THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1962

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13th August, 1963.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., *(Speaker);* Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Mr. S. E. SEALEY; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, *(Minister of Communications, Works and Housing;* Mr. W. R. COWARD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, *(Chairman of Committees);* Mr. N. W. BOXILL and Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD

Prayers were read.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been asked by our worthy and learned Chaplain to explain that he was not notified of this meeting until he heard of it a few minutes ago, and as a result, he is not, as he would normally be, attired in his appropriate ecclesiastical robes. On behalf of hon. members, I have excepted his explanation.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of this House of Friday, 9th August, I am instructed, have been circulated, and unless there is any objection, those Minutes will be deemed to have been confirmed.

Hearing no objection, those Minutes are now confirmed.

RESOLUTION *re* EAST CARIBBEAN FEDERATION CONFERENCE

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Education, and it was intimated, on Friday when this House last met, by the Hon. Leader of the House, the hon. senior member for St. Philip, that today our business would be confined to the debate on the Resolution to support the proposals contained in the statement made by the Hon. Premier in the Honourable House on the 11th June, 1963 on the character of the proposed Federation of the seven British Caribbean territories, and particularly to approve, commend and endorse the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government.

It would be recalled that by permission of the Chair this debate has been broadcast over Rediffusion, and as I have already reminded hon. members, the Hon. Leader of the House intimated that that would be the only business with which the Government propose to deal today. Instantly Rediffusion operator is not present. I am instructed he was here this morning when he arranged the apparatus; so I am wondering if the Hon. Leader of the House would move that the Standing Orders be suspended at this stage, and invite an adjournment while communication is sent to Rediffusion that their operator is not here, and that the meeting is at 12 noon and not 2 o'clock, as he might think.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I propose to ask leave of the House to move the suspension of Standing Orders. I should hate to adjourn for that reason, as it would be rather unorthodox; but I want to ask leave to suspend the Standing Orders.

12.25

ORDERS NOS. 5, 14, 16 and 18 SUSPENDED

Mr. SPEAKER: I have just understood that Rediffusion has just phoned to enquire when the House was meeting, but I am also advised that the Clerk duly informed the Government Information Office when the House was meeting and it is presumed that he would have relayed the information to the Barbados Rediffusion. It would appear as if that was not done.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg first to ask leave to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, and 18 for the remainder of today's sitting.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, and 18 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

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

HOUSE SUSPENDED FOR FIFTEEN MINUTES

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly how soon the operator of Rediffusion will be here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Hon. Leader of the House would move that this Sitting would now be suspended for ten minutes.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: It is rather difficult to specify the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would not take longer than that for the operator to travel from Rediffusion to here.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I would rather not specify the time: otherwise we may come back here and have to move another motion for the suspension of the sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: But if no time is specified, the Speaker may go somewhere and stay beyond the specified time.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Not a Speaker like yourself.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I suggest that we suspend the sitting for fifteen minutes and the House rely on my timepiece?

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I think this is establishing a rather dangerous precedent that the deliberations of this House should await the arrival of a Rediffusion technician. Perhaps, in future, we may have to await the return of some junior Reporter of one of the weekly newspapers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the speech of the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown has been relayed over Barbados Rediffusion already on this matter, and the public had the opportunity of listening to it. Other hon. members who have not had that opportunity yet would like theirs to be relayed also.

Mr. LYNCH: I have implicit faith that the hon. member who is to speak now can speak at length and say nothing until the time that the operator of Rediffusion has arrived.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what point has the hon. member risen?

Mr. LYNCH: On a point of elucidation.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, before I make this motion, may I say it is with no degree of levity or irresponsibility that I make this motion. I said just now that it was rather unorthodox, but since it was permitted to hon. members to have their speeches on this matter broadcast and since quite a number of hon. members have already had this privilege, it would be unfair to allow other hon. members to speak without the opportunity of speaking over the microphones of Rediffusion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have just understood Rediffusion to telephone and say that they understood the sitting would start at 2.00 p.m. but they have made arrangements that ten minutes from now someone would come. I may say that the constituents of the City of Bridgetown are at no disadvantage when their representatives' speeches are not broadcast because when they are passing they cannot help hearing the proceedings of this House, even if they do not come within the portals of this Chamber.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Sir, in effect, the Government Information Officer cannot be responsible for this misinformation sent to Rediffusion. I understand that the Government Information Officer is sick; therefore, some junior in the office may have been responsible for the error.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought I said that the "office" as distinct from the "Officer".

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for fifteen minutes.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to say one word?

Mr. SPEAKER: Only one word?

Mr. SMITH: Oh yes, more than one word, but I will not be long. Rather than suspend the sitting at this time so that we all would just remain sitting around the Table, can we move on to Private Members' Business and do something within that time?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House gave his word that no other business would be done and no hon. member came prepared to do any other business than this. That is why it would be inappropriate, and it would appear as if the Hon. Leader of the House was backing down from his word if he agrees now to other business being done.

I will put his motion now.

The question that the Sitting of this House be now suspended for fifteen minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Sitting was accordingly suspended, 12.35 p.m.

On Re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being fifteen minutes since I declared the sitting of this House suspended, perhaps the Hon. Leader of the House will intimate if it is his desire that the debate on Federation be continued.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: That is the intimation which I will give.

Mr. BATSON: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution, which is purporting to support the proposals contained in the Statement made by the Hon. Premier in this Honourable House on the 11th June, 1963, has had much discussion, and many hon. members have, no doubt, taken advantage of the opportunity presented to them to speak at length and to express their feelings in connection with this Resolution. Speaking at this point, it is a rather difficult situation in that most of the important points have already been expressed by hon. members, and one at this time would find himself in much difficulty in trying to put over his case; but I would utilise a few moments in order to make a contribution to this debate in some sort of fashion. Federation, as all of us know it, is very important for these islands which have signified their intention to federate. Most of these islands in the Eastern Caribbean are unable to pool their resources independently, and therefore it is necessary for them to pursue some method of Federation in order to bring about a much more stable situation for themselves; so it is that Barbados will not be acting unwisely if we should adopt a similar course.

We, in Barbados, are unable to go it alone. The reason for that is that we have only one economy on which to depend, and therefore we will have in a large measure to respect the other islands and to go along with them. Some people will say that to enter in a Federation with some of these islands which are not self-supporting would be a gamble; but when one seriously entertains the idea of Federation, he should not seriously consider such a thing. The two larger West Indian islands, namely, Trinidad and Jamaica, have already participated in Federation, and they no doubt must have found it very difficult for them to bear some of the burden which, no doubt, was imposed on them, and so they decided to withdraw from the Federation. A similar situation now confronts this island in that we are the foremost of the seven territories, and many people are very pessimistic in connection with whether this island of Barbados should enter a Federation with these colonies which are unable to support themselves; but I feel that this Government would be acting wisely if they decided to approach Federation. It is true that the British Government has not as yet seriously expressed their willingness to support financially the Federation, and that is in a large measure due to the fact that they will no doubt like the islands to go all out on their own, which is, in my opinion, impracticable. The average individual does not seem to be so concerned about paying increased taxes. We hear many people denouncing the Government when certain taxation is imposed, and therefore one has to be very careful when entering upon such an important sphere. Now, we in Barbados have decided that we will not be entering any Federation without independence at the outset. If I may quote from the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party, this is what is set out in that Document:

"The road to destiny is the road to independence.

Towards this goal the country must press on."

As the island has never been a grant-aided territory, there is no reason why within or without a Federation Barbados should not attain the full stature of *independence now* within the British Commonwealth."

One will therefore realise at the outset that the Barbados Democratic Labour Party decided, before they took over the reins of Government, that they were interested in Federation but in a Federation with independence at the outset. Some of the leaders of the other territories are not much interested in independence at the outset. In my

opinion, they have not yet become sufficiently developed; their thinking seems to be short-sighted, and they tend to pursue the same role as some of the politicians whom we have in this island when they go on public platforms and are always reminding the people of 1937. On the other hand, we of the Democratic Labour Party, are going to think on a higher level and we feel that Federation without independence at the outset will not bring about the situation at which we are aiming. That is a very important point. I remember that one of the speakers who spoke on this Resolution previously.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to other hon. members?

Mr. BATSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I remember that one hon. member in addressing the Chamber on this Resolution, made a statement to the effect that all was not well at "Sherbourne", but that hon. member, in my opinion, was just gesticulating. I am of the opinion that that hon. member might have read certain parts of the Report in the Press and therefore he no doubt might have been capitalising on the information available.
1.00 p.m.

I believe, however, that the leaders of these islands are willing to federate. They are interested in Federation, and undoubtedly they must have become convinced that they by themselves are merely existing, and in this Twentieth Century people who are ambitious must not think in terms of a Federation without independence; and although it was surprising to see that it was not unanimously expressed that they are willing to federate with independence at the outset, I still feel that after the period has transpired, they no doubt would be willing to abide with the conclusions arrived at by the Barbados delegation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Fiscal Commissioner published a Report, and in her findings much data have been compiled, and you will notice in the first chapter, the first sentence states "the story of Federation in the Caribbean makes sad reading." I feel that that first sentence expressed in this Report was not only an issue to dampen the enthusiasm of all individuals who are interested in the Federation, but it would also tend, in my opinion, to make one think twice before seriously arriving at a decision as to the pros and cons of a Federation. It was also very heartening to see.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member refresh the memories of hon. members as to that first sentence by reading it for us?

Mr. BATSON: Yes, Sir. The first sentence of chapter 1 states "the story of Federation in the Caribbean makes sad reading". The sad reading, I believe, was attributed to the last Federation which found itself unable truly to federate and truly to interpret the wishes and aspirations of its people, and that is why in large measure we found that it could only have survived for a short period. I feel that the leaders of this present proposed Federation will learn much from the last Federation, in that unity must be the dominant factor at the outset, and if there is no unity within at the outset, then the future of such a Federation will be perilous. That first sentence is therefore very applicable at the outset in discussing such an important matter as Federation.

It was also very interesting to see that these leaders of the proposed Federation have decided on freedom of movement, a matter on which the previous Federation found it impossible to come to any common agreement; and many individuals entertained much pleasure in the fact that the leaders of this proposed Federation were able at the outset to dispose of that matter of freedom of movement very easily.

To quote from the Fiscal Commissioner on page 8, we find "Freedom of movement of goods between the Units was never established during the lifetime of the West Indies Federation. Similarly freedom of movement of persons was never conceded, so that the pressing population problems of some islands could not be dealt with by any unified policy. Freedom of movement for persons has been guaranteed for the proposed Federation, and with the Jamaica obstacle out of the way, it should not now be difficult to achieve freedom of movement of goods, that is, customs union, at an early stage. These two changes will remove some of the biggest difficulties in the way of achieving integrated development." So you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the leaders of the proposed Federation seem more capable of tackling such an important matter as freedom of movement which the other leaders of the now defunct Federation found difficult to agree with. That is something very commendable.

On page 9, Sir, we find "Initially most of the Currency Board profits are likely to be swallowed up in the expenses of launching the new Board made necessary by the withdrawal of Trinidad and British Guiana. As will appear, a substantial share of import duties will in fact have to be returned to the Units to enable them to balance their budgets. This time it is the Federal and not the Unit government which decides how much revenue it will keep for common purposes."

On page 10 the Report states "In all these ways the new Federation should start off from a firmer foundation than the old. There is less difference in income between one Unit and the other. The physical distances to be covered are much smaller. Federation cannot be expected to work wonders on such a slender foundation, but it does offer the best chance for these small economies not merely to maintain their position, but — even more important — to develop their very real potential.'

We in Barbados will find ourselves being classified as accepting the role of leadership of the proposed Eastern Caribbean Federation. We have to accept that position not only because we have the largest population or the largest revenue, but because we are more stable in our economy. We find that our procedure in financial matters is very different from some of the islands, and so we have been able to establish ourselves in financial matters above board; but that expression cannot be attributed to some of the smaller territories. I believe, however, that in process of time such an evil will be eradicated, and the leaders of those territories that are guilty in this respect will in the not too distant future become so reformed, that they will be able to pattern the policy as propounded by this Government, and then they will be able to be classified and accepted on equal terms.

On page 11, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the cost, there are some people who no doubt are very optimistic.
1.10 p.m.

Some people in Barbados feel that if we embark seriously on Federation with these territories that we will be called upon to pool up the major portion of the cost, and then the opinion of some people will be that a further imposition on the taxpayer of this Island would be something that this Government will not, at the outset, welcome. We, in this Island, have been trained that whatever advancement we are destined to make, we have to do it by our own initiative; and if we are to attain an appreciable standard of living, which no doubt all of us yearn after, we will have to pull our pockets in order to attain that end. There are many people of this Island who are in doubt of the fact that this proposed Federation will come to fruition and to a successful end, and that is a doubt which is in the minds of a vast majority of people in this Island because, as you know, Mr. Speaker, further taxation will create much confusion in this Island which is over populated, especially when it is impossible for this Government or any other Government to employ all the people who are employable; and if it is impracticable for the Government to find work for all the people who are unemployed, then we will create much confusion if a proper explanation is not given. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this Government must be highly commended for negotiating with Barbados Rediffusion in order that hon. members of this Chamber would have the opportunity of expressing their feelings on this important matter over their service, so as to serve the purpose of enlightenment to those people who are unable to express their wishes in a way that would be effective. Therefore, if

this proposed Federation does not come to a successful end, this Government would have still achieved a measure of success in trying to enlighten its people on this important matter of Federation.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I feel that one of the reasons for the failure of the last Federation was in a large measure the fact that some of the leaders were conservative in their outlook in that they seemed not prepared to allow the man in the street to have some knowledge of even the word "federation", and so this country was plunged into a Federation without a proper interpretation given to those people, and this public opinion which plays an important role in any engagement was unable to make its presence felt. That is why you find that the people of this Island did not create as much confusion as they should have at the failure of the last Federation. It was due to the fact that most of them knew nothing about the Federation, and it is only now that the proposed Eastern Caribbean Federation is about to be brought into being that a large percentage of the people of this Island are much better informed; and the information which has been disseminated to them has been of such a nature that we find that in our sojourn throughout the streets and corners of this Island, many simple folk can be seen discussing this serious matter of Federation, and so, with that interest stimulated, much more hope can be seriously expected of this proposed Federation.

As regards to the cost of the Federation, the people of the country must be told that if we are to seriously enter in a Federation, we will have to pay for such a Federation. As the Hon. Premier of this country said, he would not enter into any Federation if it would disrupt the onward approach of the Democratic Labour Party to those things as were proposed in its manifesto, and he also said that if by federating this Government would have to postpone some of its measures, then this country need not entertain any thought of Federation. We feel that first matters should be first.

This Government, when it took over the reins of Government on the 4th December, 1961, found itself channelled into this federation without any previous information as to the type of this proposed Federation, and it is therefore not surprising that the tone and speed at which at the outset this Federation started has now been reduced somewhat.

There is also in this Report on page 13 two institutions which because of the breakup of the last Federation will have to be restarted for the smaller ones, for example, the Currency Board and the Supreme Court. A new Currency Board's ordinance would, of course, have to be made for the establishment of a Development Bank for the area and that no doubt will be discussed at an early stage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will notice last week that the Hon. Leader of the House made a pronouncement is connection with the fact that this Government would shortly be embarking on a Development Bank — a bank that will have a capital of $7 million — and, therefore, when we seriously stated the fact that this bank would be specifically catering to small business, no doubt, many people of this Island who have established their business and have been experiencing difficulty in properly administering it must have been relieved somewhat and their fears must have been relieved after hearing the expressions by the Hon. Leader of the House that this Government proposes to establish such a bank. There are many businesses in this community which are in much need of finance, and with the establishment of a Development Bank we will find that the situation will be much improved. Therefore, in the Fiscal Commissioner's Report where it is suggested that a Development Bank for the area should be a matter to be discussed, this Government has taken the lead in establishing that.

Now, the phrase which has become very widely circulated in this Island with regard to the cost of Federation is capable of interpretation in a number of ways. It is capable of interpretation in a number of ways in that the time factor is the most important aspect of the phrase "the cost of federation." Several years ago, this word "federation" was discussed in these parts, but it never reached any successful conclusion until the Montego Bay Conference when the leaders of the various British West Indian territories decided to discuss the matter about federation and they were able to see a federation implemented; but to the dismay and disgust of the vast majority, it collapsed after living for such a short period.

1.20 p.m.

This phrase "the cost of Federation" has become a daily expression but we must realise that the cost of a Federation can only be assessed in the terms of the time when this Federation starts. If there is a delay in a further meeting with regard to the implementation, the cost will be easily more. We are living in a development age now, an age when people are beginning to realise that they must think of the future and sometimes speakers spasmodically reflect on the past, it has now become the fashion with some speakers on public platforms to think always of the past; therefore the time factor with regard to the cost of Federation is an important matter.

It is interesting also to see the position with regard to the administration that they will be having Ministries. The Prime Minister's Department will include the Cabinet Office, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Trade and Industry including Tourism, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, and Fisheries, the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Ministry of Education, Labour, Public Health and Social Affairs. We will see from that, that it is the intention of the leaders to curtail as much of the expenditure as possible, a thing which the previous Federation paid but little regard to. So, Mr. Speaker, we find the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Duncan Sandys in December, 1962, saying this: "In a Statement issued after this meeting the Ministers unanimously reaffirmed their conviction that Federation offered the best prospects for the economic and political progress of their people."

We therefore see that the reaffirmation made by the leaders was made in good faith and we cherish the expression very seriously. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say that this Government has done all that lies in its power to make this proposed Federation workable. I do not know what will be the outcome at the next London Conference, but I feel that in the end Federation will be brought about. The recent delegation meeting in Trinidad with the four Chief Ministers — the Chief Ministers of Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana and Barbados — was a very timely conference mainly preceding the London Conference. That discussion might give some semblance of interest by the Colonial Office when the London Conference takes place. However, we in this country will be happy to federate with our sister colonies; but, as I said at the outset, if this proposed Federation is not given independence at the outset, then I do not see the necessity for entertaining it.

Mr. SEALEY: Mr. Speaker, having seconded the amendment of the hon. senior member for the City, I want to say that I wholeheartedly agree at the very outset with the amendment and I am making this contribution to the debate which is in a West Indian context. I am a strict believer in Federation; I am a strict believer that we should have Federation with all of its implications, but not Federation at any price. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, when the delegates to the Eastern Caribbean Federation Conference met in London last year many important decisions were taken. Among other things, it was agreed that certain services would be taken over and run by the Administrator of the Federal Government; it was agreed that these services will be taken over on the establishment of the Federal Government. These services were to include the Postal Services of the area, the Police, Audit, Customs and Excise, Income Tax, the Judiciary including not only Judges but also Magistrates and the administration of Courts, and then Telecommunications other than broadcasting, television and unit telephone services. The object of these services was to create from the beginning a strong Federal centre. That all goes to show that a weak or a loosely constructed Federation was a loss of time and a waste of public money. The speedy unification of services in a Federation is something which is very desirable throughout the area. There was a general agreement with

the idea or with this decision or, at least, that is the way in which it appeared. Unfortunately, Sir, for some reason or other, after second thought on this matter, the Regional Council of Ministers reversed their decision as to these services and now we, on this side of the House, are confronted with this amendment.
1.30 p.m.

I will read it:

"The Federal Government when established and the Unit Governments accept the arrangement that the Unit Governments will continue to administer the departments responsible for the collection of Income Tax, the provision of Postal Services and the Local Police Forces for a period of five years from the inception of the Federation at the end of which period the position will be reviewed by the Federal and Unit Governments, subject to the proviso by the Government of Antigua that any Unit Government not agreeing to transfer any of these services to the Federal Government should have the right to continue to administer such services."

This new arrangement, Sir, has been a dangerous proposal. The last Government got their revenue from a mandatory levy, which, in my opinion, was not in proportion for the running of the Federation, and therefore it broke down. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any other hon. member who seeks to contribute to this debate who has not yet spoken since the amendment was made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition? Before either the Hon. Minister of Education who introduced the motion and who of course has the right of final reply, whether or not he decides to avail himself of it, any other hon. member who has not yet spoken and who is eligible to speak may now take advantage of his opportunity. Failing so to do, the hon. Mover of the motion whose right is still there undeniably may wind up, but of course other hon. members including Hon. Ministers who have not yet spoken are perfectly entitled to exercise their right to speak.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I merely rise to ask leave of the House to permit the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour to reply and wind up the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education has intimated that it is proposed that the Hon. Leader of the House wind up this debate, and in that event that would be the last speech permitted in this Chamber on this subject. Is there any hon. member who is yet entitled to speak who so desires before the Hon. Leader of the House, the Hon. Deputy Premier, winds up the debate on behalf of the Government? It appears to me there is none. Accordingly the Hon. Leader of the House may now wind up on behalf of the Government with the knowledge that no other hon. member desires to speak on this subject.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think this is undoubtedly one of the most important debates to have taken place in this House for a very long time; therefore it was very useful, Sir, and instructive to have had the widest possible comment from all sides of the House on the matter, because it affects the very future of the Island, and the decisions we make now will affect the future of this Island, I should say, for the remainder of its history. I therefore propose first of all, Sir, to devote a little time to replying to some of the comments made by hon. members on the other side of the House, especially the hon. junior member for Christ Church, the hon. senior member for St. Peter, the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, and then, Sir, to go on to deal with some other matters as they appear to us on this side of the Table.

There is, Sir, the question of the transitional stages through which the new Federation will pass on its way to independence; there is the question of independence itself; there is the question, Sir, of the development which is imperative if the area is to have a viable economy and the steps to be taken to achieve this; and there is also — to sum the entire question up, where do we go from here?

Now the hon. junior member for Christ Church who was one of the earlier speakers referred to the stages of political development beginning with the actual establishment of the Federation, and its emergence eventually as an independent nation, and he referred to this controversial question in connection with the release from the Colonial Office with regard to the attainment of independence by the Federation. As a matter of fact, he quoted the Colonial Office Statement, and he said at that time that if the Hon. Premier had not replied when he did, it would have gone out to the world that we were asking for independence even before the institution of the Federation and the elections for the Federation; and he characterised this arrangement as apparent irresponsibility and not knowing what we really want.

Well, now, the Hon. Premier was at pains to correct the misstatement in the Colonial Office release, and merely to get the record straight, since the hon. junior member for Christ Church has spoken since the Premier spoke, I want, Sir, to repeat precisely what were the decisions at Sherbourne with regard to the attainment of independence by the Federation.
1.40 p.m.

The stages, Sir, were as follows:-

Firstly, the appointment of the Interim Federal Public Service to appoint Key Federal Officers;

Secondly, the preparation of constitutional instruments and organisation of Federal Departments and services;

Thirdly, the introduction of the Independence Bill in the House of Commons in June or July next year; and following that, the appointment of the Governor-General and the other people in finally settling the organisation of the Federal Establishment. There was no decision, as erroneously stated in the Colonial Office reference, to have independence before the institution of Federation. But, Sir, I merely want to state in passing that even if this had been the decision, it would not have been establishing any precedent.

Sir, I have made it my business to check up on it as to whether there was any case on record in which the granting of independence preceded the elections and establishment of the elected Government, and within recent times there were three such cases on record.

There was the case of Burma. On the 5th November, 1947, the Burma Independence Bill was passed by the British House of Commons enabling Burma to become an independent Republic outside the British Commonwealth of Nations. Major General Aung San had been Chairman of the Constituent Assembly which also administered the country pending the drafting of the Constitution. On the 24th November, 1947, the Constituent Assembly finally approved the Constitution, following which independence was granted with effect from 4th January, 1948. No elections were held prior to the date on which independence became effective.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the case of Burma, it cannot be said that they were grant-aided, but in this Federation, it would have been five of the seven colonies, if not six of the seven, which would have been grant-aided. You cannot therefore draw a true comparison between the granting of independence to Burma in their conditions with a federated West Indies, six of the seven of whom were grant-aided at the time. That is a big difference.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point brought to my notice.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: The hon. junior member for Christ Church is fully aware of the steps which have to be taken and the agreements which have to be reached before permitting the establishment of a Federation to ensure the setting up of the proposed Federation. All the trouble in connection with the grants-in-aid and the grants from the British Government, all those matters have to be settled

before we even agree to entering in a Federation, so that the question of further direct grant-in-aid to the individual territories after Federation could not have arrived at in this context at all. Those are points which must be finally settled before Barbados agrees to entering into any Federation.

Secondly, Sir, the other example is Pakistan. Pakistan came into existence as an independent dominion within the British Commonwealth on the 18th July, 1947. On Independence Day a Constituent Assembly of about 80 members was set up to draft the Constitution and to function as a *pro tem* legislature. Many of the members of the Constituent Assembly were called upon to serve as Ministers, and these and other reasons accounted for the delay in completing the draft Constitution which was finally adopted eight years after independence on 23rd March, 1956. Elections were fixed for 13th February, 1959, but no elections have ever been held under the Constitution.

The stages were those. I am not for a moment suggesting that we have any such desire to have independence and no elections, but the stages as regards the coming into existence of the Dominion of Pakistan on July 1947 were that you set up your Constituent Assembly with a number of seats to draft your Constitution and you got your draft Constitution eight years after; then they decided to hold elections three years after, but up to now they have held no elections at all.

Another case was the case of Sudan. Sudan attained independence on 19th December, 1955 when the British Parliament passed the Sudan Independenct Act. On 1st January, 1956 a five-man Council of State assumed the powers of the Governor-General pending the drafting of the Constitution. No elections were held. On 17th November, 1958 General Ibrahim Aboud took over the government of the Sudan, suspended the Constitution and proclaimed a state of emergency.

Hon. members will laugh at these examples, but they are not quoted as a desire to emulate what took place there. I merely quote them because the horrified manner in which the release from the Colonial Office was greeted in this country, both inside and outside of this Chamber, tended to give the impression after the statement had been corrected by the Hon. Premier that it was the most revolutionary principle imaginable; but I made it my business to look up the matter, and though no such decision took place at Sherbourne, the Hon. Premier in his remarks earlier in the debate presented in precise order all the stages through which Federation and independence were passed.

I merely quoted those instances today to demonstrate that erroneous as the Colonial Office's release was, yet if the Under-Secretary of State had been accurate, there would be precedence for it.

Now, Sir, on the general question of independence, I am rather surprised at the attitude with which people inside this Chamber and outside of it have greeted the declaration of the Government with regard to independence either for Barbados alone or after the proposed Federation of the Seven.

1.50 p.m.

One would almost think that independence was a daily word or at least an ugly word or a word to be abused. It seems to me that there still remains in this island this Colonial Office conception that it is far better to be dominated by an outside power than have the complete control of your own affairs. What we have got to understand in this island is that no country dominates another for the benefit of the dominated country. Quite appreciative as we are of the benefits conferred by British sovereignty in this island over a period of centuries, quite appreciative as we are of what it has meant to us to have lived under the principles of British justice and the rule of law, I do not think that any one of us should be so silly as not to realise basically what it means to be a colony, and therefore to have a somewhat greater conception of what it means to have independence.

Mr. Speaker, the world is full of examples of what it means to be dominated by an imperial power and what it means to be on your own. Therefore, I feel I may be pardoned for devoting a little time to a forth-right examination of the difference between independence and colonialism. I have the greatest respect say, for instance, for the great Canadian nation; but if you want to compare the United States of America which achieved its independence in 1775 with Canada which remained under the control of Great Britain up to somewhere around 1869 — I think that was the date when the first Canadian Federation came into existence — if you were to compare the progress of the United States of America on the one hand and Canada with almost as great resources on the other, I think you must come to the conclusion that there must have been some fundamental difference in the conduct of the affairs in those two countries that has resulted in the disparity which exists. Canada is a great nation today, we know that; but no rational person would compare Canada with the United States of America. There are numerous other parallels; every school boy knows, to quote Macaulay, what imperialism meant to India and how the wealth of India was drained and exploited by the country which dominated her.

If you were to use Asia as another example, you will find that the only Asian nation which, in our time, was able successfully to challenge the might of Western Europe was Japan. While China fell under the commercial control of European and American nations, Japan was the only nation in Asia which remained relatively independent. The conditions in Japan under the old feudal system were really less conducive to progress as a nation than they were in China or elsewhere in Asia. Yet the Japanese because of independence and freedom from domination and control of interests were able in 1902 to challenge and defeat the mighty European power, and later in the century this relatively backward Asiatic country challenged the might of the British Empire, the mightiest nation in the world plus her allies, and the great country of America. That is the only country which has been free of European domination. There must therefore be something which is inherently advantageous in being able to conduct your own affairs rather than to have them controlled by somebody else.

Naturally they made mistakes: but I remember an hon. member of this House — he is not a member of the House now but he is still alive; I refer to Mr. Keith Walcott, the former Attorney General — who, in a debate in this Chamber about ten or twelve years ago actually said that it is better to govern yourself badly than to be governed by somebody else. That is so; but I am not for one moment suggesting that this new Federation will govern itself badly or that we need have any apprehension of the ability of the leaders of the Federation to keep the ship of state on an even keel; but there is quite a lot in what he has said. History is replete with independent nations whose example we can follow. We have to look around at the Latin American and other countries whose example we should shudder to think of following; but with all levels of advance politically and otherwise, I do not think we need have any fear that the acquisition of independence on our part will or can lead to the mal-administration of our own affairs which now exists in some other parts of this area.

I am making these observations merely to bring home to the attention of hon. members that the conditions of economic growth are, to a great extent, controlled by your political climate. There is such a thing as the political economy of development; and if we are to develop economically, it is necessary to be in complete political control of our own affairs. I think it is that which prompted Nkrumah who said some years ago: "Seek ye first the political kingdom and then all other things shall be added unto you."

2.00 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Since the Standing Orders have been suspended, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The House may continue indefinitely.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: .....and we are not automatically bound to take the suspension at 2 o'clock, as this is the time we generally do so, I am going to move suspension of this debate for forty minutes.

I beg to move that further consideration of this debate be now postponed.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for forty minutes.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.

On Resumption:

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Speaker, I observe that there is no quorum, and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. and gallant member for St. Michael for pointing out that there is no quorum, and accordingly the Bell is being rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the Hon. Leader of the House was addressing the Chair. The hon. senior member for St. Philip may proceed.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, before the suspension, I was trying to establish that "independence" is not the ugly word which a number of people in Barbados both inside the House and outside of the House are apparently thinking, and I also was trying to show, Sir, that the political domination of many countries by other countries was to a great extent responsible for their undevelopment. I referred, Sir, to the political economy of growth and to the effect which the political climate had on the economic development of some areas. It would seem, Sir, from some of the remarks of hon. members that independence was a thing to be shunned. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph during the course of his remarks said: "I note from the speech of the Hon. Premier that Barbados had committed itself to independence in 1964 with or without a Federation. If that is so, I do not know anything about it. It was not said on the floor of the House; I have not heard that at any political meeting it was put to the people and the people gave the O.K. to go it alone. I have not heard of it. No matter how I am counted among other legislators, I have not given the O.K. to going it alone and saying we must be independent by 1964." He proceeded, Sir, from there to go on to slate the very idea of independence.

Well, now, I do not know if the hon. member is of the opinion, Sir, that we should remain forever in our present colonial status, neither do I know if he has an idea of when we should endeavour to obtain independence; but I do want to assure him that if there has been any progress in this country within the last ten years or so, it is entirely in consequence of what we have done and what we have processed to control our own affairs, and unless and until we attain full authority for the conduct of these affairs, the island cannot be expected to reach the stage of development which we should like. As a matter of fact, I go so far as to say that although I am fully conscious, as I said earlier, of any advantages derived from British domination of these territories down through the centuries, I still go so far as to say that to a great extent a lot or a great deal of our present lack of development and the economic condition of the country is due to this foreign domination.

I remember well, for instance, in 1929 that at Ottawa when the West Indies were not even represented by their own spokesman, but had to depend on the Colonial Office for representation, a system of imperial preferences was worked out which resulted in depressing more completely the economy of these territories. I do not know if the hon. junior member for St. Joseph thinks that for instance what was done in Ottawa in 1929 was done to benefit the British West Indian territories.

2.50 p.m.

The system which they worked out resulted in pushing up the cost of living considerably in these depressed areas to the benefit of the Imperial manufacturers. At that time, you could have bought a pair of white canvas shoes in Bridgetown for one shilling: but after these preferences were put into effect, the masses of this country who were working for 24 cents a day had to pay five shillings for a similar manufactured pair of shoes in the Commonwealth, and at the time they were getting the least possible price for their primary products. The whole history of imperialism is fraught with the imperialist country dominating a country and doing things to control the economy of that country for the benefit of imperialists; and, therefore, it seems passing strange in 1963 to hear on the floor of this House a school of thought which seems to think that we should remain under the control and domination of a foreign power.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph, of course, is not the only person in this community who seems completely aghast at the very idea of our endeavouring to gain independence in the near future, because outside of this Chamber there seems to be quite a lot of thinking of this kind. I refer to him because as a representative of the people I feel that he should have had the best thinking at heart, and rather than have outside interests dictating our affairs he would have preferred that we dictate that for ourselves.

Now, Sir, I said previously that I wanted to devote a little time to the examination of independence in principle. To my mind, when the hon. junior member for St. Joseph asked, as he did, if we are to go it alone, and when other people of this community are questioning the wisdom or unwisdom of the Seven endeavouring to achieve independence in the shortest possible time, we have to address ourselves to this question in principle and we have to ask ourselves whether Barbados, as the leading partner in this proposed Union, is itself ripe for independence. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, only the size of our population at this stage stands in our way to seeking independence immediately. It seems a matter for consideration that a small country should have to achieve independence, and that is why we are entering this federation with a view to enlarging the population, enlarging the area and the scope of the economy so as to present a bigger image to the outside world; but so far as we individually, are concerned, I think what I regard as the four essential prerequisites to independence exist in this community.

As regards the four essential prerequisites to independence, I think the first and foremost is a sense of national unity, and I think it can be said with some degree of justification that there is that sense of national unity in Barbados. It is true, we have a small anaemic, moribund section of the population which possesses, shall I say, South African theories of racial superiority, but this section no longer dominates the life of the community. As a matter of fact, it would be passing strange if five percent of the population should be allowed to dictate the conditions under which the others should exist. We have a very small number of local people aided and abetted by another handful of expatriates who would like to see in Barbados the same sort of system which you have in South Africa: but at the same time, it is true to say that we have a number of local people and a number which has come in from outside, who are sensible enough to realise that there should be no divisions in the community based purely on questions of race.

I need hardly say, Mr. Speaker, that under this Government no such theories are going to be allowed ever to exist or to flourish. We are prepared ruthlessly to suppress any of this sort of thing if it is brought to our notice. In Puerto Rico in 1946, they actually put on their Statute Books a law to penalise very severely any infraction of the principle of racial equality: and although we have not

taken this step in Barbados, I need hardly assure hon. members that the Government keeps a very close watch on reports of this sort of thing in the Island, although we know of this existence among a small section of the minority which wishes to push back the hands of the clock. We want to tell them clearly that if this sort of thing is what they want to practise and what they want for Barbados, Barbados is not the place for them, and whether they are native Barbadians or expatriates, the best place for them is outside of this country and not in it because as long as we are in control of the country, we are going to see to it that divisions based purely on this sort of thing have no place in this community. I may say that the proponents of this doctrine are few in number and completely impotent, and though we do have a little of that sort of thing, it can be said that we have an amount of national unity.

The second prerequisite to independence, I think, is political experience, and I think that the masses in this country have demonstrated in no uncertain terms within the last ten or fifteen years that they do possess political expertees. We have certainly lowered the franchise in the country and have had elections on this basis completely unaccompanied by any sort of violence. We have gone to the polls and replaced the old reactionaries with a Party which was a little less reactionary, and when that time came, the people replaced that Party with a Party which they thought would represent them as they wanted.
3.00 p.m.

All of that has been done, not by bullets, but by the ballot box. Unlike the experience of countries which are not very far away from us, geographically speaking, more important, larger in area and population, we have gone about our business of removing one political Party and putting in another political party in a most democratic fashion. Therefore, I feel justified in saying that this second prequisite to independence, that of political experience, exists in Barbados. We also have the question to consider, in this context, of administrative capacity; have we got Civil Servants capable of conducting the affairs of the country under independence? I do not think that any one will gainsay the fact that the Civil Service of Barbados, by and large, has demonstrated its capacity to run our public affairs in a manner befitting an independent country. In the top bracket of the Public Service, therefore, I would say without the slightest fear of contradiction, that we have a number of very capable and dedicated men who are prepared loyally to serve any Government which is in power and whose contribution to the community is of such, or rather can be of such, as to ensure to the country — or rather, to give the country — the assurance that, administratively speaking, the control of public affairs is in safe and reliable hands.

This is highly important. It is said that there was a Chinese who first propounded the idea of Civil Servants to administer the affairs of the country completely impartially and regardless of under whose control the country finally rested, and I suppose I can go so far as to say that, in my opinion, the Civil Service of Barbados, by and large — there are exceptions of course — lives up to the conception of what an impartial Civil Service should be. I remember after the first World War — I think it was when the Hapsburg Empire collapsed in Austria — that the Civil Servants of that country were so efficient that they actually ran the country for some time without a Government of any kind. I should like to think that with the promise which it shows now, no such eventuality will occur here and that the Civil Service will always endeavour to maintain the highest traditions of the country and be an example to countries which are less fortunate than we are.

The final and other main prerequisite to independence would be a sound economy, and I do not think that anybody would attempt to dispute the fact that in this island we have always balanced our budget. We may not always have been able to provide the reforms and amenities which we would like to have for the population, but we have never been dependent on outside financial assistance for the day-to-day cost of running the country. We have never had a bankrupt country, so to speak, and we have always been able to pay our Civil Servants. We have been able to discharge our financial obligations both internally and externally, and therefore I regard that these four basic policies on which an independent nation should rest are the policies of sound economy, national unity, political expertese and the capacity to administer your Public Service efficiently. With those four main matters conceded, I do not see any reason why it should be felt that Barbados is not capable of running its own affairs. And it is to be assumed that if we are going to have any say in the conduct of the proposed Federation, well, then, the same conditions which obtain here we will endeavour to translate there: and rather than, as the hon. junior member for the City appears to think, that we are going to sink to the level of the grant-aided territories or territories which may be characterised as being mal-administered, we will bring them to our levels and in a short space of time any defection from those principles which may exist in any of our proposed colleagues should be remedied. As a matter of fact, what I objected to in the speech made by the hon. junior member for the City is that all the hon. member did was merely to attempt to highlight the criticisms in the Hicks Report which itself emphasised the existing defects in the administration of some of the territories in the Leeward and Windward Islands. The hon. junior member for the City did that without the saving corollary of going on to quote the specific recommendations in the same Report for remedying those defects. The hon. member talked about the mal-administration, the questionable budgetary procedures and all of that kind of thing which exists in some of these territories on which Mrs. Hicks herself commented adversely. But the hon. member said nothing about the proposals for remedying this situation: and he could hardly think that since these evils do not exist in Barbados, we should even consider entering a Federation with these territories unless proper steps were being taken to improve the situation complained of by Mrs. Hicks, which we ourselves know and which the hon. member emphasised so strongly.

The Hicks Report did refer, as I said, to the existence of these things; it went on to recommend the provision of development advisers who assisted both the Windward and Leeward Islands mainly in the institution of good budgetary practice and the preparation and execution of development programmes.
3.10 p.m.

The hon. junior member for Bridgetown, therefore, is guilty of presenting and emphasising a single side of the picture without being fair enough simultaneously to say that while these things exist, the Commissioner had power to investigate conditions, has taken full cognisance of them and at the same time made emphatic recommendations for improving them, so that if and when we enter this Federation, these evils will have been eradicated. As a matter of fact, Sir, Mrs. Hicks went further. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown dealt at length with the question of tax collections, and he even went so far as to refer to what he termed as the misappropriation of public funds and all that kind of thing, and he never said that in the same Report in which the criticism to which he referred appeared, there also appeared recommendations for the establishment of effective systems of taxation and the institution, Sir, of sounder principles for the conduct of the country's financial affairs.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter is not present, and I refrained earlier from commenting on the remarks of previous speakers in this debate. I refrained from commenting on one remark of his, because I knew he would return to the Chamber sooner or later; but the hon. senior member for St. Peter took exception during the course of his remarks to the fact that the Government had been utilising the services of non-elected representatives of the people at levels where, in his considered opinion, only elected persons should have been brought in. In principle he is quite sound, but this does not mean, Sir, that Government is not justified in utilising the best services at its command in the community for particular purposes. We feel, Sir, that so long as you can depend on the loyalty of people, the fact that they may not have been elected does not mean that their services should not be called upon. As a

matter of fact, normally in theory under the British Constitution, your Cabinet Ministers should be drawn from the elected Chamber, because they sit in the Commons and are answerable to the elected representatives of the people in Commons; but history is replete with cases in which the British Prime Minister has seen fit to draw on the non-elected House of Lords for material for any Governmental services, because he regarded them as the best material for the particular purpose or the best material at that time available. The present British Foreign Secretary is not a member of the House of Commons. The Prime Minister, Mr. MacMillan, went to the House of Lords to pick out Lord Home to fill the portfolio of Foreign Minister in his Government and this was not without precedent. As a matter of fact, even now with the British Conservative Party reeling under a succession of blows, there is considerable support in the Party itself for the election as Leader of the Party not a member of the House of Commons, but a member of the House of Lords, Viscount Hailsham. For some time he seemed to be far ahead of his rivals for the post of Head of the Conservative Party; so I want to assure the hon. member that the matter of which he complained in this respect *re* the selection of people like Mr. Ward to serve the Government in certain positions at a certain time, is not because we do not support the principle of having elected representatives of the people in these positions, but for reasons which we felt justified our choice. The hon. member has no conception of how busy the Ministers are in endeavouring to put the economy of the Island on a sound keel. We are living in a country in which the.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in so far as the statement which I made is concerned, I think it was a long time ago; but I think I made it clear that there is no objection on my part to the Government choosing anybody as its adviser, but in the absence of elected Ministers undertaking the role of responsibility where elected Ministers should be. I do not like to see people.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I can now hear the hon. senior member for St. Peter as the Leader of the House has given way.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what I should like to make clear is that my objection was not an objection to the Government's prerogative to choose whomsoever it cared to advise them, but the point I made and which I still insist in making is that under the circumstances in which this question of advisers arose, I said that I considered that elected Ministers should hold the responsible role of being in the front line of the representation of this country, and the Government can take whoever it cares as advisers. The hon. member was at pains to draw the analogy of Lord Home as Foreign Secretary, but I will be at pains to draw to his attention the case of Edward Heath who had been undertaking a very important mission on behalf of the British Government, and there are some people in the Treasury who as technicians and economists could be far superior to Mr. Heath in his knowledge of the economic situation of the European Common Market, but yet the British Government chose to have a responsible Minister deal with that. I am of the opinion that elected Ministers should, wherever the nation's interests are involved, be the persons answerable to Parliament, and not advisers who are not answerable to Parliament, because if anything happened to the Premier, the hon. Mr. Ward, no matter what his ability is, could not come here and answer to us, but he was the only person left if anything happened to the Premier; so wherever the Premier is involved in negotiations like that, one of his Ministers should be there so that if anything arose the nation would feel better. It does not in any way reflect on the person they chose to advise the Government, because Government has that freedom; but I still maintain that an elected representative should be the person there, and if the Premier is there, he should have one of his other Ministers in case emergencies arose. That was the point I made, and it does not interfere with the Government's prerogative to choose thom they care as advisers.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: I merely wanted to point out that we appreciate and endorse the principle on which his remarks were based, but we exercised our prerogative in what we thought was in the best interest of the community, and we had to bring to bear on our decision, Sir, a lot of factors of which the hon. member could not possibly have been aware — the availability of the Ministers, Sir, at this time and the important things to be taken into consideration — and as I said, one has got to bear in mind that we inherited this country with a more or less static economy, and if we are to change this state of affairs, it means that there are times when Ministers find themselves overburdened in many directions.
3.20 p.m.

It is generally known that almost every Sunday, you can find two or three Ministers at the Government Headquarters for some time of the day. As a matter of fact, as regards the Hon. Minister on my right — the Minister of Communications, Works and Housing — I am absolutely sure that there are few Sundays when he is not in his office at the Ministry. Therefore, so long as we are assured of the loyalty and the capacity of the individual in question, and so long as, in our opinion, we do not infringe the democratic rights of elected members, we are justified in taking any action which we consider to be appropriate at the time.

Sir, I think I have dealt with the remarks by the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the hon. junior member for the City of Bridgetown. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph spoke at length in this debate, and really, Sir, I have heard him outside of this Chamber speaking in very stringent terms condemning the leadership of his party; but on this occasion, he rose to new heights and I have never heard a more bitter attack on the leader of his Party and the manner in which he conducted the old Federation as that given by the hon. junior member for St. Joseph. As a matter of fact, all the evils which he complained of and which he advised us to shun in such emphatic terms were conditions which existed in the old Federation.

Mr. Speaker, if you refer to his speech, you will find that on page 16 of the Report he referred to the manner in which the last Federal Elections were run, he referred to the Ministers' salaries and he begged us if we are responsible for this new Federation to let the Ministers get the same or less than the Ministers in the local Government. He said that the Prime Minister of the Federal Government got $18,000 per annum and he should not have got more than the Premier of Barbados. I regard his speech as very unfair to the former Federal Prime Minister although the former Federal Prime Minister really got away with murder.

Mr. SPEAKER: You mean political murder.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Your Honour is quite correct. I have neard of no reports of other kinds of murder committed by him. The hon. junior member for St. Joseph begged us not to give the Prime Minister $18,000 and all the other perquisites which the last Prime Minister got, and therefore, it might be useful, since the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was at pains to refer to the Prime Minister and the Ministers and their salaries, for us to devote a little time in investigating the conditions which he begged us so strongly to shun.

The Prime Minister of the old Federation, Sir, used to get a salary of $21,600 a year. He had a free house, properly furnished, and three months after moving in he said it was not good enough and was not suitable and he wanted a new house built. It is not surprising that the site which he selected for this new house for himself is the site which the Trinidad Government finally selected for the new Hilton Hotel. Where now stands this modern massive structure of the Hilton Hotel to improve the economy of Trinidad and Tobago, the ex-Prime Minister of the West Indies wanted a castle built for himself. He had two cars, chauffeurs, gardener's allowance, travelling allowance and, as a matter of fact, in one year, the travelling expenses from June 21st to November 23rd amounted to $7,000 for the whole Federation. He was not even satisfied with this, because midway between the only Session of the Federation, he took steps to improve the allowances of the Ministers and himself.

I do not think the hon. junior member for St. Joseph should now consider himself unduly worried that there would be extravagance on our part because this is the only Government in this Chamber since members were paid, that a salaries revision for Civil Servants was not followed by a Salaries Revision for members of the House. I make bold to say that following upon a salaries revision for Civil Servants less than two years ago, if there was another Government, there would be an attempt to increase the salaries of members and Ministers; but we regard it as incumbent upon members, including the Ministers, to draw their belts and make any sacrifices inevitably in making their present salary sufficient. Therefore, I can assure the hon. junior member for St. Joseph that we do not propose to do in the Federal Government what we have not done here. I agree with him that in this respect, the last Government was an example never to be copied by any succeeding West Indian Government.

We are dealing with the Prime Minister's high emoluments in office and other terms and conditions attached to his post, and it was not surprising to learn that, now he has resigned, the enormity of his pension is really to be marvelled at. He gets a pension of £2,000 a year. If Prime Minister Macmillan, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, with nearly 50 million people were to resign tomorrow, his pension would be the same £2,000 a year. The Prime Minister of the little bankrupt West Indian Federation with a revenue around $11 million on his resignation gave himself a pension of £2,000 a year, the same pension to which a resigned Prime Minister of Great Britain is entitled. I understand that there are 32 retired Colonial Governors and out of them, only three are drawing a pension of £2,000; all the others are drawing a pension less than that; therefore, I share the apprehension of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and I tell him that the very last thing which we should do is to copy anything from the last Federation and we will shun its evils like the plague; and when it comes to fixing salaries for Ministers and what not, we will use the pruning knife.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that these salaries should be exactly the same as what we are paying out at the moment for conducting the affairs of Barbados. I do not want to quote in detail everything the hon. junior member for St. Joseph said in this connection. He said:

"Before you go to London, get together and formulate your plans with the sole idea of starting in a small way financially, as small as possible until we can get somewhere and increase; but for God's sake, do not give a member $600 a month for travelling in your constituency; do not start top-heavy. Let it be done at once. Whatever you are getting in the local Assembly, let us start with that and let that be so even with the Civil Servants. If one of these Civil Servants is coming from a department of yours and he is getting a dollar, do not give him $1.50; give him the same dollar. Let us work out a formula and put it to the people. Put it to the people so that when you go to them and ask questions, they would be able to answer you."

He said much more in the same strain.

3.30 p.m.

The hon. member said that he would tell the people that until this Government or any other Government called the Council of Ministers together again before the Leaders went to London we would not get anywhere. "Do not let the Leaders go to London and waste money. Let us fix our differences here first. We may go to St. Lucia and hold a conference instead of holding it in Barbados. We must outline the cost of Federation and point out that if we have to federate, we have to give up certain things. We do not want so many Ministers and we would not be paying so much money to Ministers. We must discuss the matter among ourselves and arrive at a unanimous decision."

The hon. member, of course, like all the taxpayers in the area, is still groaning under the burden imposed upon them by his party leaders. What amazes me is that the same Party leader of the same hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the same people are running about this country and suggesting that the people should put them in charge of the new Federation. It seems to me that there must be some barefaced hypocrisy somewhere, that the hon. member can get on the floor of this House, that he can stand up in a Forum like this and take time off to criticise everything that they did. He has told the people that they should put them back to run the Federation.

Mr. SMITH: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I have never been anywhere in this island and told anybody to put me or my Party to run the Federation. I have not said one word to the people of this country relative to the running of the Federation by my Party. All I did was to tell the people to be careful with the present Government with their black box proposals in taxation. That is what I told them.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the hon. member say that he does not want his Party to run the new Federation; but his Party went out and spoke on their platform at meetings at which the hon. member was present and they have been talking about Federation. I agree with the hon. member that he should not want them to run the Federation; but it does not mean that his Party has not been presenting this picture. Mr. Speaker, you know, and the hon. junior member for St. Joseph also knows, that the manner in which the last Government misspent the moneys contributed by the territories represented in the Federation, is a matter which will always, as long as the West Indies last, call forth the condemnation of right thinking people. When the Ministers had to travel, they were given warm clothing; at first they had to have an allowance of sixty dollars for gardeners. They had free houses and it was proposed that they be given an allowance of $78 for gardeners. They had travelling allowance for travelling in Trinidad and in their own constituencies, and whether or not they had chauffeurs, they had an allowance for chauffeurs. When the hon. member talks about the Civil Servants and the manner in which they were treated, I want to say that the scandal of the manner in which the Federal Civil Servants were treated will remain with us for a long time. There are retired Civil Servants from that Federation who got as much as $22,000 by way of severance pay for work under six years with a Unit Government and one year with a Federal Government. Reports are that some of them got as much as $50,000 and in one case the sum of $52,000 was paid when the Federation broke up. For all of that the Prime Minister must bear some responsibility because the proposals came from his Cabinet. I must say, therefore, that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph was more than justified in complaining about the remuneration which was paid to these people.

Again, Sir, merely for the purpose of the record, when the hon. member talks about the size of the Federal Public Service and so on, it is useful to draw to the attention of hon. members in this House what happened in the last Federal Government and what the hon. member wants us to avoid. I said that they had a revenue of $11 million and no Al Capone robbing the Chicago Bank has ever perpetrated the same outright robbery which the last Federal Government perpetrated on the funds contributed by the people of the West Indies. When the Federal Government started in 1958, they had some 300 odd Civil Servants. Nobody knows what they did, but by the time they ended, they had 462. I attended a conference in Trinidad earlier this year, a Conference on Oils and Fats, and I was appalled at the number of Civil Servants in attendance at this Conference. There was a whole rostrum, so much so that they could not find anywhere to sit. As a matter of fact, they had more Civil Servants than delegates. This year we had more delegates than Civil Servants. They had all sorts of people just for the purpose of saying that they had something to do.

When the Federation started, the Prime Minister had 33 Civil Servants in his office; in the following year he had 39 and later on in the same year he had 51. Mr. Speaker, if you can tell me in the name of Heaven what the Federal Prime Minister did with 51 Civil Servants in his office in Trinidad, I would be glad to know. The Minister of Communications started with 13 Civil Servants in 1958; he had 18 in 1959 and later the same year he had 26.

3.40 p.m.

The Minister of Finance started with twenty-eight and ended up with thirty-four. Now, Sir, the whole British Colonial Office, when Britain had the biggest empire the world has ever seen — the whole of Africa, India with over 400 million, Nigeria with 40 million, Ghana and Sierra Leone — only had 450 Civil Servants to run this entire empire, but in Trinidad the Federal Prime Minister, under the leadership of the Party Leader of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph, had in his little Kingdom 462. *(Shame!)* When the Federal Government folded, he had 462. What he did and what they did only God in Heaven knows, because we cannot find out. As a matter of fact, I am reminded that if they had gone on like this multiplying every year, according to the theory of Parkinson's Law, by the year 1980 if they had lasted so long, they would have had more Civil Servants than people in the Federation. *(Laughter).* So I am more than grateful that it has taken a member of their own Party to draw attention to these evils on the floor of this House, because it should be a solitary lesson of the people of this Island never again, either calling themselves a Party or as individuals, to entrust them with the conduct of the Island's affairs either at territorial level or Federal level; and in this new Federation, we are proposing, Sir, if we do not want to wreck it, if we do not want all this loot and booty, as one Federal member called it, to be extracted from the Treasury of the Federal taxpayers, we must keep them as far as possible from it.

I think, Sir, that I must have dealt by now with most of the speakers who contributed to this debate. The hon. junior member for Bridgetown unfortunately was not here earlier in the debate, so that a lot of the matters to which he referred, a lot of what took place at Sherbourne, the question of the grants-in-aid, the question of proposals for tightening up expenditure and the institution of a better system of checks, all these things he would have heard because they were referred to by the Premier in his speech, but he missed them. I need not be repetitious, and therefore if he wants information on these matters, all he need do is to refer to the debates of earlier speeches and he will get all the enlightenment which he needs. I do feel, Sir, that he especially and to some extent the hon. junior member for Christ Church, did pay appropriate attention to the present economic condition of the territories, but at the same time they refrained, studiously or perhaps unwittingly, from referring either to the necessity for or the advantages to be derived from the undertaking of a proper development programme to improve the economy of the territories. Included in this exercise naturally must be not only political considerations; you must have, Sir, a programme for economic improvement to enable the territories to be financially independent, to improve their standards of living, and to provide for the people of the area the standards of living to which people in more advanced countries are now accustomed. Hon. members and the general public can rest assured that the Government of this country is not going to enter into a Federation with anybody if this federation means uniting solvency with bankruptcy. We are not prepared to place any undue burden on the taxpayers of this country. Before we enter into the Federation, Sir, we have to be assured that the assistance which it will get, especially from Her Majesty's Government, will be enough to place the economies of the territories on a more sound foundation, and we have to be assured in addition, Sir, that proper plans are being formulated to make the individual territories as self-supporting as possible.

Hon. members seem to think, Sir, that we are going to federate just as we are, and that when the time comes for balancing the budget of a grant-aided territory, the taxpayers of this country will be called upon to do it. Nothing could be more silly in the context of the investigations and of the reports and of the recommendations made on this matter; but if you listened to some of the speeches made in this Chamber, Sir, you could come to no other conclusion than that we are taking our solvent Treasury and amalgamating it with bankrupt territories. In so far as Barbados is concerned, as I said earlier, the Government is embarking on an economic programme, and naturally we expect to see the same thing done in the entire Federal area. It took the island of Trinidad twelve years to get ninety industries; it took Jamaica ten years to get seventy. With our present programme we are bound to surpass the achievements of both these countries in a given period in this direction. What we are planning to do for Barbados, we hope to do for the entire Federal area.

3.50 p.m.

First and foremost, we have to see to it that we produce in the area as much as we can and that the territories become more self-sufficient.

At the moment, in the Seven, we are importing $7 million of goods from Trinidad alone and we are exporting a little over $1 million to Trinidad. Almost everything which we are importing from Trinidad can be produced in the Seven. The list of items imported from Trinidad includes citrus juice which can be produced in St. Lucia and Dominica. It also includes cocoa and spice, petroleum products, some rum, cement, bottles, clothing and fertilisers to the tune of $14 million a year. The first item on the developmental programme is that every single item which can be produced in the Seven — what we should do is to replace these products by producing them ourselves. The only raw material which Trinidad has which we do not have is oil. And even the $5 million odd in petroleum products which we import from Trinidad is refined from crude oil which Trinidad herself imports; so there is no reason why we should not do it ourselves.

Hon. members will recall that we have already taken steps in this Island to make this country more self-sufficient with regard to petroleum products, and there is no reason why an extension should not take place to the extent at which we can provide the petroleum requirements for the entire Seven. There is no reason why we cannot do that; and certainly, after a Customs Union has been established, there is no reason why fruit and vegetable juices should not come from Dominica and St. Lucia into the other territories which now import them from Trinidad. Similarly, Sir, with clothing and even fertilisers the territories can be self-sufficient, and from there we can go on to establish industries in the various territories according to their available raw materials or mineral resources. There is no reason why the Hydro Electro power of Dominica and St. Lucia and to some extent St. Vincent should not be utilised to the economic advantage of the area. There must be an overall programme which must take into account the appropriate domestic resources of these territories, and if we are planning to embark in Barbados on an extensive overall development programme and we have anything to say — I mean the Government of Barbados — in the running of the proposed Federation if and when it starts, naturally, we would see that our efforts on economic expansion are not duplicated in the territories with which we are associated.

I do not think that anybody will expect that we would countenance what, for instance, goes on in Dominica now where they pick the citrus, make jam and jelly with it or the grapefruit skin and then export it in 40-lb. and 50-lb. containers to Great Britain and then re-import it into the territories in 1-lb. glass jars. That is utterly fantastic. All the jam manufactured in that territory is packed in 50-lb. containers and they pay freight two ways and then buy it at a fancy price from bottlers in the United Kingdom. This is the sort of thing which goes on now. Hon. members can rest assured that we are not permitting the enormity of the task evolved in developing this area and improving the economy of it and then do something to nullify it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Hon. Minister would give way, I would like to draw his attention to this. I notice the Hon. Minister is about to wind up his speech and I should like to draw his attention to the fact that I have not received any explanation from him regards the amendment which I moved to Section 4 of Appendix "A" and to paragraph 2 or Section 7. Those are the paragraphs to which I made amendments, and I notice that the Hon. Minister is about to wind up his reply with actually no answer given to the amendments which I moved. One was on the question of rebutting most of the things which had been agreed to at the conference in London and the other was on the power that the Governor General and the Interim Council of Ministers elected would

have to make laws limited to a number of subjects. We, on this side of the Table, said that we did not know what that limit was and we want to know if after those laws were made by the Interim Council of Ministers, they would come before the elected Legislature for ratification. I am told that those points would come up. Those hon. members who had spoken before I had made that motion, as I understand it, can have the opportunity of speaking on the amendments which I made and I am sure that those amendments are worthy of an explanation from the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the Clerk to read the amendments of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition so as to ensure that the Hon. Leader of the House, if he thinks fit, would deal with the point.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would not only ask for the amendments to be read, but also the particular sections as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members are presumed to have copies of the Statement with them. I can hardly imagine any hon. member leaving that Statement at home.

Mr. MOTTLEY: May I be permitted to draw the attention of the Hon. Leader of the House to this?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the Hon. Leader of the Opposition not to attempt to make a speech.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will not attempt to do that. Lest the hon. member should wind up without replying to my amendment, just let me say that mine was an amendment and those who spoke before me can take the opportunity of replying to it.
4.00 p.m.

Paragraph 2 of Appendix "A" states this:

"The Federal Government when established and the Unit Governments accept the arrangement that the Unit Governments will continue to administer the departments responsible for the collection of Income Tax, the provision of postal Services and the Local Police Forces for a period of five years from the inception of the Federation at the end of which period the position will be reviewed by the Federal and Unit Governments, subject to the proviso by the Government of Antigua that any Unit Government not agreeing to transfer any of these services to the Federal Government should have the right to continue to administer such services."

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is necessary for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to quote his references specifically; he might quote the paragraph and the reference number, because hon. members are not only deemed to be able to read but also to have their copies before them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was only drawing the attention of hon. members to what it says here. It says in sub-paragraph (4) of paragraph 7 and this is one of the recommendations of the Conference:-

"Appointment of Governor-General and creation of Federal Council of Ministers into a body corporate with power to legislate by Regulations made by the Governor-General on the advice of the Federal Council limited to a number of subjects, such steps as are necessary for the launching of the Federation."

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members have their Statements before them just as the hon. member has his Statement before him. As I say, the hon. member only needs to give the reference, and hon. members will follow him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I hope they are following, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: They are doing their parliamentary duties.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member is assuming that I am winding up the debate at this stage. He might read what he is reading later on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then that would be unnecessary. The hon. member has the Statement fresh in his memory.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the potential developments of the area. I was saying that hon. memers of this Chamber have been presented with a unique opportunity in our life time. We have the opportunity, as elected members of this Chamber, to lead the people of this area into independence, which is to make a very marked contribution to the history of the world at this time. That is so for the simple reason that internationally speaking there is so much confusion, bloodshed, violence and what not taking place among the non-independent peoples that if the members of this Assembly, the Leaders of this Government, can eventually unite the scattered territories of this area into a Federation and lead them to an independent nation, we will have accomplished something of which we shall be proud.

I doubt very much that hon. members of this Chamber appreciate the significance of the history which they can create and the inportance of the position in which they find themselves. Obviously, there are difficulties and obstacles to be overcome. Jamaica and Trinidad ran from them; but if we achieve this history we will have on record that it was this small island of Barbados with its relatively insignificant population as compared with Jamaica and Trinidad, this small island of Barbados with its relatively insignificant resources which provided the effective leadership to unite these territories and to bring about the grouping which had been proposed for over one hundred years but which was seldom, if ever regarded as being possible of achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any hon. member with a sense of responsibility will want to find himself lacking in appreciation of a call and opportunity like this. Barbados has, in the past, provided leadership for the West Indies in many matters on many occasions and it seems to me that again fate has decided that the mantle of leadership should fall on the people of this small rock. In the same way that a small island like Great Britain has made such a tremendous impact on Europe, so it seems to me that a similarly small island like Barbados should, in the context of Caribbean affairs, make an outstanding contribution to the history of our time. I do not think that any hon. member of this Chamber will want to be guilty of failing to rise to this unique occasion.

These territories almost throughout their entire independence have been completely dominated by outside interests; little or nothing has been done to develop them. We have grown accustomed more or less to relieving our population problems and our economic pressure by emigration, and now even this door is being closed to us. Recently, and in the face of growing resentment on racial grounds, Canada has thought of liberalising her emigration laws and so the doors are opened to the type of emigrants which we have not got. Great Britain herself has seen fit to curb the flow of unemployed West Indian immigrants to her shores. We are being so discriminated against that even in the case where territories in this area have been for some time entitled, so long as they were independent, to have their nationals enter the United States of America under a quota entry system, even though some territories have achieved independence, this privilege has been denied them. Both in Trinidad and Jamaica the leaders thought that the mere attainment of independence was enough to enable them to do two things first and foremost to join the organization of the American States and, secondly, having done so, to have their nationals in America on a non-quota entry system.
4.10 p.m.

We ourselves — and when I say "we" I mean the Government Party — entertained the same idea, and on the occasion of a visit to this country two or three years ago of officials from Her Majesty's Government concerned with Colonial Office affairs, we presented a memorandum to them making certain proposals along these and other lines, because first and foremost we asked them to endeavour to obtain for us a portion of the quota which Great Britain herself had for the entry of her nationals into the

United Kingdom which was not used to the fullest extent and secondly, Sir, we referred to the facilities which the Organization of American States have for non-quota entry into America. Now the position with Trinidad and Jamaica is that although they are independent, even they are now being told that since they were not independent at the time when these non-quota provisions applied to the twenty-one States comprising the Organization of American States, it would require an Act of Congress now to include them, and as it were, to forestall this, we now see attempts being made to liberalise the flow of West Indians into the United States providing they have certain basic skills. Any unemployed national, any uneducated peasant from Peru, Bolivia, the Argentine, Brazil, or any State comprising the O.A.S., any national with skills or without skills is free to buy a ticket and go to the United States of America; but these provisions, even if and when we do enter the Organization of American States, do not or will not automatically apply to us. Apart from that, Sir, the aid which a number of European and American countries are giving to undeveloped territories in Asia and Africa is being denied us, because we are regarded as part and parcel of the British Commonwealth, and therefore the responsibility of Great Britain. Are we to understand around this Table here that there are hon. members so oblivious to the need for aid and developmental assistance that they want us to perpetuate our position as colonials, and therefore deny ourselves of the possibility of getting aid from outside in the same manner that independent Algeria, independent Trinidad and Jamaica, independent Sudan or independent Nigeria or Ghana are getting from more developed territories? That is what it amounts to.

The British Government itself, Sir, is offering very limited aid. Only last month Jamaica got $3 million from America for housing at an interest rate of 2%. If Jamaica were still a colony, she could not have gotten this aid from America, and therefore, Sir, I myself must be amazed at the stand taken by hon. members in this debate who neither want a Federation of the Seven nor do they want Barbados to be independent on its own. I do not know what they want. It seems to me you have to have one or the other. Either we are satisfied to go it on our own, small as we may be and relatively insignificant as we are or endeavour to present a better image to the outside world by unifying ourselves with our neighbours, Sir, or trying to raise their standards, where they are lacking, to ours, and then presenting a united front as an independent nation among the other independent countries in the Hemisphere. I say, Sir, that our own programme for development is well underway. We will do no less for the other territories than we are doing for ourselves, and in many respects, aspects of our developmental programme can be better implemented if we are economically associated with some of the territories.

Mr. Speaker, Barbados for instance could never be self-sufficient with its requirements in meat. At the moment, almost all the meat we consume in this country has to come from as far away as Australia and New Zealand — long distances at enormous freight rates — not only ordinary freight rates, but refrigerated freight rates — when in the neighbouring territories of Dominica, St. Vincent and Antigua there are areas large enough and rich and fertile enough to provide enough meat for the entire area under a well-organised developmental programme, when a mill for the manufacture of meal and feeds in this country and an attempt at cattle rearing and reproducing in the territories in the Seven which lend themselves by their natural resources to this purpose, with a meat packing plant here or somewhere else can in a relatively short time do two things: make meat available to the people in the area much more cheaply, and assist in expanding the economy of the territories.

There are two distinct efforts, Sir, underway to establish a sugar refinery in Barbados. At the moment it is to some extent considering the possibility of supplying refined sugar to the other seven territories, but in this, as in many other respects, Sir, I think we will find that the industrial development on all fronts of the area will proceed apace the moment political union has been established. There is no reason, Sir, why the coffee, cocoa, and the copra in some of these territories should continue to be exported in their raw state and the finished produce brought back in when with a little careful planning and enough finance for the development of these industries, such a lot can be accomplished. I do not know if hon. members expect or think that British manufacturers or the British Government is going to take British taxpayers' money and lend us or give us for the purpose of providing development of this sort, which in the final analysis must inure to the disadvantage of British manufacturers and the British economy. It is too much to expect. We have got to do these things on our own initiative, and we have got to have the political power to do what we want without interference unduly from outside. I said earlier this is the basis for the doctrine enunciated by Nkrumah, that seek ye first the political kingdom and then all other things shall be added unto you.

4.20 p.m.

The amendment moved by the hon. senior member for the City of Bridgetown, seeks to exclude certain paragraphs contained in Appendix "A", and I am at a loss to understand what he means by this. Appendix "A" is an Appendix to the Statement referring to the Federation of the Eastern Caribbean territories which was laid in the House by the Hon. Premier. This has nothing to do with the Resolution tabled by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and which we are asking the House to accept now. The Resolution tabled by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy says:

"WHEREAS the peoples of seven British Eastern Caribbean territories, through their several legislatures, have agreed to establish, and enter into, a Federation of their territories, and

WHEREAS they possess the untrammelled right to act freely and responsibly in determining the nature, purposes and functions of such a Federation, and

WHEREAS the Regional Council of Ministers, composed as it is of the Heads of Democratically elected Governments of the area, has at its recent meeting with the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies in the United Kingdom Government, outlined its views on the character of the Federation to be established, and

WHEREAS these views are embodied in a Statement made before this Honourable House by the Honourable Premier on Tuesday, 11th June, 1963, and are set out as Appendix "A" of the said Statement.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. How can the Hon. Minister say that Appendix "A" has nothing to do with the Resolution and the Resolution says: "..... and are set out as Appendix "A" of the said Statement."

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is personally entitled to express his opinion. That is the opinion of the Hon. Leader of the House. Every hon. member is entitled to express his own opinion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not saying that that is not so, but the hon. member now quotes something which he said had nothing to do with the Resolution. However erroneous it may be, this is a statement of fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a statement of opinion. The Hon. Leader of the House does not think it relates to what you say it relates to.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sure Your Honour will have my amendment in front of you.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have it in the forefront of my mind.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will prefer Your Honour to have it in front of you so that you can read it.

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, what we are asking the House to accept is set out in the final paragraph of

the Resolution moved by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and it reads as follows:-

BE IT RESOLVED that this House supports the proposals contained in that document, and particularly approves commends and endorses the proposal that the new Federation should be independent from the establishment of the first elected Federal Government.

The hon. member needs not concern himself unnecessarily with the preambles which are introductory to the Resolution itself. I am saying, Sir, that the hon. junior member for St. Lucy who introduced this Resolution quoted Plato whose doctrines and the basic principles essential for good government are well known. The Hon. Premier who followed in his speech quoted Aristotle and his contribution to the ideals of good Government. The hon. senior member for St. Peter quoted an American economist called Gailbraith on the acceptability of certain political theories. I want to conclude my remarks on this matter by quoting a Frenchman who is famous as a great emancipator in this area and who is honoured in the neighbouring colony of Martinique by having both a school and a street named after him. That man is called Victor Schoelcher and in Martinique they have the Lycee Schoelcher and the Rue Schoelcher named after this great emancipator. Victor Schoelcher went on record as saying, referring to the West Indian position in the middle of the ocean, glancing at the map which shows them to be almost in touch with each other:-

"One cannot help to think that they may well come together some day and form a distinct wonderful fold in this modern world. They might well unite in a confederation joined by common interests and possess a modern fleet and industry, arts and literature all of their own. That would not come about in a year or two or three centuries, but come about some day it shall; if it be natural, it shall be so."

I think that Mr. Victor Schoelcher has spoken well enough, not only in this paragraph but in several other lines of his. He has referred with almost prophetic attention to the number of the evils which eventually came to exist in the territories which he mentioned. He talked about a merchant fleet which we should have, and at the recent conference attended by the Prime Minister of Barbados this thing was talked about among other things because the question of the high cost of transportation of goods coming into the area by foreign bottoms leaves no doubt at all in my mind that the high cost of living is due to that. We have no control over freight rates and every now and then they go up.
4.30 p.m.

As I said, this is not the only matter or condition in the West Indies to which over one hundred years ago Victor Schoelcher with prophetic vision drew attention. Nobody would expect Barbados to have its own merchant fleet, but certainly a unified West Indies could consider unified action of this sort. Mr. Speaker, we could talk at length on the steps which need to be taken to make these countries what they should be, but I think that all of us will realise that the time has come to put an end to our individual existence and to plan unitedly for the development of the area as a whole; and this can only be done under the existence of political union, and this union must be an independent union. *(Cheers.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is the words proposed to be inserted stand part of the Resolution, that is, the words proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those of a contrary opinion will please say "No".

I think the "Ayes" have it.

(A MEMBER: Divide!)

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I understood the Hon. Minister of Education to call for a division.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. COWARD, SMITH, SEALY, LYNCH, GODDARD, and MOTTLEY - 6.

NOES: Mr. BATSON, Honourables E. W. BARROW, W. A. CRAWFORD, J. C. TUDOR, G. G. FERGUSSON, Messrs. LOWE and YEARWOOD - 7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the negative, six hon. members voting "Aye" and seven hon. members voting "No". I declare that the "NOES" have it. The question now is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those of a contrary opinion will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:-

AYES: Mr. BATSON, Honourables E. W. BARROW, W. A. CRAWFORD, J.C. TUDOR, G. G. FERGUSSON; Messrs. LOWE and YEARWOOD - 7.

NOES: Messrs. COWARD, SMITH, SEALEY, LYNCH, GODDARD and MOTTLEY - 6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative, seven hon. members voting "Aye", and six hon. members voting "No". I declare the "Ayes" have it. This Resolution has now been passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR MR. YEARWOOD

Mr. YEARWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask leave of absence from my duties as a member of this House for two months as from today's date.

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

4.40 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. A. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, that brings Government Business for today's Sitting to an end.

I now beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 17th September at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

4.44 p.m.