have some influence on Trinidad's attitude.

I passed through Trinidad a few weeks ago on my way to England. I know the feeling then was: "No increase."

I talked to quite a few people and that was the feeling then. It is not that I have a moment's doubt as to the *bona fides* of the Trinidad politicians, but I cannot at this moment say whether or not there has been a change of opinion. As I have said, this is a very vexed question, and we are not prepared at this stage to go down definitely on one side or the other.

If we see that this question will probably wreck the federation then we have a suggestion to make and some recommendations to bring forward which might give an opportunity to the Conference to accept a compromise.
1.05 p.m.

In case Jamaica takes the stand of withdrawing from the Federation if she does not get what she wants, people want to know what would be the attitude of Barbados, and whether Barbados along with the others - Trinidad and the rest of us - would be prepared to carry on Federation properly on a limited scale? Well, at first flash, speaking personally, my reaction if Jamaica does not want to come in and withdraws is to let us have a try ourselves. That is again an opinion prevalent in Barbados and that also will be given thorough examination. As I said, that is my personal opinion and at the Conference we will see the reaction to that rather than have the Federation wrecked altogether because Jamaica decides to secede. I think the rest of us, given goodwill and understanding, can have a shy at making the Federation a success without Jamaica.

I know that Jamaica is also very strong on this question of Customs Union expressly for her external tariff. That might also to her be something insuperable and we certainly cannot accede to something of that sort which would further pauperise the smaller islands. Those, I understand, are the two biggest hurdles and we have taken the opportunity to let the Legislature know our feelings on all these matters, hoping that this meeting, Sir, of the House will further give approval and concurrence to the stand as outlined by myself to be taken by the delegates at the Conference beginning next Monday.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is to be regretted that we met here today after such short notice to consider what should be a most important matter - further Constitutional talks in Trinidad at a Federal level. The entire atmosphere surrounding this is one of unpreparedness from beginning to end. We knew long ago that these talks would be held towards the end of this month in Trinidad. We had vacation; but long before the vacation we knew that that would be, and we should have had so many opportunities of discussing various Reports that lead up to the all-important constitutional talks which are just next week.

Even in considering the few notes on this paper that was handed to us last Tuesday after we had met and were told that we would be called on to consider it today, I am not at all surprised that the Official Opposition has taken the stand it has in not appearing today, not only because they were not asked to join the delegation to Trinidad, a procedure that this House has been consistent in, excluding the Opposition at every turn - they only wish the Opposition to come in and sanction what they are going to do - unlike Jamaica and Trinidad and the Government that operates in those two islands today; even before Dr. Williams came in, the Opposition was always carried on these important matters. He has followed that practice and even today with the rift between the Parties so severe as it is in Trinidad, he has still given the Opposition an opportunity to sit on the delegation that would comprise the conference in Trinidad next week. In Jamaica it is the same thing; a member of the Opposition even after the very recent elections will be included on the delegation, but this Island particularly from the very inception of the Federation, with the exception of the Conference at Montego Bay when it was not in their power to exclude any one, absolutely refuse to have a member of the Opposition, and for that reason, I can see the attitude of the Official Opposition in staying away today.

I still regret, however, that they have not taken the opportunity of expressing their opinion as I will express mine today. No matter what delegation goes, this is going to be binding on us and future generations, and I wish to let this delegation know that I do not approve of the unprepared approach they are making in going to Trinidad in this haphazard manner. We have been presented here with a paper with views on matters that have engaged the attention of other Legislatures from time to time. We have read about them in newspapers and have heard them discussed over the radio, but never once have we had the opportunity of debating these same matters in here, and now we are asked to approve. There are some very frightening and alarming suggestions, and as the Premier said, some seem preposterous. Where are we going from here in Federation?

The Premier said that Federation apparently was brought into being more as a compromise than anything else and he cited cases both in England and elsewhere where just for the sake of expediency and because of an impending election certain things were written into the Constitution. Now one thing has been written into the Constitution, and that is that there should be no income tax in the first five years. That is one of the amendments that is in these talks. Well I say that must stay and for the very good reason - not that we fear increased taxation because it is going to come - that the all-important matter of Customs Union must precede that. If you go to Trinidad and accept the imposition of a Federal Income tax without in some measure pinning them down as to a date on Customs Union, you would be putting your head into a noose from which you will never get out. In Barbados we have always stated that we were going into Federation with the two important matters of Customs Union and freedom of movement, and the few discussions we have had in here in previous sessions have always centred around them, because we felt we would not feel the competition from the other islands no matter how big they may be, provided these two things were achieved.

1.15 p.m.

When I speak of Customs Union, I am not speaking of a Customs Union in five or ten years to come. We wish an earlier date for it. Let us say within three years. Pin them down to that. Give them a date because it will take time. Say to them, 'Within three years give us a Customs Union.'

We have been sitting in this House for the past twelve years and have seen Jamaica encouraging industries into that colony; and in a lesser degree within more recent years we have seen Trinidad doing the same thing. We have sat here and have not done very much about the matter, but we have tried to pick up within the last two years and the speed with which we are trying to pick up during that time we should have been developing ten years ago. I remember that the former Premier stated, not once but on many occasions, that industrial development was not very much a matter for the unit territories but it should be developed on a regional basis.

On examining this document I have seen written into it a contrary view expressed by the present Government. I shall read it.

"This Government will continue to oppose any proposal for the zoning of industry by the Federal Government. We consider that industrialists should be free to decide in which units industries are to be located."

That Sir, is opposite to what previous Labour Governments in Barbados have expounded, and the opposite view was expounded by Sir Grantley Adams; therefore, I wonder why this change now. I would have thought that, after the other two bigger islands - Jamaica and Trinidad - have already got a start on us in industrial development, you would have found capitalists more willing to go into those regions. It is difficult to start industries from the ground, and it is a very well known fact that industries will follow other industries. I say that not because I am against a free competitive market; but if this Government can only be assured of stability, that will outstrip the other colonies.

Let me assure the Hon. Premier also that industrialists will also take a keen note of what the tax structure of this island is; and from there we go to the Federal income tax proposals. It is stated that before Federal Income tax can be achieved, the individual income tax basis of the other islands should be as close together, if not similar. That is quite sound reasoning. If we were to be taxed more heavily than, say, St. Kitts and then you are going to place a Federal income tax on top of the people of Barbados along with that, you can very well see the burden that we would have in Barbados would be of such a magnitude that it would discourage any investors from coming here. It may even discourage the existing investors in Barbados and it may cause them to move out. Therefore, far from getting them in, it might be an exodus. That is why I say, before you can even touch the subject of Federal income tax, you must make your point and you must make it so effectively that you can say that Barbados can only continue with the discussion if they are prepared to talk about Customs Union first and, therefore, because of that you will give them a date. Say to them that within three years Customs Union should come into being.

I know that you are going to have a difficult task and it is going to be resisted. It is in their interest to resist it because they have well developed their industries and we have not got started yet. Let them know that this little colony of Barbados is dependent on sugar, and has a huge growing population; let them know what assistance the people of Barbados want from the Federation. It is time that we talk of what assistance we want. Let them know that we want to know what we are going to get out of it. They look on us as the biggest of the small islands; yet they still think of us as one of the large islands. That is not good enough.

Now, Sir, Trinidad has put forward proposals of a magnitude that we without greater detail are unable to follow. The Premier of Trinidad has stated that the money budget of the Federal Government which is \$11 million is wholly inadequate and he envisages a budget of \$140 million to \$143 million. That is a staggering figure. Where is this money to come from? It can only come from the taxpayers of the West Indies. However, he has followed it up and stated what are the services which he would propose to hand over to the Federal Government. In other words, he means that they must do something. They must take over services if they are to be given any kind of increased budget.

Our Government has not proposed a single thing which they would like or would wish the Federal Government to undertake. As a matter of fact, people in the West Indies generally are at a loss to know what is going on in the Federation and what services the Federal Government are giving. Large sums, relatively speaking, are being spent there, and people are travelling to and from Europe and up and down the West Indies but with no tangible results. What they are doing should be told to the people. The people should be seeing the results and they should be told what is happening. But everything is so abstract. Reports are being given out, but nothing tangible is being done - apart from the two ships which are running through these islands; and even so, everybody is not aware that these ships are taken over by the Federal Government to run a service between the territories. Apart from that, very little else is being done.

Sir, I am speaking for the masses because this is going to bear on them. What is the size of the budget which this Government proposes to give to the Federal Government. What is the scope of responsibility which you are going to place on the shoulders of the Federal Government? None of these things have been told us today. I cannot vote for an increased vote to the Federation without knowing what they are going to be called on to do; and that would have to displace some of the things which we are doing in Barbados today. That must be so because we cannot bear the burden of increased taxation. We have to be relieved of something if we are to hand out more money to the Federal Government. They must undertake some of the responsibility which we now have ourselves.

(1.25 p.m.)

I would like to know what is Government's intention on that. You say you realise that there must be increased revenue for the Federal Government; but you do not state what are the increased responsibilities that they will be called on to perform and the increased services that should be rendered to the unit Governments.

When it comes to the thorny question of increased representation in the Federal House of Representatives to me that question is not just a matter of numbers. It is a matter of proportionate representation. I see where Mr. Manley after a very victorious election stated that he wished the Federal House of Representatives increased by some large numbers, and the only two units to get that increase are to be Jamaica and Trinidad. Jamaica is to get ten more or eleven more and Trinidad five more. Barbados will remain with the five that we have and the small units with their two. Personally I do not see the necessity for any increase at all. I have estimated that the cost of the salaries of the Federal Representatives, the expenses of getting them to Trinidad for a session of two months or a month and a half would be in the vicinity of \$100,000.00. Subsistence allowance and plane fares all add up to about \$100,000.00 for one session. Then they return home and their salaries go on, and we see the spectacle of the Federal Representatives travelling up and down the West Indies and returning to their homes for long periods enjoying good salaries and good allowances. The hard pressed people are now to be confronted with increases of a similar nature.

I would have hoped that the Prime Minister of Jamaica would have paid more attention to economy, realising that the taxpayers at least down here, are very poor and that money should be spent more directly in the service of the people and not to have a top heavy administration.

Imagine the West Indies Federal Parliament with something like sixty members, each one having to be taken down to Trinidad and taken back to their homes when the job they have to do is limited. We in Barbados must remain with our five representatives and be swamped by Jamaica and Trinidad.

I can see this Federation evolving not on Party lines. It will not be long before the fight will be on with Jamaica and Trinidad. If Jamaica once puts herself in a position where she can dominate the others, it will be a sad day for these small islands. They have been promised by the big islands that their development will be taken care of. I have not seen any indication of that yet. The small islands from St. Kitts to Grenada have been promised by the big islands that they can look forward to the economic development of their territories so that in the near future their standard of living will be improved. I have not yet seen any evidence of that. It is mere lip service. The big islands now want to increase representation for themselves and leave the others as they are, when they have not even begun to keep the promise of economic development of the smaller islands nor even to assure them that it will be postponed until even a further date.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I purposely came here today not so much to give the House my views as to how I see Federation is going, but I did hope that with the brief notes that were given to us on Tuesday we would have been given today a fuller explanation of the proposals of Government. The Premier has stated that there are one or two views that are his personal views. We cannot vote for personal views. We must have the intention of the Government. On so many matters of importance it appears that he is waiting to get there to see (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On what points did I say that I reserve personal views? I did not.) I was coming to that. He said that when he got to Trinidad and the question of representation was raised he had proposals. He had an alternative proposal that in the event of a break down of the Conference (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I certainly did not say that they were personal views.) 1.35 p.m.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sorry if that was not his personal view, but this is what he said; he said that in the event of a likely break-down and the Jamaica delegation threatening to secede from the Federation, he had proposals to make that may meet the situation, but we do not know these proposals and he cannot have a mandate from this House for something we know nothing about. He may not want at this stage to give the House these proposals, but he did say that; but even if he did not say that he had personal opinions on that, certainly there were other things of importance on which he expressed a personal view. We should know where the personal views begin and end and where the Government steps in. As I said, the preparation of this is so hasty for so important an occasion that I have to hear more from the Ministry, and I do hope that I will because I wanted to get an idea from them as to what is their intention.

I have given a brief summary of what my views are on the Federation as outlined in this brief note, but I regret unless there is a very strong amendment to this Resolution that I cannot accept it, and I will not be voting for it, because I consider it very unprepared and unworthy of the Government of Barbados leaving here to go to such an important Conference with this paper. I would even suggest to Government that for as much as they have not got anymore to offer, they should go to the Conference and suggest a postponement of the Conference that they may get ready with a proper proposal, because it will reflect on the island of Barbados if we go there as unprepared as the delegation will be going. I cannot support this Resolution as it stands. I have expressed my opinion, but I do hope I will hear other Ministers speak because I might be enlightened even further on many of the important subjects that are here.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I begin by saying to the Hon. Premier that he would not have to explain to me what he did mean by his personal views, because I am prepared to say what he said. He said

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rose when the hon. junior member for Christ Church was speaking and I rise again. I never said anything about personal proposals.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am prepared to say what he did say and it is for him to say what he meant by those words. On the question of representation he said that he had had some talk with people in Barbados and from the general discussion he had with people his personal view was that if Jamaica wants to go its way, they should endeavour to have a Federation with the others and leave Jamaica out. That is what he said as far as his personal views are concerned. I made a note of it and I will deal with that when I come to that stage, but that is where he expressed a personal view on these matters and not the view of the Government; after discussion with people in Barbados he felt that that view symbolised the thinking of people in Barbados. If the hon. member did not explain it that way, that is what he said. That was at the end part of his speech, but I do not propose to start at the end; I propose to start at the beginning.

It is true that this document here as it is written need not have come before a Meeting of the House at all. It was never intended that there should be a meeting of the House to consider this document, because if it were considered to be a more serious document of this Chamber in a more serious matter, you would not have expected to introduce it on Tuesday and ask for a meeting on Thursday, as I did not believe that the Cabinet itself came to these conclusions in a matter of two days. I do not believe that the only consideration they had for these matters was a two-day discussion, because you would have had to have a discussion on the Croft Report, Customs Union or the Fiscal Report before you expressed a serious opinion; so I do not believe it was intended for the House to give approval to this in the structure of what the House of Assembly is. In view of the fact

that the Government has a majority of members in the House and a majority apart from those in the Cabinet, they are not particularly concerned about such matters, and I may humbly say that I do not believe that two members of the Party other than the Ministers have read the Customs Report or the Fiscal Report or know anything about a Clause in the Federal Constitution; so it is not a matter for them to discuss this matter because it is not a local matter. It is not like putting a pipe in St. Andrew or building a road in St. Philip or putting a playing field at some other part; therefore it is not of immediate concern to their own constituents or a question of whether their political life and death is dependent on the Federal Elections in Barbados. From the Government's point of view it is more or less an academic exercise rather than a serious legislative matter; so as it was an academic exercise you have given attention to the matter and now are putting it before the boys and saying all the points have been considered and this is a précis of all these things.

Now I do not agree with the Official Opposition on many things and I do not agree that they should allow this Government or any Government to believe that it is their intention to be accompanied on matters that are supposed to be the responsibility of the Government. At the beginning of these Conferences, that is the first London Conference, you did not know what you were going to do, and my view was that you should make it national because in any case there was no partisanship involved as we had these proposals for a Federation in which we wanted to take part and become a unit. I felt that you should take somebody if the Opposition felt that one of them should be taken. My view today is that it is a little different because you are going to an inter-Governmental Conference. You have expressed your view on it and you have said what you feel should be done. If the Government agrees to carry something it should do so, but if I were a member of the Official Opposition - I am a member of the Opposition because I am not a member of the Government Party - I would not want to be included in a Government delegation or any Government mission in which the Government's policy was to be initiated or enunciated because I am not part of that Party's policy; so I do not want to join them in something to which I am not a party.

1.45 p.m.

And that is where I say the Official Opposition at this stage should not ask for representation on the delegation. If I were a member of the Official Opposition, I would oppose the idea of expressing that opinion. It looks as if you are begging someone to take you somewhere on something to which you do not belong. If no partisanship was involved, well then, it might be all right, but partisanship will be involved now because Federation as such today is a reality. You have a Federation. There is the Federal Government and this Government is meeting as well as other governments to express the Governments' opinion. I think that the delegation from this Government will be there to express the present Government's view and what they themselves think should be; therefore, it is the right of the Government to go to this Conference on their own and if there are matters which they put before Parliament for discussion, it is the right of members of Parliament who are in the Opposition to express their views on them.

Of course, Sir, I do not think the Government took the Opposition seriously. When the Hon. Premier returned from England on the last occasion, he made a statement at the Airport, not on this matter but on general matters, more or less giving the impression that in so far as Government was concerned, it did not matter so far as Government was concerned, as to what the Opposition felt on what they had achieved. The Hon. Premier did not say that but that is the impression which I got from the statement he made at the Airport. He said something to the effect that in any case what he was going to do will not please the Opposition. Of course, he is working on the hypothesis that you cannot please everybody; therefore, he has reached the stage when you do not try to please everybody. That is the reason why we have received this copy of the Resolution and were asked to come and discuss it in just two days. I do not believe you can seriously ask hon. members, if it were the intention of the Government that it should be a lively discussion on

this matter, to come within two days to do so. They gave us a copy of this Resolution on Tuesday for discussion today. If Government had intended that there should be lively discussion on the matter, surely, it is something that they could have given us before.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will begin by showing what is stated here. It is stated:

"The Government wishes to strengthen the Federation, as it is only in this way that we can create a West Indian nation worthy of the name. We want the people of these Islands to be West Indians first and then members of the several Unit territories. Thinking as West Indians, we want a West Indian Government that can truly govern."

These are platitudinal statements; they are not statements which mean anything. What Government is afraid to say in this Resolution is that they are either prepared to increase the taxation of the people of Barbados or that they are prepared to lower their present standard of living in order that the Federal Government can be made stronger. It can only mean that. If you say that you are not in agreement with the mandatory levy, it must mean that you are prepared to increase it out of your revenue directly; therefore, you will either have to budget for more money or you will have to reduce some of the things which you have already budgeted for, or there is the other alternative of your giving them the power to make their own taxation. This means that you will agree that they impose taxation on such things which they suggest, which would mean that you as a taxpayer will have to pay more for what you now have.

From the time we started to talk about Federation, that had to be made known to the people of every unit. It had to be pointed out that Federation would mean more money by taxation from the people of the various territories or it would mean the Federation being given a grant from the United Kingdom Government. As regards that, I am one of those people who have taken a stand in the same position of thinking as that which Sir Alexander Bustamante stated at Montego Bay when he said that the Federal Government should as a matter of right be able to get from the United Kingdom Government at the very beginning a substantial grant not on the basis of almsgiving, not on the basis that you are so penniless and poverty stricken and cannot do this or that, but on the basis that the territories of the West Indies were colonial territories with a Crown Colony system of Government for the most part so that they could not expand their economy in the way in which the people in the territories would have liked them to expand. If we have been caught up with a situation like this, we are doing nothing improper to ask the British Government to subscribe a substantial grant to the Federal super-structure which we intend to build. I do not subscribe to the view that a substantial grant at the beginning from the United Kingdom Government to the Federal Government is anything improper and that it would in any way take away your independence. It would be only a grant to put you on your feet to do certain things.

Now, Sir, the hon. junior member for Christ Church said something which in a general way would appear to be O.K. but in a specific way he must remember that if you have agreed to Federation, eventually, you are going to have to agree to all of the necessary elements it must have if it must work. Over the years I have come to the conclusion from what I have seen in these colonies - and I have visited all the territories that are units of the Federation - that this is so. What has caught up with the leaders of the Federation is something which I think they did not calculate for. The very constitution of the Federal Government today is one which they did not think of. Nobody thought that elections for the first Federal Parliament would have made the sort of revelation which it did and would have produced the results which it produced, in that nobody expected that the Windward and Leeward Islands, the poorest in the Federation, would have emerged with the major leaders of the Federation at the beginning. What do you find? The major leaders of the Federation when it was being talked about backed out from the Federation after the manifestations they made about it; therefore, it so turned out that the unit Governments still remain with their more powerful politi-

clans in them and the Federal Government with all this big over-all pronouncement about this new nation has become a Government of second eleven cricketers with the first eleven cricketers still in the pavilion. What has really happened is that the first eleven cricketers stood back in the pavilion and just put one of their first eleven men to go and lead the second eleven team. Therefore, Sir, the problem with Jamaica - and it is a problem with Trinidad also - is that these territories are contributing the most money to the Federation and they find themselves in the position of Unit Governments governing the Federation which they have to subsidise. This is a parallel which I will use as an analogy. We believe in democracy; but democracy is not an old type of Government, it is a young type of Government. It has various ways of functioning. Tomorrow if the members of this House of Assembly, though we believe in democracy, find ourselves being governed by twenty-four inmates of the various almshouses, we will all say that something has gone wrong.

1.55 p.m.

Yet the leaders cannot come out and say that. If I were a member of the Federal Labour Party it would be oligarchic to say that. The Federal Labour Party controls the Federal Government; but it is not a united Federal Party. You can see what is happening. The Premier of Jamaica is the President of the Political Party in which he ran candidates but in which he himself did not run. He stood out in order to make Jamaica stronger and to make the Federation stronger. That was his reason. The Premier of Trinidad did not run because he wanted to make Trinidad stronger and to make the Federation stronger. The Premier of Barbados did not want to run because he said there were certain things in the Federation he did not like; and at one time he even said he would keep far from it. They said they would make him Prime Minister but there were differences between the big shots and the Federal Labour Party that the situation in the Federal Government would have worked out the same way: Jamaica president, Barbados the next Vice Admiral etc.

Now you get the Barbados Premier becoming Prime Minister for St. Lucia, Jamaica, St. Kitts, Montserrat etc. and that is the Government now. The situation is that Barbados has to find more money and Trinidad has to find more money and the people of Jamaica are not pro-federation, irrespective of Party. That is true of the people of Jamaica as a whole - and you cannot blame them, because it is the biggest island in the Federation - for feeling Jamaica's destiny as distinct from anything else. The Jamaican is the most nationalistic person and Jamaica is the most nationalistic territory of all the territories of the Federation. Their political emancipation in the last twenty years has been based on Jamaica's nationalism and you cannot take that out of their breasts. This is part and parcel of this new generation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It being now 2 p.m., of the clock, this sitting will now be suspended for half an hour.

On resumption,

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was on the point of explaining the present position in the Federal Government *vis-a-vis* the Federal Labour Party. It should be remembered that these territories though federated, are independent units with separate Governments and peoples; and their representatives have in the first instance tried to comply with the views of their respective constituents. I believe I am right in saying that everybody put forward the idea of federation on the basis that his territory has something to gain. Unfortunately that is a tendency of human nature. It's human nature to ask: "what advantage I am to gain?" I heard discussions among people. Some say: "I do not believe in Federation at all." I heard discussions in which one says: "We are too poor: I do not have anything to give St. Lucia, and Dominica does not have anything to give us."

The whole idea that the politicians put before the people was that they were going to be better off. Very rarely do people ask the masses to make a sacrifice, because sacrifice on a mass basis does not make sense; such sacrifices are made on an individual basis. The only time you appeal to people to make sacrifices on a mass basis

is in war, and the result is still the preservation of one's own interest. The whole concept therefore is if you will gain something.

Federation in its early stage has shown us that some of the territories cannot gain in the sense that the national income of Barbados is going to be increased because there is a federation, or that wages in Barbados will increase because there is a federation; but from what I know or from what I have seen, the poverty that exists in the West Indies will not stop if you believe you can stop it on an individual basis.

2.35 p.m.

If you go to Montserrat, Dominica or St. Vincent, to mention only three places, and you see for yourself the standard of living and what exists in these three territories, then you have to ask yourself whether it is not a challenge to you to do something to relieve this stark poverty that you see. I have been to Montserrat and have seen in their main industry a man working for 90 cents a day. The very economy of the place is an extremely poor one. Under these circumstances you cannot talk in loose terms that the West Indies can go on as territorial units, and that is why I say that if the personal statement which the Premier made as a result of discussions is put forward as Government's views, then Government does not understand the whole idea of Federation. You cannot at this stage begin to tell people in the West Indies that you are going at Federation without Jamaica because it is making a nonsense of the whole concept of Federation.

What are you afraid of? If Jamaica makes a stand for greater representation, that is understandable; you should hear their views and what they have to say, but do not believe that because they say they are going to withdraw you can make a statement saying that if they withdraw it does not matter; it does. A Federation of the Windward and Leeward Islands and Barbados is moonshine. If you begin to talk about cost and domination, what will happen if you leave out Jamaica? Do you believe that Trinidad will remain with you just as a big brother and would not want to dominate too? I am not particularly concerned about the Federal Parliament; I would have been more concerned about Parliament from the financial end as member to member. Member to member is not unreasonable because it is purely a matter of its composition. The Barbados House of Assembly has twenty-four members with 230,000 people; therefore you cannot talk about proportionate representation. Barbados is a small unit with 24 members, but do you believe that in Barbados it would be easy to get the Barbados House of Assembly to reduce its numbers to sixteen because it would be cheaper for the colony as you would only have to pay sixteen members instead of twenty-four?

Speaking under correction, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Jamaica now has a House of Representatives of forty members to the original thirty-two or twenty-four; so it is nothing unusual, if one of the unit Governments has a Legislature of forty or thirty-two members, to have a Federal Legislature of sixty-five. I am not dealing now with the composition; I am dealing with the view that if you say it is too unwieldy it does not matter, because the United States House of Representatives is much larger than any State Government, and all Federations are like that; so this is where the whole House of Assembly comes in.

The Premier put this matter before us as a Resolution. Is it a Resolution of the Government or of the Labour Party? It is supposed to be a Resolution of the House of Assembly now in Session. It is just like you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, being Deputy Speaker and Chairman of this House in the context of the person in the Chair, not meaning what the appellation of Chairman means in a Parliamentary sense. Now if this is going to be a Resolution of this House, it must symbolise general views; but can these views be taken as the Government's views or as the views that are representative of the people of Barbados?

I have been given the feeling from what the Premier has said that it does not matter what Jamaica does, we can go on by our sweet selves; but we have to do our best to

keep Jamaica in the Federation and not allow them to feel that it does not matter if they go out, because if you make Jamaica feel that it does not matter if they go out, there is an easier chance for Jamaica going out and surviving than it is for us by having them go out. I talk to people who know something about Jamaica. From its own economy Jamaica has shown what it has done in a short time as compared with what was done in Barbados. The whole idea is that we have not been so fortunate. In the last ten years they have found large deposits of bauxite and have had a rigid, intensified industrial programme. They are near to the United States when it comes to the question of tourism. You are now expending money on tourism, but since 1947 Jamaica has been having tourist traffic existing which is something you cannot hope for, and the reason for that is because they are so near to the United States. A man can get into an aeroplane in Miami and in three hours he is in Jamaica. It makes a lot of difference with what Jamaica can offer him and what we can offer, because we cannot put an aeroplane up and say "Come to Barbados!" as the man still has to pay passage. The fact is that they would not do as well outside Federation as inside, but that is a different thing. What I said and will repeat is that it is easier for them to go out and get on than it is for us to remain without them and get on. (A VOICE: Equally.) The Hon. member says "equally", but it is a matter that without Jamaica, the only big territory you will have making any contribution would be Trinidad. Let us be practical about it. St. Vincent is a grant-in-aid territory as well as St. Lucia; St. Kitts for some years was a territory which found itself in a good position but now finds difficulty; Antigua is a grant-in-aid territory. With these territories that today still depend on the British Treasury for grants which have to be given to the Federal Government, do you see them in the foreseeable future joining themselves together without some of the others that can really stimulate the economy to be anything representative of something worthwhile? They have broken away from their own Federation because it was a stark example that they did not want the Leeward Islands Federation. Barbados is poor too; and when we think in terms of Jamaica we cannot have this insular idea that a politician can make a statement and not think of the future of that statement. The former Premier of Barbados who had no inclination for financial and economic matters easily to put this thing from his mind said that he wanted economic planning to be done on a zoning basis. Now you get this Government saying "this Government will continue to oppose any proposal for the zoning of industry by the Federal Government. We consider that industrialists should be free to decide in which units their industries are to be located." Are you going to say now that you oppose the zoning of industries on a Federal basis, but formerly when you had no industries it was different? 2.45 p.m.

There was a time when Barbados was so far behind the others industrially that this idea of zoning looked all right because you had nothing to zone. It was just like a man who has nothing to give; therefore, he said he was not looking for anything; but it was something different when he had something to give. Today, Barbados is getting people to come and put up industries; therefore, this Government is now saying that it is opposed to the zoning of industries.

This is where I am not opposed to the idea of Jamaica trying to protect its industries. I think that until you can discuss these things, you have to give each territory the right to preserve what it has. I say that because it is out of what they have that you propose to get something. Now, in Jamaica, that Government has done a lot for the people; and still if you go to Jamaica today and see the poverty there, you can only say that it is still a poor colonial territory.

I am a believer myself in Customs Union. I look upon Federation and Customs Union as axiomatic. If you talk about Federation, you have to talk about Customs Union. I feel that the two are axiomatic and in the process of time you have to talk of Federal Income Tax. I feel it is axiomatic that if you talk of Federation, you also have to talk of a Federal Postal Service. There are certain things which are done in the smaller areas which you cannot talk of doing in the bigger areas. However, I feel that there are Federal services in the West Indies which have to be initi-

ated. I feel the time has come when you cannot think of a postal service of Grenada, a postal service of St. Lucia, a postal service of Montserrat and a postal service of Barbados. You must have a Federal postal service and a Federal Post Office. I feel that revenue from such things as postage stamps should go to the Federal Government. There are certain services which should be taken over by the Federal Government and would be more efficiently done by that Government, so that you will have certain things done on a federal basis. I feel we have a lot to be gained from Federation.

Sir, the Barbados Government has not expressed a view on this matter, and if I may express my views, one of the damaging things which have been done to the new Federation is this anti-American attitude which has been allowed to generate to such a stage as to make certain sections in America feel that the West Indian Governments and West Indians are opposed to the people of the U.S.A. I want to say this. If our progress is to be accelerated at a great pace, I cannot see it accelerated at that pace without the help and assistance of the U.S.A. Despite the sugar which Barbados sells to the British Government, in an individual way, this small place looks to supplementing its income on the invisible income which comes to many Barbadians from friends and relatives in the U.S.A. Many people come here and say that they cannot understand where Barbadians get the money from, but it is a fact that their family in the U.S.A. send them clothes; therefore, at least from that fact, they get their income supplemented on another basis. I, therefore, do not feel that any new nation like the West Indies Federation should make enemies with other nations. Are you at this stage where you should make enemies, or are you at the stage where you should make friends to whom you can call for assistance when the time comes?

I do not know how the members of the Government feel about this, but we are living next door to Latin America and there are markets there open to us when the West Indies start to industrialise. The United Kingdom Government sent one of their Ministers to Caracas recently and the British Overseas Airways Corporation put one of their aeroplanes on service not to Barbados, but to go to Caracas because they realised the potential trade which they were likely to get in Venezuela. They felt that it was of such importance that they must go there. What do you think of that to the West Indies? If Great Britain is seeking trade with Venezuela, should we not explore the possibilities of trade with that country and all such territories in Latin America which are next door to us?

Here in Barbados I understand that the tourist trade owes a lot to the amount of traffic which they get from Venezuela; so, on the basis of trade you can see what we have to gain from dealing with those countries.

I do not propose in my speech on this matter to do anything more than to emphasize some of the obvious points which in my view should be emphasized. One of them is this. I think it should be made crystal clear that the impression should not be given that we are opposed to Jamaica to the extent that it appears that we are going to participate in any movement towards secession; that is to say, if they say that they go out, we say that we are going to carry on Federation ourselves. Of course that may be bluff by them, but it is not good at this stage to give the impression that the major groups of the Federation are not prepared to face sacrifices which have to be faced. What I have said is an analysis of the situation in the smaller territories and it is by no means a statement to make you feel that these smaller territories of the Federation do not have a part to play - and a very vital part - in the Federation and that their representatives should not be in the Government of the Federation holding responsible positions. What I have said is to emphasize the obvious fact that one of the dangers from which we are suffering is insularity, and another is the question of power in that because you are one of the big units, you feel that you are powerful and the smaller fellow has no right to tell you what to do. That is the situation which exists now in the Federal Government 2.55 p.m.

You may ask yourself this question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Why is it that this is a Government motion? It is not like a motion to amend the Trade Union Act for peaceful picketing, but the Ministers do not even want you to speak on it without interruption. I am of the view that the Federal Labour Party, which is the Government of the Federation, should at this stage be forming a policy in their own Party without more or less thinking of what the Federation should be. What do you find? The three powerful units of the Federal Labour Party are propounding different points of view. Jamaica wants to postpone Customs Union on the basis of her local interests. Trinidad is anxious to have Customs Union or no Federation; that is also in her local interest. Barbados is willing to have Customs Union and Freedom of Movement also in her own interest.

What does this all mean? It means that all of them want to form a Federation, but they are saying "Give me a little to pay up." I personally believe in free trade. I believe you can find some other means of taxing people. One of these days you will find that it is more expensive to collect. The expense of carrying out Customs regulations at Airports as compared with what you actually collect will show that it is not really worth the trouble; but that is part of the system of the World. I am not worrying about things that must come. You must have Customs Union.

Although Trinidad is talking about Customs Union, Trinidad is afraid of West Indians now since she is afraid of Freedom of Movement. We want the people of these Islands to be West Indians first. Do you realise that one of the things that has happened in the Federation is that the people of the Federation are afraid of West Indians? The idea of Barbadians and St. Lucians etc., going to Trinidad is worrying Trinidad. You are not talking about Algerians or Moroccans; you are talking about West Indians. Yet you have these boundaries, with Trinidad believing that as soon as you have a Federation Barbadians would come down in large numbers like locusts. Similarly there was a movement in Barbados some years ago to keep the St. Lucians out, as if there was any need to do that. There are so many Barbadians here like sand on the sea shore that the question is how will any one else get in.

Jamaica as such cannot be opposed to Customs Union. What Jamaica is wondering is if it will put her in a position in which Trinidad can rival Jamaica. That is one of the difficulties with Mr. Manley because you have this rival situation. In Jamaica if the economy drops, Sir Alexander Bustamante will want to show that he did more for Jamaica than Eric Williams did for Trinidad.

If the Barbados Delegation is going to this Conference I believe they should be specific on certain basic points. Barbados is not really a powerful industrial area itself and has really never pressed for any particular position in the Federation; and now that we are going to crystallise things at this Conference we should be in a good position because we are more or less neutral. Barbados felt in the past that if she got the Federal Capital she would feel all right. The people of Barbados were given to believe that the Federal Capital was more important than the Federation. Everyone thought that Barbados would turn rich overnight. Now the Federal Capital is not in Barbados, and the people in Trinidad have all the headaches.

I am one who opposed the idea because I felt that for several reasons Barbados was not suitable for the Federal Capital. I felt so not for the reasons that Trinidad has found but for other reasons. I felt that Barbados was not the most suitable place to build the Capital of the West Indian home in view of certain ethnic differences.

I am not as dogmatic as the hon. junior member for Christ Church in making a statement about Federal Income Tax. I feel that, although there is a contradictory statement here in this note that the Premier should explain, because at one stage this note gives the impression, or states in paragraph 4 that this Government considers that the Federal Government should continue to be supported mainly by mandatory levy, and then in extending that, the Premier expressed the view that we still need more money. 3.05 p.m.

What I do not understand is that in paragraph 6 the note states:

"In view of the very limited resources of these islands, this Government does not consider that there should be any great increase in the expenditure of the Federal Government."

The word "great" here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is really a difficult word to define, because I cannot see you beginning in this paragraph to qualify expenditure as the note continues "the interests of the people of the islands can be best served by the Federal Government setting an example of thrift and careful housekeeping". If it is a criticism, let us say now what we at present criticise in the Federal Government. Let us be frank about it. West Indians have a sort of idea that in order to be equal to any other Minister in the world, you must have all the things which the other Ministries which have been existing for so many years under different economies have to make you equal, but you cannot be equal unless you are in that sort of position. There is another bogey idea - and I do not subscribe to under-paying people - that the amount of money which you pay a person is conducive to the dignity and position and ability to meet people. You do not meet people on that basis; that is how you live. You must give a man enough money that he can live without looking to others to make him live or maintain the position which he should be in; that is to say, if a man is a Minister he should be able to draw from the public purse enough to live on without worrying the Banks unless he is going in for a big project, or worrying private people and people having loan tickets for him and feeling that he has an obligation to them because he borrowed money from them. That is the sort of thing you like to relieve public people of; and yet if you give a Minister \$10,000 a year and he wants to live in a House for \$60,000, he would still have to borrow money to pay it off; so it does not matter.

I feel that the Government of Barbados should know what the Federal Government is doing. They may say that you do not like to spend money and that Barbadians are cheap, but we are West Indians now and they are spending Barbadian money; so it is a question that they are spending some of our money even if it is not much. The Ministers in the Federal Government get something like £900 a year as allowances, and if I am wrong, the Premier can correct me, and when I add up some of the money they get, I find that the Ministers in the Federal Government are better off than Nehru in India, a place with 400 million people. It means therefore that when you go and ask people for assistance, they can say "Look what you have!" In this note the Government is not clear as to whether it means that the Federal Government is now spending money too lavishly or what. I do not know what is happening, but I believe I have heard on all sides, even from some of the Federal people who are at present drawing some of these allowances, that it is too much. It is very liberal to begin with. If we feel that it is not necessary, we should stop any more liberality of that nature. When you look at the United Kingdom and its economy, I think a Cabinet Minister gets something like £5,000. You can compare that with the £2,500 which a Minister gets in the West Indies or in Trinidad.

What I would like to say is that the Barbados Government should be able to go to Trinidad and have an appraisal of the work that is being done at present by the Federal Government in relation to what the Federal Government needs. For instance, I am interested in labour and I would really like to know what the Ministry of Labour is doing in the West Indies apart from our reading now and again that the Minister is invited to open a Baby Creche or to go somewhere and tell some person nice things. I want to know what the Ministry is doing on a Federal basis so that we would know what to do.

I agree with the hon. junior member for Christ Church when he asked the Premier if he could state like Dr. Eric Williams, Premier of Trinidad, whether it is his intention that the Federal Government should be strengthened, whether it should have more income, and what are the proposals of the Barbados Government to the Conference, if they feel it should have more money and from where it should come.

In this statement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is what is stated:

"This Government considers that the Federal Government should not continue to be supported mainly by a mandatory levy, but that in its place power should be given to the Federal Government to raise revenue by Federal duties direct on the lines recommended by the Fiscal Commissioner. This would make the Federal Parliament directly responsible to the tax-payers, and more fully aware of their responsibility for controlling expenditure and avoiding waste."

They are responsible to the taxpayers now, because all of the Federal M.Ps are elected by the taxpayers of the Federation. The question of how you get the money is a matter that has been agreed upon, but they are responsible to the taxpayers because they have been elected by the taxpayers of the various territories on adult suffrage basis; so there is no question of being elected by the taxpayers because when they go back to the taxpayers for a renewal of their contract, the taxpayers will have the right to say if they are going to renew it. We would like to hear something specific, and this is where I would like to say to the Premier that the Barbados Government has for many years now on these international matters been treating the House in a cavalier fashion in not discussing any Report at all as a document, but coming down subsequently and telling you about them, like the Customs Union and the Fiscal Commission. There are things which the Civil Service have prepared and sent to the Cabinet in which the Government is enunciating a policy as if they were discussed in the House of Assembly and you had the views of members.

When you see here in the note "on the lines recommended by the Fiscal Commissioner", have you ever discussed the recommendations to know if every recommendation by the Fiscal Commissioner is acceptable to Barbados in every way? There would be variations to these things. You did not discuss these things in Parliament, but you come back and say that these are the proposals you intend to make.

As I said earlier, it is not my business to ask, and I do not think from the way I am constituted physically and mentally that I am the type of person who would ask to go to things where I am not wanted, and that is why I said that the Official Opposition made a very big blunder when they said that in so far as this is concerned the reason for non-participation in the discussion was because no one was taken from the Official Opposition.

3.15 p.m.

It is Government's business as any other because it is for them to say whether they want someone or not. As a member of the House of Assembly, I would want to know more about what the Government feels about the raising of finance for the Federal Government. Dr. Williams said the Federal Government should have a revenue of \$143 million. I do not agree with the Premier of Trinidad that you should jump from \$13 million to \$143 million, but I know that he was dealing with statistics and figures and when you are dealing with statistics and figures, the paper does not refuse anything; you can write anything down. I have not read all that he had to say on the matter; therefore I do not know how he proposes to get the money. Dr. Williams is a young politician but the old ones make fantastic proposals too. All that I gather from what he has written is that Trinidad is now reaching the stage where they would like to play a more positive part in the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the boys in the various groups are tuning up for greater power and, as I see it, no more second eleven boys would be going out to open for the Federal Government; each colony will be sending its opening bats. They are saying, it was all right for the second eleven bats to open when the Federal Government only had \$9 million to spend, but if we have to give \$143 million to be used up, we cannot entrust that to the second eleven bats. As you know, Sir, you do not give small boys a new ball to play with; you give them a composition ball. However, Sir, what I would say for the Premier of Trinidad is that whenever he states anything that should be done, he also states the reasons for doing it that way. He is not afraid to debate his reasons in the matter of finance, no matter how fantastic his figures may seem.

What I notice in this House is that you have an important matter to be discussed, but it is treated very lightly because you have only given notice of it the day before. It is being treated as if it were a Resolution of Sympathy where you ask the Clerk of the House to open some file and he copies the Resolution from that in the file. Years come and years go, you will find the same type of Resolution, not a word is added or taken away. It seems as if the old one was so good that it is no point in your trying to improve on it. An important matter like this is treated in that fashion.

The Hon. Premier had the opportunity to let us know what he thinks on the question of finance of the Federal Government long ago because it is going to be the most important matter to be discussed at the Governmental Conference. Speaking as a Barbadian, and as one who took part in the Federal Elections, if I were elected, this is one of the issues with which I would have to deal if I were a member of the Federal Parliament. On the question of uniformity of income tax, the Hon. Premier was very right when he said that before you embark on a Federal income tax, you want uniformity of taxation. I feel that that is a difficult thing to tackle but it must be tackled first. It is a thing for the experts to handle because there is such a wide disparity at present in the income tax laws of the territories. Owing to the peculiarity of the disparity of income tax between the territories, you cannot say that a man pays so much taxes in Barbados; therefore, he can pay more than what the man in another colony pays. For instance, in St. Lucia there is no land tax. You know that if you go to St. Lucia. A man in St. Lucia has income which in its valuation is taxable in Barbados but it is not taxable in St. Lucia. What is the relative position with that taxable income of that man as compared with the same man in Barbados whose income is taxable? The whole fiscal and financial policies of the territories which exist now would have to be reviewed so as to arrive at a Federal income tax. A man who is living here, if he owns a house, has to pay taxes to the parochial authorities; therefore, the whole question of taxation would have to be surveyed very carefully. You have to bear in mind that this Federation is not like that of the United States of America. This is not a unitary Government and I do not think that I can live long enough to see it being a unitary Government. For instance, they are no buses which can take you from Boscobel in St. Peter to Toco in Trinidad; therefore, you can very well see that if you are living in Barbados, you cannot enjoy any of the facilities in Toco. I feel that before you can have any question of taxation on a federal basis, it is necessary that we all fall into line. As I have said, we are not like the United States of America; therefore, we should begin in a limited way, that is to say, we have to be content with what the Federal Government can reasonably do.

Sir, I am also a believer in a certain amount of gradualness within a certain context. I do not believe in the phrase which has been used by one great Englishman of the "inevitability of gradualness" in every way because I do not feel that we have enough time to wait. With so many other things which we have to do, we have to do the necessary things first. However, I think that the finance of the Federal Government can be stepped up from \$11 million to something more and we can put some more services on that Government to do and I think that it can be stepped up by an examination of the postal services of the unit territories.

As a matter of fact, from Resolutions which have passed this House on the last occasion, I see that we are going to increase the postal rates to all territories within the West Indies and outside of the West Indies. More people are writing to each other because there are more literate people in these parts. I do not know if this increase in postal rates is done as a means of stopping some of this service. I am a believer in self-government to the full, but I do not see you getting self-government if you do not say that you go in for the maximum of Federation.

The new constitutional proposals for this Island have not yet been laid before us, but the Hon. Premier says that we are going to have a greater measure of self-government. If that is so, as I have said already, I do not think that these units of the Federation want all these Governors. One of the

things which the Hon. Premier should say at the Conference is that we have now enough governors in the Ministers themselves. Barbados has got seven Ministers and at that, every Minister is a governor unto himself. How many more Governors do you want? You say that the Governor is going to come here but he cannot tell you what to do. Why bring him? Let us get some of the Ministers' wives to act as Governor. As regards this idea that you are constitutionally bound to have a Governor and all that sort of thing which has been handed down to us all these years ago, we should tell Great Britain that we cannot afford to spend money on this sort of business any longer.

3.25 p.m.

They had a Constitutional Conference in London with respect to the Windward and Leeward Islands. Some of the Ministers in those islands do not have as much to do in a month as I have to do in a week at the Barbados Workers' Union. I do not want to hurt anyone, but I only want to say that the idea is that you must change your Constitution and your outlook because it is done somewhere else; it is done in Australia.

I want to know what you want Governors for if you have become self-governing. I understand that in all these countries where you have self Government and the Governor does not agree with the Ministers, he must go. What is he there for? We expect a new Governor here. If he does not agree with the Premier and his Ministers, he must go. Why bring him in to perpetuate trouble? They have a Constitution which is unwritten. Something will happen. The Attorney General will advise that it has happened in Australia in 1891 and cause a constitutional crisis. A whole break down will then come about. Why bring in all these people to perpetuate trouble? When it comes to the Attorney General and all these officials, if you see that they will create trouble, leave them out. You will have to have a law officer to advise the Government on law. I do not know if they have any spare lawyers, but all of them are not too bright and one may put you in constitutional trouble. I do not believe in this Governor General business either. I do not believe in the preservation of power beyond the people to whom you have given power. I do not know what safeguards you want. We have twenty-three members in here. Must we get someone else to tell us what to do?

I feel that we are too small and too poor to have these constitutional trappings. If there is no work in a place like Barbados where every one has to work for a penny, I do not see how we can afford the luxury of having a Governor who can only approve what the Ministers do. It is time for us to tell the Secretary of State for the Colonies that that is not the sort of money we want to spend. If you want someone for these Birthday parade ceremonies and one to hand things out, put him there. I hear we will soon stop with Chief Secretaries and things like that. You want a Minister of Home Affairs.

If you say you want someone to weigh the scales it will mean that the last time I expressed my views in this matter the Ministers were wrong. We cannot fight on two fronts. I have experienced that the workers in Barbados do not know what is happening about Federation. They will know now, when the Government says we have to pay charges on the hospital, charges on goods, charges on social services which cannot go on if you have to look for another \$600,000 for the Federal Government. So far as the Federation is concerned the whole area will be powerful but Barbados will not become powerful overnight. We will be one of the territories in the Federation where you will find that growth will not be as fast as in Jamaica.

Dominica is a territory that is really in need of the Federation. There are not enough people in Dominica to develop Dominica; so we will gain from it. There is not enough money, however. Take the Barbados budget and drop it in Dominica for one year and you will find that there are not enough people there to do the work which could be done; but they need money and plenty of it and I know money of that magnitude cannot come from these ten territories that form the Federation. I hope that the delegation which goes to this Conference will make itself clear on some of these matters. I say that I am sorry that the members of the Of-

ficial Opposition are not here because it means now that this approval asked for will only be the approval of the Government and its Party, and as a matter of fact the Government and its Party have already discussed this matter outside the House last night.

3.35 p.m.

It is a fact that the Government and its Party discussed this outside the House, I understand, last night; therefore so far as this House is concerned, it is only a little formality - a round-table thing. I can agree with the view expressed in this Resolution by the Premier, but I cannot agree with him to say that if Jamaica decides to secede, Barbados will go at it along with the others. I feel that that is not a view to express because it is nothing that has been proposed. There is no proposal from Jamaica that they intend to secede from the Federation even if they do not get the 65 seats. You cannot go by the newspaper and say that because the newspaper says so, it is the view of Government that it would go along with Federation, and that that is the feeling of Barbados.

There is one true thing, and it is that when a Government is in power it can always say it speaks for the people of Barbados, even if the next day the people push the Government out. I say that because there is a temptation to say you are in power and on every single issue which arises you have a mandate from the people. There is no mandate here; it is a matter of our views. Do you feel that you can go at Federation without Jamaica? I do not feel so and do not begin to encourage the thought. We cannot go at it without Jamaica; we are hard-pressed already without British Guiana. Do not let us get the feeling of insularity. I feel that we have to bring them in on a commonsense basis.

If you leave Barbados, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and go outside the West Indies, you will realise that today in the world individual territories like Barbados, no matter what contribution Barbados makes to the world, mean nothing. We have passed the stage of wondering if we are going to have a Federation. We have one and we are going to make it work. There are members of the Federal Labour Party who know that they are going to have a discussion and they had better work these things out and tell the people in Jamaica and Trinidad that they are naive and want power. Barbados has the idea that it has given the Federation a Prime Minister; so it does not want industries. Barbados is not fighting for anything in the Federation; we have the Prime Minister and another Barbadian who is President of the Senate, so what more do we want? We have been given the top posts; so we do not want industries! A Federation constructed on that basis is bound to give the feeling that Jamaica and Trinidad are the dominant people. As soon as you start that kind of talk, look like going home; and if money is being paid out, you can ask any member here if he would pay money to something unless others were paying too. Do you think the Government would allow the Democratic Labour Party to run the Government if it did not subscribe? The big territories felt that way in the original set-up, but the feeling is understandable. You would have no Federation if Barbados and Trinidad said they were going to walk out of the Federation; it is not a Federation of 48 States; it is a Federation of 10 small Units, and you have to face the fact that if Jamaica walks out you do not have a Federation.

I would say: let us go easy on this idea that there has been a sort of campaign in Barbados against Jamaica. They want these things to feel big. You must expect that an island of 1 1/2 million people must feel big in a Federation of 3 million people. I heard the hon. senior member for St. Michael talk about representation in St. Michael and asked us to look at the size of St. Michael as compared with the others. All of us do that; and I say if the Premier thinks that if Jamaica comes out of the Federation he can have a Federation with Trinidad and the others, he will see what it is. Barbados should be clear enough in its mind to see that in this whole question of Federation it is a matter of power politics and where power lies. You will remember that when they went to Jamaica to settle the vital question of the Capital, the Federal Labour Party was going to be in power and you will remember that when the question of where the Capital would be came up, they had the greatest shock in that when the votes were counted

some of their friends did not vote for them and Barbados had a solitary five votes. That shows that on this question of Federation you must think on a Federal basis. It is all right when it comes to Unit Governments where we join together on a common basis; but when it comes to territorial interests, Barbadians think in terms of Barbados, Trinidadians think in terms of Trinidad and the same goes for Jamaica and the other islands. That is understandable at this stage because we are still dependent on the local units.

I believe that everybody would say, and I say it too, that we should be glad that Mr. Manley won the elections in Jamaica; if the reverse had been the situation and Mr. Bustamante had won with that large majority, you would have to wonder what would happen to the Federation; so do not be worried, because the success of the Federation and how long it lasts is dependent on Mr. Manley. If Mr. Bustamante had won, the difficulties would be greater.

I hope that this question of Jamaica will not loom too high. I am not a party to that so far as the Resolution is concerned, but I take it that Government did not necessarily want to have anybody voting on their Resolution because they have the numbers to vote for it, though I would like to know some of the views of those persons who had to put this matter before the Legislature.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel it is important and essential that there should be as great a variety of contributions in this Chamber on this Resolution as possible, chiefly because it is not only our own internal problems that we are thinking about here when we discuss this Resolution, but we are very much concerned with what will happen to us as a result of this coming Conference, not only from our own internal point of view, but in our relationship with all our neighbours.

3.45 p.m.

Therefore, I want to subscribe to the view and, as a matter of fact, I certainly welcome the contributions which have been so far made and at the same time I deplore and deprecate that the Official Opposition have taken the stand which they have taken. It is quite obvious to any keen observer that they like to appear as political martyrs when, indeed, they are digging their own political graves themselves.

It is, I think, important to be able to gauge what the attitude of the Barbados delegation is going to be at the Governmental Conference. I say attitude, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even as distinct from what is their particular policy or the actual text of the Resolution which they have presented to us because not only the detailed presentations of the Resolution have some importance but the attitude in which the Resolution is presented is as important as the particular text of it is. I think it is correct to say that we from the territory of Barbados should expect a delegation to be going there with a competent and constructive attitude because when we recall the history of Federation, so far, we can feel pretty much assured even though in the beginning when it was the feeling of everyone trying to see how much he could get for himself, I believe that everybody has become most conscious of the idea that if Federation is to continue it must be with the idea of how much you can give and contribute to it rather than how much you can get from it within the first few years.

I would like to feel that the Barbados delegation goes there with the feeling that they are already contributing a lot to the Federation with the kind of leadership they are contributing and with what service they are able to render if and when called upon. Therefore, they are not going with the idea of how much we can pull out of Federation. As the Hon. Premier has said, we are interested in strengthening rather than weakening Federation. I would like to feel that our delegation does not even sanction other delegations going into any cheap bargaining. I use the phrase "cheap bargaining" because there can be bargaining of a particular form in which you can say that is reasonable bargaining, but there is another kind of bargaining which can be regarded as cheap bargaining. I understand that cheap bargaining went on in the sifting of the capital of the Federation. I really would not like to see any cheap bargaining.

There are the Exclusive and the Concurrent Lists of Federation; but do not let us fool ourselves that the Federal Government is directed or that you can take away one item from one list and put it to another list. Rather, let us make sure that it would not be any weaker. Do not let us take off a little bit here and find ourselves adding on a little more somewhere else.

It is refreshing and quite heartening to know that the Government of Barbados considered that they would keep pressing for the freedom of movement of people and goods in the form of Customs Union. I take it that these things are always regarded as proper requisites of Federation and I do not think that there is any question as to whether these should be accepted; but I think it is a question as to how they should be brought about. Indeed with the attitude of this delegation to other delegations, chiefly in Jamaica, Customs Union and freedom of movement should be carefully examined. The attitude of Jamaica is that Customs Union should not be brought about for a long time. I believe that going as far as that would be to destroy the very ideal of Federation. I think we should have it expressed as many times as possible that our interest in freedom of movement is a requisite of Federation and it does not mean that a whole bulk of us would be getting on the next boat and going to another territory; the idea that it is established would give us a feeling of belongingness and of West Indianism. It is that feeling which people who belong to some national status feel when they visit the outside world. When we develop with that feeling in which we can say that we belong to a representative nation, our status, not only political status but for that matter our social and economical status as such, is improved and bettered.

The same thing takes examination when we think in terms of Customs Union. Just as freedom of movement gives us that feeling of belongingness when we know that under the Constitution there is complete freedom of movement, so too, there must be that complete feeling of oneness with the establishment of Customs Union even if there are financial and fiscal problems attendant on it. I think we must be understanding to the attitude of some of the other places in respect of Customs Union and freedom of movement. In Jamaica, their attitude towards Customs Union is that even though they know that they have it already written in the Constitution that they consider it a requisite of Federation, they are saying now that they cannot accept it as a prerequisite of Federation. However, we should not let Jamaica or any other place for that matter feel that we want Federation without Customs Union.

I wonder, Sir, if it might not be a good thing to suggest that some deadline date be set for the establishment of Customs Union. I know some of the leaders in Trinidad think a deadline date should be set for the attainment of dominion status. It has been argued in Trinidad, for instance, that when we set deadline dates for those things which we want to achieve, we tend to surmount the transitional difficulties, because we know that we are definitely aiming at these things. There might be some good argument in that. We do not want to feel that our delegation will want to enter into anything, especially dominion status, precipitately. However, I think some consideration should be given to the setting of a deadline date to institute Customs Union and also dominion status. I know from the point of view of dominion status that our former leader, the Prime Minister of the Federation, was always against the idea of the setting of a deadline date because he argued that we may be ready to achieve it before that time. I think that may have been his attitude because of our Constitution in Barbados.

Sir, I am certain that it will be well worthwhile also to have regard to the other form of suggestion that if you do set a date in which you want to achieve something, you will find yourself getting over your transitional period more resolutely and not wasting your time.

3.55 p.m.

One of the very vexed questions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this question of taxation and federal finance; and I am quite certain that some one at sometime has to say it. I do not know how often it has been said before but I intend to say it now. We cannot fool ourselves or attempt to fool other

people by keeping quiet on the matter. It must be boldly stated and understood that Federation will cost us more money if it is to be properly run. Any kind of development before it begins to pay dividends must cost you something more. The same thing will be true of Federation. Ministerial Government in the various islands is costing us more, even if it has started to produce better results than the old colonial system; but the fact remains that it has demanded more of people; and the people who have worked to see Federation and the development of a strong federal structure must face up to, and not try to shelve the issue that it is going to cost you more.

However, Sir, in costing us more we must be sure that it is also producing better services and raising the living standards of the people of the West Indies. I think it is true to say that in the initial stages even the Local Government system that we have initiated will cost us more; but if you intend to operate a better service for the people concerned, that is what you must aim at even if you find in the initial stages that the cost is more.

I like to have the idea of Federation and the advance of dominion status linked with the analogy of adolescence and maturity. When some one is in his late teens he feels that he will soon be leaving school and getting away from the shackles of his parents. As you assume maturity and all its headaches you cannot wonder if your parents will keep feeding and clothing you. The same thing is true of the Federation. Everyone feels that we can advance to dominion status and become a strong unit. But we must face the fact that in going to this goal we will meet the difficulties and growing-up pains that we are meeting just now.

However, Sir, we find that we are required to grow up faster than people were allowed to grow up in former days. It just must happen because of the pressure of the 20th century and you must be sure that we reach adulthood quickly so that you can raise the living standard and become an evolved economic unit. As it stands now you will only regard the Federal Government as being in an advisory capacity to unit governments. They have had to collect information; but even the services they would like to offer now in an advisory capacity they cannot, because it would cost them more money than they have now to use. There is a stage where we might find that we have to pay more money to let the Federal Government operate and we might find that it is not as strong as in the early stages.

At a certain point in the development of the federal constitution I think you may find that we have a Federal Government which is less strong in its legislative powers than the unit Governments themselves. The Premier of Barbados is Premier in his own right. It is not so with the Prime Minister of the West Indies. I am not talking about the privilege involved. It is good that we have a strong personality as Prime Minister of the Federation so that people in the outside world can hold us in the highest regard. What I am speaking about is actual legislative status and in that connection the Federal Prime Minister is not as strong as the Premier of Barbados, Trinidad or Jamaica. It is an anomaly; but we must remember, to use the words of a friend of mine who likes to debate the subject, that we must always think of the Federation as a centrifugal rather than a centripetal force.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we agree that even in its present stage the Federal Government is going to cost us more, we have also to expect that they must find some means of getting this money, and that is where the question of taxation looms very clearly before us.

I have heard it discussed in certain quarters that it might be that we may reach a kind of compromise where instead of an additional income tax added to our own regular income tax in individual Units, you might be asking some of the Unit territories to let you have some of their own income tax, proportionately speaking, to help develop the services. That has been mentioned; but the question always is that you have to decide how much services you expect and demand from your Federal Government; and if you know how much services you

do expect in an allotted time, you have to be sure that they have the prerequisite amount of money to carry out these services. We, therefore, either have to face the fact that if we want to get away from mandatory levy, there is going to be additional federal tax in addition to income tax, or there must be some agreement that Unit Governments reduce some of their own services, so that if they do not want to tax individual inhabitants any more, they would find themselves reducing their own services, passing them to the Federal Government and allowing the Federal Government to use part of what the Unit Governments used to use as income tax to develop these services.

I think that is where the Trinidad proposals merit worthy consideration. I have not had the privilege of reading the latest Trinidad publications, but I did hear some thing read out last night in a discussion in which I took part, and I think that again depends on how much and how far we agree on how much services we expect the Federal Government to carry in how short a time. For instance, I know the Trinidad proposals will include things like Postal services and Customs Union which we would say are good things to have and they had better have soon, but they also include things like asking the Federal Government to take over Education and fishing limits in territorial waters. I can quite easily see the Trinidad situation there. Trinidad has an educational problem now that they cannot at the moment see their way out of; so it would be a lot easier with the educational obligations in Trinidad to say: "Let us turn a lot of these headaches over to the Federal Government and get the benefit of the whole thing." I can understand that they would be glad to give them up.

Our educational situation in Barbados, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has been that we do not have the money as such yet to develop our educational programme. I do not think it would be right to say that the Minister of Education in Trinidad does not have a fairly clear picture of what he would like to do, but as it stands in Trinidad right now the Minister of Education in Trinidad is not quite sure at the moment where he would like to go and where he is actually going on with the educational policies of Trinidad, because of the various denominationalities that obtain in Trinidad education and it is a headache which they would not mind turning over to the Federal Government. We have to be wary whether we can accept such headaches so early; and of course it amuses me when the Trinidad Government talks about fishing limits in territorial waters because they are conscious that they are not capable of facing the problems they are having with Venezuela and can say to the Federal Government "Take over these headaches we have as well." It is understandable that if they give you proposals for a strong Federal Government and a large Federal budget, it must be considered, and I will repeat this again because I think it appears right: "How many services would the Federal Government be able and interested and willing to take on in a prescribed time?" That is one of the things which the Unit Governments and the delegations would have to consider very carefully. Are you prepared to give up some of these services to the Federal Government? I know that the Windwards and Leewards look to the Federal Government to take over some of their activities because they are poor and poverty-stricken in many ways, and would be glad to say to somebody: "Run our economics for us". As a Federal Government you cannot say you will run all the social services for Dominica but only part for Barbados. As a Federal Government you have to be careful if you say that you are taking over a certain branch of social services; it is to be on a Federal basis and you must be careful how much you take on with the amount of money we have.

Sir, I am loth to raise the question I am going to come to now, and I do not think the Barbados delegation from the Resolution I see here before us intend to raise it, but we are not going to be able to avoid discussion in the next few days on the Federal capital site. Even though the Barbados delegation will not be raising it, and even though perhaps they might want to keep an open mind and say they are neutral, they must in their

own minds have a very considered opinion as to what they think in any debate that takes place on the Federal capital site, because I already know that there have been wranglings in the Federal Labour Party - and perhaps as high as the Federal Cabinet - whether in the House of Representatives it was not expected that this question would have been raised, and the Federal Labour Party discussed it to the point of saying that this question is not going to be raised; and yet a member of the Federal Labour Party felt so strongly on it that he decided that he was still going to raise the issue of the Federal Capital site on the floor of the Federal House of Representatives; so if raised there, there is no avoiding it in the coming Conference.

The W. I. F. L. P. might try to salve the cankers, if you might regard them as such, and try to settle the issue, but it is going to be raised at the W. I. F. L. P. Conference. I think it is right that our West Indian brothers should know that it is not so much a political problem as perhaps a sociological problem.

I understand that the Federal Civil Servants themselves do not feel quite at ease working in Trinidad, and it has been said - and there is that relationship with the Trinidad Civil Service - that it is not on the best footing at the moment. Of course, you must get these differences of opinion and rubbing against each other, little disagreements and so forth, but they do not get any better if you refuse to discuss them. As a matter of fact, you must have a clear understanding of what is and how we can get over it. My personal reckoning, Sir, is that a mistake was made in putting the Federal Capital in Trinidad in the same way as I feel it would be a mistake to put the Federal Capital of the United States in the city of Chicago. Chicago is one of the leading industrial cities in every respect, and for that matter, because it is the leading industrial city, finds itself with a lot of underworld practices, and the same thing is true of Trinidad. This cannot be helped; whenever you get a leading industrial city with a population so mixed, you are going to get all types more pronounced in it - the very rich, the very poor, the very good and the very bad, and very often it is the bad that hits the headlines more than the good. I think, therefore, that having the Federal Capital in Trinidad is like having the capital of the United States in Chicago, and even though our delegation does not have it in their Resolution that they intend to raise it and intend to be neutral if it is raised, I charge that they should have a strong considered opinion on it, because sometimes in a vital issue neutrality is more dangerous than taking some particular stand; you cannot be ever neutral on matters which appear to be of vital importance.

I think the question is one of the last we need to touch and the Premier referred to it as a vexed question. Perhaps it is a vexed question, but I honestly do not think it really presents an insuperable problem, and I do not think it really presents a problem nearly as difficult as, say, the problem of Federal finance or the problem of Customs Union or freedom of movement. It is not really an insuperable problem even though it might be presented as such, and all that we must understand if the Jamaica delegation is coming with that attitude. You might say it may be conditioned because of certain conditions at home just as when we go to a Conference representing Barbados at times. I do not think in this case that we are in the position of having to consider a particular election coming up in Barbados or just having passed an election and have to remember election promises to the same extent that the Jamaica delegation will be in; so we must try to understand their situation; I really do not think it presents an insuperable problem at all. It must be of course understood that salaries and allowances to the Federal M. Ps right now do take a large part of the Federal Budget, and we have to wonder whether we can really afford to have excessive overhead expenditure and not have the requisite services for it.

I myself feel that the Federal Prime Minister may have been slightly embarrassed when he had to go to the

Canadian Mission soon after the Federal House might have passed these high and sudden raises in Federal salaries and allowances for Federal M. Ps. I would feel embarrassed. 4.15 p.m.

I understand that the argument, chiefly from the Jamaican members of the Federal Parliament is that they find themselves out of pocket when they leave Jamaica and come to the Federal Parliament; therefore, they have strong arguments in saying that they should be paid this, and that they should have subsistence allowance, even though others find it difficult to comprehend. They do say that they find themselves very often out of pocket and worse than if they were representatives in the Jamaica House of Representatives. You therefore cannot say that you are going to pay a particular salary to representatives of one island and another salary to another representative of another island. If the Jamaican members of the Federal Parliament can put their argument so strongly that it can be accepted, the salary of Federal M. Ps must be raised for all alike. Again, such already are the expenses by way of salary and allowances of the Federal Parliament that we need not say that we have to be very careful when we talk about increases of the Ministries in the Federal Parliament because at the moment we cannot get money to do what we want by way of services of the Federal Government. We might say that we should pay a little more taxation and at the same time increase representation in the Federal House, but you will find that all the increased taxation will do is to pay for increased representation. We must be very careful before any answer is given to this suggestion; there must not be any preconceived answers given; you must consider all the obligations and conditions under which you would have to give these additional allowances even under the former representation.

I understand that the Hon. Premier has said that there would be a proposal by the Barbados delegation on this matter of unit representation and I gather from the way it was presented in the House that it was not his inclination to make that disclosure at the moment. We should go with the proposal that considerations on the matter should not reach a stage that any of the smaller units are divested of the minimum which they now have. As a matter of fact, I would be inclined to press that Montserrat as small as it is should not be in that position of having an elected representative only and an alternative representative in case it is impossible for the elected representative to attend Parliament. I think that is a strange position to be in and I would be in favour even though it would cost \$500 a month more that Montserrat should have two representatives sitting in Federal Parliament rather than electing one representative and then having an alternative representative in that position. It certainly does not appear to me to be as efficient a system as if there were two representatives. Let us be sure, whatever the proposals are, whatever the agreement, that no unit is divested of any of its representation which it now has. I would go as far as to say, in my personal opinion, that Montserrat should have two representatives and it would not cause the Ministers to have any grey hairs because of that.

If you talk of proportionate representation according to population, you will find that St. Kitts will be reduced to one representative. Let us be careful, whatever proposals we make, to see that there must be the minimum representation of two representatives for each unit territory. You can have twenty-two for another island but no unit territory should have less than two representatives.

Therefore, I am given to feel in summarising that our delegation will go with quite a degree of confidence - that confidence which I remember the late Mr. T. Albert Marryshow used to speak with on the outcome of Federation of the West Indies. I heard him say in Harrison College Hall in 1940 that each of the unit territories should say: "Let us go into Federation seeing what we can give rather than what we can get out of it." He was termed "The Grand Old Man of Federation" and I think his words would do us well if we heed them. Let us see what we can contribute to the cause. We certainly want dominion

status. We know we want that; therefore, do not let us go into Federation saying "Let us get this sort of thing now and forget what we are aiming at." We know perfectly well that we cannot benefit as our children would out of Federation. Let us do a good job at the Conference now and so prepare a better future for the generations to come. If we adopt the attitude that we are going to contribute as much as we can because we believe in Federation, we would be adopting the right attitude.

I think the people in the West Indies have developed a sort of federal consciousness and a little more than what they had eighteen months ago. Sometime ago, I heard in this House the Leader of the Barbados National Party criticise a statement of Sir Grantley Adams when he talked about technical possibility of retroactive taxation. That speech was described as the dropping of a bomb in a school of fish. I will say that it galvanised the Jamaicans into thinking of what Federation means. When you make an individual territory feel that you do something to make him feel the pinch of the shoe, it makes him start to think about it. I feel that statement has done a lot to galvanise a lot of feeling towards Federation, even as far as Jamaica. We must look for development of the Federal spirit. Some islands have it more than others. We in Barbados are not as strongly nationalistic as those in Jamaica. I believe this individualism of ours would be able to contribute much to the spirit of Federation if we decide that we do not term ourselves Barbadian nationalists as such but in our individual capacity we become possessed with the feeling that we become West Indian nationalists.

4.25 p.m.

With these remarks I would like to offer my very best wishes to our delegation in whatever contribution they may make. I feel pretty certain that the hon. senior member for St. Peter, when he referred to the statement of the Premier as regards the attitude to be adopted if Jamaica said she would secede, somewhat overstated his remarks. I believe I heard the Premier say that someone posed the question and asked what would his reaction be. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, that question is not before us, but the answer given to the question by our Premier was his personal reaction. He said that if Jamaica said she would leave, let her go ahead and leave. I do not think he was carrying that as one of our bargaining weapons because that would be a sorry state of affairs. We are glad to know that Jamaica did not actually say it, even though in the Jamaica elections statements like that were banded about. We know that Mr. Manley whether he likes to be a big noise or not believes in Federation as we do. I am certain that if we can carry our belief in Federation in some concrete proposals, in the correct attitude or atmosphere, this conference will be speaking soon of West Indian Dominion Status.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: There are just one or two points which I want to clear up. I am sorry that the hon. junior member for Christ Church is not here. I think he began by saying words to the effect that he was disappointed with this meeting because he thought that we had come here to discuss the Croft and other Reports. The Croft Report was laid in this House some time last year. I am not quite sure of the date, but I think the Report itself came out some time in October and it must have been laid very soon after that. Hon. members should know that after any Report is laid here, any member has the right to move on any date that he will discuss that particular item, whether it is a Report, a statement or whatever else it may be. If he is trying to criticise Government on that, he himself is subject to criticism.

Quite a lot of fuss has been made over some reference of mine about personal opinion. What I did say was nothing in connection with the request of Jamaica relative to increased representation. What I did say was that on Tuesday I had met a gentleman from another island who was then in Barbados and we discussed this conference. He himself will be a delegate and the subject came up as to the attitude

of Barbados in case Jamaica showed a willingness to secede. I also said that last night at a certain meeting the same point was raised. It was my personal feeling then and now that if Jamaica wanted to secede the rest of us would go ahead and make Federation a success. That was my own personal feeling. It was not a Cabinet decision.

This particular Resolution was laid on Tuesday. The Cabinet had already met and made the decisions they wanted to make. I did say that it was my personal feeling, and I hope that that will clear up any misunderstanding over the point.

Relative to the question of increased representation I did say that if it came to a question of compromise, in order to pour oil on troubled waters Barbados had a formula which would give Jamaica a certain amount of increased representation. I did not disclose that formula then for obvious reasons. I did say that that formula would give Jamaica about three seats less than the number she is asking for now, but I did not disclose the formula. If it would cause hon. members to have some quietness of mind, the formula that we are going to use is one based on Canadian increased representation. Further than that I will not go now.

We are going to this conference and if this point of increased representation is discussed and we know the attitude of the other territories, if it comes to a show down where the whole conference will be lost because of stubbornness and because of the lack of a compromising spirit, at the last moment we will advance our formula.

So, Sir, when it comes to the question of personal feeling it was only in one instance that I mentioned that, and that point was raised in discussion with me after the Resolution had been laid.

4.35 p.m.

The hon. junior member for Christ Church did make the point that we should see that a date is fixed for the implementation of Customs Union and internal free trade. There has to be a certain definite date fixed. If we reach agreement, then the agreement must come into effect from such and such a day. We are not going to leave it in mid-air.

There is only one other point that I might touch on, and that is the point raised by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph relative to the Federal Capital. We want it to be clearly understood that we are going there and if that subject is raised, we are taking absolutely no part in it. We do not think that we should, and if it is so raised and it came to a question of voting, we shall abstain from voting. That is our stand on that particular point, and I think the majority of Barbadians will be well satisfied to know that their delegates are not taking part in this question of the siting of the Capital. I know that the general feeling in Barbados at the moment is that we do not want it, and I think you yourself know it, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have been hearing it from all sides and that is also the feeling of the delegation. I think, Sir, that that was the most important point raised.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th October, 1959, at 12 noon.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to second that.

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

4.40 p.m.