

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 10th November, 1953.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Mr. G. H. ADAMS B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs. M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, F. C. GODDARD, F. E. MILLER, J. A. HAYNES BJA., J. C. MOTTLEY, E.St. A. HOLDER, V. B. VAUGHAN, C. E. TALMA, Mrs. M. E. BOURNE, Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, L.L.B.

PRAYERS

Prayers were read.

Mr. BARROW entered the House and took his seat.

MINUTES

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting of the House are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPER LAID

Dr. CUMMINS by command of His Excellency the Governor laid the following:—

Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Accountant General by the Commissioner of Police during the quarter ended 30th June, 1953.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE

A Government Notice was given as follows:—

Mr. M. E. COX: Bill intituled an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. Cox seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937, was read a first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: As regards the Address tabled by the honourable senior member for St. Philip dealing with the processing of peasants' canes my ruling is that since 7, sub-section (2) of the Act amending

the Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act entirely covers the points raised in the honourable members' Address, the Address is superfluous.

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking the leave of the House to take Order No. 4 first in order to deal with 4A, the Resolution for \$81,000. If honourable members look at the Resolution they will see that the money is being requested to purchase the Admiralty property at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip. The Admiralty has been getting behind us recently for us to say definitely whether we are willing to buy the property or not. Although I do intend to ask the House to begin to day consideration of Order No. 1—the Message dealing with Ministerial Status—I am asking the House to deal with this Resolution first. I am therefore asking that we postpone the first three orders and take No. 4 as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am not objecting to the shifting of the orders today. I would like to say that I understand that this item is where it is through your Honour's generosity and tolerance in allowing No. 1 on today's Order Paper. It was drawn to the Government's attention that it was a ruling of this House that the fixing of the Order Paper should be done by the House. I bow to Your Honour's ruling, but I want to say that the matter could have been rectified in a manner different from this.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to take Order No. 4 as the first order.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES APPOINTED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am told that the Chairman of Committees may not be coming today. In that case I am suggesting that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew be Chairman of Committees for the day. I make a formal motion to that effect.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded.

The question was put and agreed to without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mrs. BOURNE in the Chair.

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

On the Order being called for Mr. Adams to move the passing of the following Resolution:—

Resolved that the sum of Eighty-one thousand dollars be granted from the Public Treasury and placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1953—54, No. 20, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution, and that the Legislative Council be invited to concur herein, and if concurred in,

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Madame Chairman,—This Resolution, as honourable members will see, is to put the sum of \$81,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to purchase this Six Cross Roads property now owned by the Admiralty. I do not think that anyone, if they consider the purpose for which the property is to be used will object to this Resolution on principle. They might object, not to this Resolution, but to buying it at a fancy price. I think that honourable members will agree that if we have a chance to purchase property we should take advantage of it, as long as we feel that we are not being asked to pay too much for it. I will read the Addendum.

The Addendum says that "the Admiralty wishes to dispose of its property at Six Cross Roads, St. Philip, at an early date". Here I will pause to say that we have been bargaining with them for pretty nearly over a year. They wanted more than we were prepared to give. We told them that we would not give them more than they paid for the property and they agreed. The Addendum continues: "and has given the Government the first option to purchase. It has been decided to take advantage of the offer." The Admiralty could get the property sold otherwise. The Addendum continues: "The land consists of two separate lots which are approximately 32 acres and 16 acres respectively, and for this land the Admiralty has agreed to accept the price it paid in 1948, namely \$24,888." I know that that amount may seem to be a lot. In fact, to us as a Party, all land in this island is too dear. But if honourable members work it out in the basis of prevailing prices they will see that the price in itself is not terrifically high. In fact, it is a reasonable price as things go. We have got expert advice as to the worth of the land, and we have been told that it is reasonable.

The remainder of the Addendum is as follows:—

3. The price for the buildings has been agreed at \$48,000 and this figure is considered to be fair and reasonable. These buildings consist of one control building, complete, one building 90% complete, living quarters, generating room and garages, and the walls and door frame for kitchen quarters. The Government is advised that these buildings could be conveniently converted for use as a school.

4. In addition there are three generating sets in very good condition for which \$7,200 has been agreed upon. This figure is considerably below the market value. These sets are required as stand-by sets at Seawell Airport to replace the existing stand-bys which are now in poor condition and uneconomical to operate.

5. Apart from the proposal that the buildings should be converted for use as a school no precise plans have been made for the utilization of the remaining area of the land, but Government is examining the possibility of using it for Aided Self-Help Housing or for a small holding scheme or both.

6. The sum of \$81,000 may therefore be broken down as follows:—

Land			\$24,888
Buildings			48,000
Generators			7,200
Incidental and Legal expenses			912
			\$81,000

If honourable members need any more information as regards the incidental and legal expenses I will endeavour to give them. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more. We as a government see the possibilities of making use of that land as a start with our first new school. The building is there already. It is also a useful place for the establishment of a small holding scheme—another Seawell Scheme, and I am glad to be able to inform honourable members that the Seawell Scheme is turning out successfully. Although the Government has certain views as to the use of the property we hope that in the course of this discussion honourable members will throw out suggestions. Whatever the Government might decide to use the land for, we will eventually have to come to the House and say we have decided to cut it up into three-acre lots, or whatever else we decide to do with it.

We feel it has been a good thing for us to get this land without the Admiralty putting anything over on us. Buying land for the same price that the original owner bought it for is contrary to usual practice in Barbados. I see the honourable senior member for the City smiling. Perhaps he is smiling because I put it too mildly. Only a lunatic, the honourable member would say, sells a thing for the same price for which he bought it.

I invite the co-operation of the committee in the form of useful suggestions, and I move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ALLDER: Madame Chairman,—I beg to second the motion. (Cheers). I do not think that anyone can dispute the price if it is the same price that the Admiralty paid for it in 1945. I notice that some additions have been made and those have been charged for also. I have for a long time felt that it was a waste to allow such valuable property and buildings to lay idle as they did, and I am glad to see that some step has been made by the Government to acquire this property. I feel that the people of St. Philip and the adjoining parishes will also be glad to know that the property is to be acquired by the Government, and the purpose for which it is to be acquired will, I hope, make them more glad.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has asked for suggestions as regards the best way to utilise the property. There can be no better way, in my opinion, than to meet the needs of that part of the island for a secondary school. While it is true that the parish of St. John has the Lodge School, if you take into consideration the population of St. Philip, which I am told is the largest parish in the island, and if we take into account the adjoining parish of Christ Church, along with St. Philip and St. John, certainly we will agree that a secondary school is the most pressing need. I hope that now they are going to acquire this property Government will consider the demand of these parishes for a school—a thing for which they have been asking for years.

I notice that the total area of land is 48 acres. I think that all of the schemes suggested here can be put into operation without either one embarrassing the other. I feel that the aided self help scheme can be put there, that the adequate playing fields can also be put there and that part of the area can be rented

cut on a co-operative basis like in the Seawell scheme. I think that this is one of the most progressive bits of legislation that has come before this Chamber in recent months. I hope that since the Government has asked for suggestions they will give mine the consideration which I think they deserve. I think that the people of the area would be glad to have a school there. It would mean a great saving to hundreds of parents who now have to send their children to Bridgetown to get their education, and what is more, the congestion in this area would be relieved if the children in this, and the adjoining districts, had another secondary school to which they could go.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Madame Chairman,—I am forced to congratulate the Government. I want to say a word of appreciation for this step that the Government proposes to take. As a representative of the people of St. Philip in my humble capacity, Madame Chairman, I think that this is one of the best things that has happened to them within the last few years. Since the end of the war I have been worried by that property lying there idle. I made enquiries about it at the Vestry Nomination, and I extracted a promise from some of the vestrymen that something would be done about it. I do not know who was the prime mover in making Government consider the acquisition of this property, because it seems to me right now that the Government is not greatly interested in the people of St. Philip. (A Member: That is not true. We want one with us.) Whether you get one or not time will tell. However, I still want to congratulate the Government.

The parish is greatly in need of a secondary school. We of the Vestry, as trustees of the Hutchinson Trust Fund, have been looking around the parish for a suitable building to start a secondary school under the auspices of the Trust. I hope that in co-operation with the Government, the trustees will get this building into operation as quickly as possible. I am sorry that my colleague is not here to-day. I know that he is very interested in this matter. The property, Madame Chairman, is in a good locality, and I hope that without any delay Government will get to work on whatever schemes they decide upon, together with the secondary school and put it into operation.

The question to-day is not whether the price is too high or too low. The question is to acquire this property and to utilise it for the benefit of St. Philip in particular and the whole island in general. I feel that if the Government handles this thing wisely this district can become one of the most important and built up districts of the whole island. Without any further comment, sir, I want to offer my support to this Resolution and I hope that other honourable members will do so.

Mr. LEWIS: Madame Chairman,—Everyone is complimenting the Government on having seized the opportunity to acquire this property, and I suppose that I should compliment them also. My only criticism will be the method by which the money will be taken from the Treasury, and I must have something to say about sending more generators to Seawell. I wonder if I could get any information about that. It seems peculiar to me that the Government should be reluctant to create revolving funds for fishermen or for Civil Servants out of money in the Treasury, but that they should do so out of loan funds, but when it is a question of buying acres and acres of land which will be here for years and centuries if Barbados does not get washed away they buy it out of current revenue. That strikes one as being a very peculiar attitude towards financing. If it is one

thing that should come out of loan funds it is something like the purchase of this land. I do not see in the body of the Resolution any indication that it will come out of loan funds, so I take it that this will be another case of money being taken from current revenue, and then the Government will borrow money at four or five per cent to lend to fishermen, or for a loan to Dodds or for the Civil Service Fund. I suppose there must be an explanation. I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to tell me whether the Government has decided definitely on that policy or whether they have considered it at all.

When it comes to the question of the generators I am wondering when we will ever hear the last about stand-by equipment at Seawell Airport. We have paid endless sums of money in connection with the lighting of the airport; now we are getting equipment from the British Navy and everything is being channelled in the direction of Seawell Airport. They have electricity from the Electric Company up there, and they already have stand-by equipment. Is this additional equipment to be put there and allowed to rot? It really baffles me. I have been asking the Government about getting a generating plant for the Belle Pumping Station. Perhaps these generators are not of the kind that could be used there. If that is so I would like to be told. But do not tell me that you are going to buy equipment from the Americans, equipment from someone else, and now that you are getting generators from the Admiralty you are going to send them to Seawell where you already have stand-by equipment in addition to current from the Electric Company. We know that it would be a serious thing if there was no lighting at Seawell for an emergency or even for a regular landing. It would be a serious matter. But if you buy stand-by equipment and put it there, and then continue to buy such equipment and put it there you will be courting disaster because it will remain unused for a long time and probably become useless altogether. I feel that the Government should reconsider the matter.

I have talked over and over again in this Chamber about the possibility of reducing the cost of pumping water by having a generating plant at the Belle or wherever else you pump water. All that we can hear is that the point is being considered. It has been mentioned long enough for the great Engineer of the Waterworks Department to express some opinion on it. Is he afraid of offending the Electric Company or what? We have to furnish his salary and do a lot of other things. I would like to see some of that expenditure reduced. The cost of pumping water went up considerably after the passing of the Five Year Plan and when we thought we were taxing people to put money into the Treasury we were taxing them to put money into the coffers of the Electric Company.

As far as the suggestion about using this property for a school is concerned I must congratulate the parish of St. Philip. It is one parish that has a committee floating around looking into the question of a school. If we can develop a hospital at Four Cross Roads perhaps a better place for a school would be Six Cross Roads. I do not know if it would be a dangerous spot to put a school at or not. There is one member of the House that made a suggestion to me. Since he is not here now and I am not sure that he will be here before the debate on this Resolution ends I will say what he told me. The suggestion was that the Government might use the generators for giving electricity to the people of the area. If that is not a sensible suggestion I will still

accept the responsibility for voicing it in this Chamber.

Those are my views, Madame Chairman. To summarise I would ask again why take this money from current revenue when land is one thing that you can pass on to posterity. Also, why is it necessary to send these generators to Seawell when you already have stand-by equipment there plus current from the Company? When you take into account all the resolutions that we have passed for wiring and the various changes in the lighting system at Seawell we must be spending something like £15,000 or £20,000 a year by now. One estimate alone that I remember was for £10,000. It would be a good thing for some honourable member to get hold of all the resolutions that have been passed in connection with the lighting of Seawell and see what it does cost.

Mr. ADAMS: When members of the House lose confidence in me and want to get rid of me they can do so; but as long as I am alive I will always reply to the honourable junior member for the City. As I have asked on more than one occasion what earthly difference does it make, if a man has to spend a certain amount of money, which pocket he takes it from. Suppose a man worked for £13,000 a year and to educate his children he had to borrow £200 from a bank. Does it make any difference if he pays the school fees out of the £13,000 or out of the £200 which he has borrowed? The honourable member always gets up and harps on current revenue and loan funds. I would agree if he argued that you should not borrow if you have no need to do so. If you have to provide £10,000 to run a Government, a business or a home does it matter if you take money from the till in your bedroom or from the bank? What the honourable member is harping upon is purely text book theory. The honourable member's argument leaves me absolutely cold. Of course the Government budgets for certain things out of current revenue. Of course when it comes to building a hospital or putting up new parliament buildings you say let posterity help pay for them. But if you have money to spend on the Civil Service, some on hospital development etc. and you have some of the money in the treasury while you have to borrow some, does it make any difference out of which set of money you take what you want for the Civil Service or the hospital?

Mr. LEWIS: I know that that is the honourable member's view, and that that has always been his view. But I had thought he had revised that opinion. I thought that he had become a little more sensible.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Madame Chairman,—I think it is time that the Opposition get in a word. I am not going to associate myself with these complimentary remarks about the Government, because if the Government had passed up an opportunity like this they would be guilty of betraying their trust to the people. It is so often that you hear these complimentary remarks especially if the case affects the constituency of particular members. But I speak on this matter quite disinterestedly. Even though we know that recently the Government of Bermuda would not pay the Admiralty what the latter paid for a property but wanted it cheaper, I will still say that as prices go in Barbados the price of this land is reasonably cheap. It is 48 acres of good, arable land on the main road. That is why I say that if the Government had allowed the opportunity to slip they would have been guilty of betraying their trust. While that is so, Madame Chairman, 20/- in this day might be too much to pay for

a sovereign if you have no need for it. There is, I repeat, no point in complimenting the Government for buying this property. No sane government in charge of the finances of the island could have allowed the opportunity to slip. I accept their word that they tried to get it cheaper. I suppose that at times you must have a conscience. The Admiralty bought this land before prices had soared as high as they have.

In the Addendum we see the proposition about providing a school. Let me say here and now that the Government must realise that they do not have all the brains and ask someone outside too for advice. The school proposal seems to have met with the approval of the honourable junior member for St. Philip and the honourable senior member for St. John, while the proposal about the generators met with opposition from my colleague. I want to say that I share his views on that. I think that a better use can be made of the generators. Of course I agree that the Airport should have all the necessary equipment. But if the electricity from the company is already attached and there is also a stand-by there, where is the wisdom in suggesting that you must have another stand-by? Let the Government seek outside for advice sometimes. I do not care who made these suggestions; they are foolish.

Now that I am talking about outside advice and now that we are discussing the provision of a school for the St. Philip area let me say this: I know that it is going to offend some people; but when it comes to another secondary school or more secondary schools for Barbados it must be apparent, and I believe the Government will agree with me, that one of the best things they can do is to set up some committee an inter-denominational religious committee, since people seem to have more confidence in trusting the education of children to religious bodies than to anyone else. So you should set up such a committee to make recommendations as far as education is concerned.

There is a suggestion that I want to throw out. The land should not only be used as a school for this area but in a way which will affect beneficially all the parishes of the island, especially as you have these generators on the spot. It is well that consideration be given to technical training of youngsters. It is an area where, I understand, efforts have already been made at hewing out the good quality stone which you have in St. Philip. In this country, with the Housing Board spending all the money that it is spending—I do not believe I am original in this; the honourable Leader has already said that it was suggested—Government could exploit every possibility as to whether more houses could not be made of the stone which we have in this country instead of building them out of wood. Therefore, with the generators on the spot, and it is recognised that St. Philip produces the quality stone needed for building, you could develop an industry hewing blocks out of this stone for building. I feel that a greater use could be made of these generators, even if you start a scheme that would only be an incentive to private enterprise, rather than putting them up at Seawell to rot.

I hope that this land will not be another Stockton or another Erdiston. As I have said any price can be too dear if you do not need, or put to any use that which you buy. Of course the Leader of the House thinks that everything is too dear except what he owns. (Mr. ADAMS: I have never yet sold a cane hole.) That shows how much he wants for it; he would not even sell it. However, I agree that the price for the land is reasonable, and that the

Government did bargain with the Admiralty. I am not speaking of St. Philip alone. When we come here we represent the whole of Barbados. I represent Barbados. (A MEMBER: And you represent the Chamber of Commerce). I do not represent the Chamber of Commerce anymore than the Leader of the House represents it. I may represent it in one way and he in another.

I repeat, I subscribe to the views of my colleague that you should not send these generators to Seawell; and I repeat, that whatever is planned, Government after acquiring the land should get on with the job. We of the Opposition often make suggestions and in the future we will make more. We are often told that there is no provision in the Five Year Plan for this or that. Is the purchase of this property an exception to the rule? Whatever it is, I support it strongly. I hope that we will not be asked where is the money to come from. Sometime ago the cry where is the money to come from came from the people on this side of the table. Today it comes from the Government side.

As far as the point raised by my colleague as to whether this money should come from loan funds or from current revenue I cannot agree with the Leader of the House that it does not matter. It certainly does matter. Right here in this town there are people with £30,000 in liquid cash lying down. But it pays them at times to go outside and borrow money and to use it to develop something. I must disagree with the Leader because in my humble opinion Capital Works over and above a certain cost should be financed from Loan Funds. That is my opinion as far as the expenditure of Government Funds is concerned. Perhaps in dealing with small sums it does not matter; but when you are dealing with large sums like \$200,000 or \$250,000 it does matter.

Anyhow, Madame Chairman, I want the Government to get going with this matter under discussion. I believe that something good can come out of it, even if the land is used for a Self-Help Aided Housing Scheme. The Housing Board cannot cope with the whole housing problem at present; so branch out to St. Philip and let the people get houses at a much cheaper rate than at present.

Mr. MILLER: Madame Chairman,—I think it is a great pity that the House has not been given details of the capacity of these generators.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable member will give way for a moment I will tell him that the Government Electrical Engineer was asked to examine this equipment and to make a report; because we questioned the price of the land—the Admiralty asked \$48,000 for it when they bought it for \$28,000; and they agreed they would take what they gave for it—and we at once began to consider that maybe they would want more for the equipment too. We had inquiries made by more than one person, and as I have said, the Government Electrical Inspector was asked to examine the equipment and to make a report. In his report he said that (a) the generators are in excellent condition. (b) The price of \$7,200 which is asked for them is extremely reasonable, considering their condition—a new one costs between five and six thousand dollars. (c) The generators are urgently needed at Seawell as safety standbys in case of a company power failure. These Listers operate on 230 volts whereas the Airport operates on 230 volts and 110 volts. That means that part of the current will have to be transformed. A suitable transformer in good condition was among the equipment purchased from the U.S. Airforce and is available without extra cost.

That, Madame Chairman, is all the information of a technical nature that I have. I will add that

there were various suggestions before the Executive for the use of this property, and the equipment. One suggestion was that the generators should be retained for use as a transmitting station for a Police Training School. The idea of putting such a training school there had already been before the Government. Carrying the generators to Seawell has been put up as a proposal. I asked honourable members to express their views because I did not want them to think that the Government was trying to rush anything through. We have gone into this matter very thoroughly. We have got information which we feel is workable if the House does not come down strongly against this, that or the other thing. Secondary school, a self-help aided housing scheme, a Boy Scout Headquarters, all those things have been gone into. I do wish honourable members to throw out suggestions so that when we decide on any particular matter it will meet with general approval when we bring it before the Legislature.

Mr. MILLER: I was most concerned with the generators. As far as the question of acquiring this land is concerned, I think that getting 48 acres at this price is unusual for the Government. I believe it is the first time in two decades that the Government has got good land at such a price.

As regards the generators, if the Government Electrical Inspector said that a new one would cost between five and six thousand dollars, they must be relatively small generators. I wonder if the Electrical Inspector at Seawell is convinced that he could find use for them. There are three units at Seawell now—two Caterpillars and one International Harvester. I remember that some time ago the Government had a major overhaul of these units carried out, and replacements to one of the units cost more than the first cost of the unit. It was a state of emergency and Government had to keep those units there because there was no current from the company. What I am thinking of is that at the moment you are using the company's power. No sane and calculating individual would think of purchasing and operating a plant with a capacity of 50 to 80 H.P. where electric current from the company is available. That is why the Government was advised to carry the company's supply. It would cost less than to manufacture the electrical energy for themselves. I say that with some knowledge. I operate a 40 H.P. plant. It would cost me 4.25 cents a unit less to use the company's power. Operations at the Belle Pumping Station used to be fuelled with crude oil. They are now fuelled with natural gas. In changing the level of the water the department decided to use the bore hole, high speed type of pump. I am asking the Government not to regard me as any impossible human being. It is just that I am capable of saying something on this question which will be of help to the Government.

The generators will be powered with the Diesel type of engine. Such an engine, with a simple change of a gadget can be made to operate with natural gas. I do not know about the legal expenses. Perhaps, the Leader of the House being a lawyer might not think they are high; but to me they appear a large amount. I do not think it is necessary to go any further. On the whole I think the Resolution is a sensible one. But I would like to express the hope that in the near future one of these generators would be used to keep the Cassava Factory in operation 24 hours a day.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: I would like to offer a word of apology for my colleague who is absent today. I know that this Resolution would be dear to his heart. He has used up much energy in trying to get this property put to some useful purpose.

Mr. ADAMS: I would just like to remind the House that a lot of good can come out of St. Philip sometimes. In 1949 Mr. Garner, who was then a representative of St. Philip in the House, asked the Government whether they were aware of the existence of three powerful generators at this property and suggested a use for them. I am glad to hear the honourable member say that his colleague is interested in this matter, because four years ago Mr. Garner was also interested.

Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox in each case the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATUS DEBATE

On the Order being called for Mr. Adams to move the consideration of His Excellency's Message No. 25/1953 forwarding copies of the correspondence on the subject of ministerial proposals for Barbados:

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have not got for each member a copy of the Address which I am asking the House to pass eventually as an answer to the Message sent by His Excellency the Governor on the question of Ministerial Status. I do not, however, propose to hurry the House in any respect on a matter of so great importance, and therefore it may not be necessary to put the Address in the hands of honourable members even to-night, but I will give the substance of it as I speak.

There is a great probability that the honourable junior member for St. Peter and myself may be leaving the Island on Friday of this week to go to the United States of America in connection with the possibility of an extended emigration of workers. That is why I am asking the House to deal this week with the question of Ministerial Status. We have been asked to send the highest possible delegation—forgive what may seem the blowing of one's own trumpet—who can speak with authority on the matter of sending working men up to the United States. In short, it is almost what happened during the war when Sir Grattan Bushe went up to the U.S.A.; So it has been decided that both the junior member for St. Peter and myself should go. I can say that Mr. Bustamante is almost certainly going. You could not in Barbados let a matter like that slip. Therefore, as I have said, the honourable junior member for St. Peter and myself are likely to be leaving the Island on Friday because it is felt that sending representatives of the people may be more effective than sending an official. Government feels it is better to send members of the Legislature who may be able to speak on behalf of the Legislature, rather than to leave it to an official.

For that reason, Sir, I am asking honourable members to begin to deal with Ministerial Status this evening. I am proposing later, when we are about to adjourn, to move that we adjourn until tomorrow, and we may have to sit also on Thursday. Because of the absolute necessity of having to go on such an important matter as emigration I am asking this House to begin to deal with this other important matter this evening. I do not think that there is a single member sitting around this Table this evening who will object to the principle of Ministerial Status. (A Member: You are wrong.) I really gave credit that all 24 members of the House were intelligent, but I am sorry to have made a mistake. However, Sir, I don't mind a joke. I can

appreciate a joke as much as anyone else. But we are joining the rest of Colonials throughout the seven seas in saying that Colonialism must stop. We say that every country, every race and every set of people must be arbiters of their own destiny. They must govern themselves, and anyone who is a colonial and who does not say that, has the mentality of a slave. He doesn't mind other people governing him.

I start off with the premise that it is fundamental in this age of democracy that every people, whatever their origin, or whatever the origin of their Government might be, feel and agree that it is better to run themselves badly than to be run by someone else.

Of course, it is a matter of academic debate that Colonialism and Imperialism may have brought blessings in their train. I do not think, however, that at this time I will have to try to make out a case for our wishing to have and fighting for self-government, whether absolutely or relatively.

Now I wish to say right at the beginning, as honourable members must have gathered from reading between the lines, that because Barbados was a settled Colony, and because of the fact that the settlers who came here originally came with the ideas of settlers of those days they brought to this Colony laws which existed in Great Britain. Barbadians from the earliest days of settlement followed the traditions and the forms of government of the United Kingdom, and our people rejoice, even more so than the people of Bermuda and the Bahamas—who are still governed by the two Chambers of Commerce of those two countries—our people rejoice in a constitution which prohibits the Governor from having Reserve Powers.

Members of the Labour Party have produced Manifestos since 1940. I would like here to pay tribute to the honourable senior member for Christ Church who one morning, after very strenuous campaigning, sat down with the late Secretary, Mr. Hugh Springer, and myself, between two and three o'clock in the morning, and drafted an election manifesto. From that time we have kept before the public the insistence on the part of the Labour Party that we must have self-government in the sense of having ministerial responsibility—not merely the desire of a nation to run its own affairs, but, because of the inefficiency caused by the divorce of responsibility from power. This Assembly, and of course the Other Place, had absolute power for 300 years but no responsibility, until Sir Grattan Bushe came along and, by what we call the "Bushe Experiment," changed the situation somewhat. The Government for 300 years has had full responsibility and the Legislature only power. Power and responsibility were divorced from each other. I do not think that the honourable member for St. James will feel hurt if I remind the House that it was possible for an Attorney General—not that he established any precedent, he only carried on an established practice—but it was possible for an Attorney General to bring in a Bill sent down by the Government and to vote against it because his constituents sent him to the House and his responsibility was to his constituents. That was the system. It was a system which could work in the old days when planters returned planters' sons or cousins to the House, but it was bound to break down when democracy broke through the ranks of the plantocracy. —, or when in the words of the late Dr. O'Neale, "the floodgates opened to such an extent that there were no longer any gates there."

It is inevitable that with the spread of democracy people must say whom they want to make laws and to govern them, and they must follow the precedents

set by the democratic nations of the world, or we may say, go back to the Mother of Parliaments, the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want that there should be any misunderstanding on anyone's part, high or low, as to what Ministerial Status means. There must be no misunderstanding whatsoever, either by the House or by the potential Ministers, or by the Head of the Administration, or the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Neither must there be a mistake by the Leaders of the Opposition, or the army of the Opposition. But of course there is no Army. I want to be most emphatic. What we are proposing to-day as regards Ministerial Status is nothing different from this: as we put it to Sir Alfred Savage when we first put our views on paper, in all internal affairs there must be absolute self-government. The relation of the Governor to the Ministers must be the relation of the Queen of England to the Cabinet of that country.

I made that clear to the Colonial Office already, as well as to those who should be acquainted locally and I make it clear now, because if I do not make it clear the possibility of a difference may appear in the future and it may be said that it was not understood to be that. I apologise to honourable members if I am a bit jerky in my speech, for though the occasion really deserves a first-class preparation of one's speech, it is not my disposition to prepare a speech. I want to stress that the way in which the four of us—I refer to the four of us from this House, who are on the Executive—approached this problem was to say that Barbados has had representative institutions for a long period—nearly three hundred years—and the Bushe Experiment was overgrown; it being seven years old now. It is therefore impossible to say that it has not had a fair trial, as a matter of fact, it has had a very long trial and it has been successful. Really, we have to thank the heavens that we have no substantial racial minority groups in this island nor any particular difference in culture from each other. We are homogeneous and it makes no difference to us so far as our general outlook is concerned. We start with this great advantage. It is a good thing that we are homogeneous, because by that we have the same general outlook as regards self-government. I need not say this because it is well known that we have all along followed the British system of holding elections for representatives to our General Assembly; we have lowered the franchise and the qualifications for membership to the Legislature, and so on, and, in that way, we have come to the stage when it is impossible to say that Barbados has not reached self-government.

Honourable members may have heard me say this before. For many years in the past, it was a habit of mine to make newspaper clippings of what anybody in an important position in the United Kingdom said about the granting of self-government to a colonial territory as soon as it was fit for it. I have had occasion once or twice to say to some such important persons: "Can you tell me in what respect Barbados is not fit for self-government?" Nobody would answer that question—at least not in the negative. It is preposterous to suggest that Barbados is not yet fit to do so. There are one or two persons who have suggested that Barbados is a small place and it is not ripe for party government, but if those pessimists do not exist we would not be alive. It is nonsense to say that because we are a small community we are not ripe for self-government. That has nothing to do with how large or small a community may be. The form of government may differ in this respect that a small community may

not need as large a government as that of a large community, but to say that the principle of self-government should not be established in a small community and the machinery for putting it into effect is just to talk more nonsense.

I am endeavouring to keep this debate on a high plane and for that reason I do not intend to answer the stupid accusations against members of the Government by Mr. George Hunte in the *Advocate* Newspaper. Honourable members already know that, as to the position of three of us on the Executive, who hold offices in the Barbados Worker's Union, that we have long since made it clear that we will not hold two incompatible offices should ministerial status come into effect; therefore, it is just sheer dishonesty for one to write saying he is looking forward to see what we will do in this respect. There are certain persons who write for the "gutter" press who may write that sort of thing, but one does not expect those who have greater responsibility, like the writers of the *Advocate*, should stoop to such a low level of journalism.

Sir, I have stated in a broad outline what is proposed to be our ministerial set-up and I invite honourable members to agree with me when I say that there is nothing more that Barbados can do now to show its fitness for self-government. Starting with that premise, the four of us from this Chamber, who are members of the Executive, asked since 8th February, 1951, by the then Governor, Sir Alfred Savage, after informal discussions about ministerial status, what was the Labour Party waiting for and why do we not go ahead with ministerial status, I made no secret of our plans, I mentioned that we were conscious of the fact that when ministerial status is set up in Barbados it must follow the highest traditions of government, just as that in the United Kingdom. As I said, matters began to come to hand when, in February 1951, Sir Alfred Savage wrote a memorandum addressed to us, the four members of the Executive, on behalf of the Labour Party, to put forward our proposals for ministerial system. We did not reply until May, 1952, more than a year afterwards and for reasons which I think every honourable member is aware. In our reply then, we took this point of view. We went back to precedent which was that of Canada in 1840, when it was a number of colonies and when Lord Durham made his famous report. We quoted part of that report, which stated that those colonies had reached a stage when perhaps they had to take a risk. They had reached the stage when the British people had to try and reconcile the desire of the people of the colonies to run their own affairs and the necessity for the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain to be responsible for their security, and so on. Sir, we stated that in our memorandum to the then Governor, Sir Alfred Savage, and we have never deviated from it. We have followed the classic suggestion as to the divisions of powers between the United Kingdom and local government. We pointed out that, as long as we followed the British system of government—and it is easy to follow it in Barbados with our British traditions of having a flexible system of conventions in constitutional practice—we could combine the desire for self-government with those safeguards that may be necessary from an Imperial point of view. As we put it to the Governor, we saw no reason why we should deviate from a flexible system of government which British people have occupied and regarded as superior to that of written and more rigid constitutions. We, therefore, feel that the same system of

Cabinet responsibility that has grown up in Great Britain should be promulgated and given to the people of Barbados without a specific statute creating the posts of ministers or the writing up of local enactments to explain the functions, duties and responsibilities of ministers. I may say that, to avoid confusion, it will be necessary to write something in order that ministers and the Heads of Government Departments should know what course ministerial system would follow and what are the conditions. Something should be written to let ministers know on what conditions they are appointed and that they must resign in case there is a "no confidence" in the Government; as well as something should be written pointing out the position between the Colonial Secretary and the Government respectively. Sir, in short, what we, the four members of the Executive, have done is to point out that whatever is the English practice to let it be the Barbados practice. We put that view to the Governor, who put it to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and that is the condition on which we are saying ministerial status is to function in this ancient colony of the British Empire.

In our memorandum to Sir Alfred Savage we stated and I quote:

"What we now affirm is that the decisions in matters of policy in internal affairs should rest with the House of Assembly members of the Executive Committee, as representing the view of the majority party and thereby the electorate".

"As a corollary to this, it is our considered judgment that the Governor in all matters of legislative policy respecting internal affairs must as a matter of constitutional convention accept the advice of his Ministers".

Let me say here now that, if the honourable junior member for St. James, the honourable junior member for Christ Church or the honourable senior member for St. Philip were running this Government, I would say everything I am saying to-day. This matter has nothing to do with a particular party; it is not a party matter; so long as the electors send a party here with a majority; the relationship of those who form the government with the Governor should be the same as the relationship between Sir Winston Churchill and Her Majesty the Queen. What I claim for the Labour Party, which I represent, I also claim for any other party. We would be stupid if we did not accept that; in fact, we will never get anywhere unless we accept that. I think this is an opportune time for me to sound a word of warning. I am suggesting to honourable members on all sides of this honourable House to remember firstly that we are Barbadians and not to in any way play into the hands of people who would like to see us still with only a certain measure of independence and government. Let us all bear in mind that Barbados is our country and we should run it.

I will make two or three more quotations from the memorandum by members of the Executive to Sir Alfred Savage, and perhaps, if members so desire, I can move a short adjournment for tea.

We tried to make the point, and I quote:

"In our opinion, and in the opinion of the Party, for whom we speak, the stage has been reached in Barbados that was reached in other parts of the British Empire when the system of Responsible Government was established in places which nevertheless remained Colonies for many years thereafter".

"We can do no better than to recall the situation that existed in the British North American Colonies

"at the time of Lord Durham's famous report and the solution reached at that time. In this respect, we are all well aware of the difficulties attendant on the initiation of Responsible Government in the Colonies. In the words of the well-known historian: 'The problem demanding solution by an enlightened Imperialist like Lord Durham was how to reconcile a system of government based on complete recognition of Colonial autonomy with the preservation of imperial rights'".

I pass over what was followed then in Canada. We further stated:

"We are well aware that in any division of functions, powers and responsibility, there will be at times overlapping and possibly conflict. But we believe that just as in other places and at other times solutions have been found of advantage both to the United Kingdom and to the Colonies, so in Barbados, giving goodwill in all sides, Responsible Government can and will be effective".

"We are so homogeneous in Barbados and our whole outlook so British that we are convinced that, with three hundred years of representative government, it is reasonable to assume that, as in the United Kingdom, there will be a smooth functioning in the years that lie ahead of the principle of government by a series of constitutional conventions binding alike on the Governor and on his Ministers and the Legislature."

"In other words, whatever functions exist in Great Britain, relating to the appointment of, and termination of, office of ministers: to the summoning, prorogation or the solution of legislature: to the appointment of non-hereditary members to the Upper House; to the acceptance of the advice of Ministers of the Crown; to their collective responsibility; to the position of the Prime Minister vis-a-vis the Crown, the Legislature and the Cabinet; and generally to the exercise of the Royal prerogative in the context of Government by a constitutional monarch should, in purely internal affairs,—as referred to above—be observed in Barbados."

The final quotation which we stressed more than once and which I specifically throw out to honourable members is the excellent quotation:

"Every purpose of popular control might be combined with every advantage of vesting the immediate choice of advisers in the Crown, were the Colonial Governor to be instructed to secure the co-operation of the Assembly in his policy by entrusting its administration to such men as could command a majority; and if he were given to understand that he need not count on any aid from Home in any difference with the Assembly that should not directly involve the relations between the Mother Country and the Colony, This change might be effected by a single despatch containing such instructions".

Sir, before these proposals for ministerial status were written, and in spite of what appeared to us as a brake by Sir Hilary Blood when he was Governor of the Colony, on the Bushe Experiment, everything affecting the policy of the majority party as expended by the four members of the Executive has been put into effect. We have followed the same course as that of the British party system. Obviously, a Governor cannot send a bill to this Place that we are not bringing. We have always insisted on that and, obviously, with ministerial system, it would be more so. I repeat that firstly as Barbadians, not as Labourites, Congressites, Electors Association Members or otherwise, now that we have the chance to run our affairs in the same way as the North American Colonies began to run theirs almost a hundred years ago; in the same way as the Australian Colonies and as the New

Zealand Colonies; we should see to it that we grasp the opportunity with both hands, nor should we waste any more time in our attempt to do so.

Before I ask for the adjournment, I want to say that we, the four members of the Executive, are very conscious of the fact of our responsibility in a ministerial set-up. Let me say that there is more pain in this than pleasure. We are very conscious of the fact. We are undertaking—if we become ministers—the full responsibility of running the affairs of this country, and we know that, unless we can convince the people of this Colony, as represented by the members sitting here, we can be fired overnight. It is a grave responsibility. I do not want to be personal, but a person like myself can always go back and work at his calling; but it cannot be so with everybody. It is a grave responsibility. I wish honourable members to realise that, in this matter, we are not fighting for the Labour Party or its present leaders are not fighting for personal gain, but we are fighting for what we think is justly due to the people of Barbados, and that is the right to be completely and absolutely self-governed in internal affairs.

Rather than go on to a new point at this stage, if the House agrees, I will move the adjournment and, afterwards, I will address you on the Governor's message, paragraph by paragraph.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat while Mr. ADAMS was speaking.

Mr. GODDARD: Sir, without forfeiting my right to speak again on this important measure, can I at this stage move a motion that this debate be adjourned for further consideration? My reason is —

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot entertain such a motion at this moment because there is nothing before this House.

Mr. COX: I beg to second the motion that this House be adjourned for half an hour.

The question that this House do now adjourn for half an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling,

REPLIES LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay replies to Question No. 4 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and Question No. 6 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the House adjourned, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was addressing the House.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment, I dealt exhaustively—though I hope I did not tire honourable members—with the general principles on which ministerial status is based, and with what the members of the Executive, who are from this House, put before the Governor, Sir Alfred Savage, the then Governor and Sir Robert Arundell, our present Governor, and to the Colonial Office. It is clear understanding that we should follow the English conventions both as regards to the relationship of the Crown and Ministers in the ministerial set-up itself. In short, we intend to advance straight away in our general affairs, according to the British parliamentary system. I will just again put to honourable members very shortly the chronological sequence of events. As I have said, Sir Alfred Savage had informal talks with us, the four members of the Executive, as to the nature of the proposed

ministerial set-up and, eventually, he wrote us a memorandum and we wrote the additional memorandum from which I have quoted. The additional memorandum was sent because there was one or two points which we had put, which led to a misunderstanding and it was left to us to send him the additional memorandum to make what we said clear. Following on the transfer of Sir Alfred Savage to another Colony, Mr. R. Turner then acted as Governor and it was he who wrote Despatch No. 303 of the 30th April, 1953, which is in honourable members' hands. It was Mr. Turner who set out, roughly speaking, what had been discussed or agreed upon by Sir Alfred Savage and the Colonial Office on the one side and the House members on the Executive Committee on the other side. Bear in mind the four of us who are members of the Government in this House, and not the Executive as a whole. I have to say this, though with no attempt to attack Mr. Turner, but in order that honourable members should not make the mistake of thinking that every phrase in the Acting Governor's despatch has been accepted as a basis by us. Ours has always been the general, broad basis of self-government; as Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of England, is to the Queen so should the Prime Minister of this Colony, whom we are going to call Premier, be to the Governor. We pressed for that at the Colonial Office. It would be seen in expressions which appear in Mr. Turner's despatch, some things which seem to be a relic of colonialism. The relic of power in the Governor's hands has just not been accepted. I hope I have made that clear. Perhaps some honourable members might make reference to it; some honourable members might feel that there is a catch in it. I will only say that, as long as I am alive, there will never be any catch in it. I shall take the utmost care to see it does not happen as long as I have the honour to be the Leader of the majority party.

I do not propose to go through Mr. Turner's despatch. If honourable members come across any phrase that raises doubts in their minds I hope they will get up and point them out. Let me repeat that the four of us addressed the memorandum to the Governor in order to clear up certain points. Our views were sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and, after a certain amount of correspondence, eventually the Secretary of State for the Colonies sent the despatch which you have in your hands accepting with certain modifications the suggestions made by Mr. Turner, the then Acting Governor. I will deal with the shorter document from the Secretary of State for the Colonies and will make only reference to Mr. Turner's report. I will therefore ask honourable members to look at the Secretary of State's despatch, dated 24th August, 1953. As can be seen, paragraph (1) is introductory. Paragraph 2 reads as follows:—

"The proposals, which I observe have been put forward after consultation with representatives of the political parties and other leading members of the community in the Legislative Council and with the members of the Executive Council, involved the setting up of a ministerial system with the assumption by the House of Assembly's members of Executive Committee of executive responsibility for a number of departments of Government. Subject to the results of consideration of the proposals by the Barbados Legislature and to the comments which follow, I should be prepared to agree to such a change."

I hasten to say what honourable members of this House will approve and that is that our minis-

terial system is better than that of the others in the British Empire.

(A VOICE: A Joke!)

The honourable junior member for St. John cannot help it. He must sneer at members of the Labour Party; but our ministerial system is the best.

(A VOICE: A Joke!)

The Honourable junior member St. John, who said that is a joke, I want him when he gets up to tell us in what respect this set-up falls short of any single constitution in the British Empire—I have not said the British Commonwealth of Nations. Let him tell this House in what respect that of Trinidad, Gold Coast, Nigeria, or even British Guiana is superior to ours. There is no constitution in any British Colony today that has equalled the proposals set out here. I continue to read Paragraph 3:—

“I note that there was almost complete agreement among all shades of political opinion that such changes as might be agreed on should be affected so far as possible by convention and natural evolution rather than by legal amendment to the constitution. I welcome this approach.”

That is the natural evolution of the Dominions today. They all started with the system which we have to develop and to take over responsibility fully in the course of time. There was a time when the British Navy defended Canada; now Canada has its own navy and army and airforce. We have started exactly as the others started.

Paragraph 4:—

“I note also that there was a unanimous agreement that whatever changes might be agreed on, the administration of, and responsibility for, such matters as external affairs and relations, defence and security must remain a matter for the Governor acting through the Colonial Secretary . . .”

As honourable members will see from the portfolios of the five ministers proposed in the set-up, this is the only country in which the Prime Minister will have anything to do with the Police. In Trinidad, Nigeria, Gold Coast, there is no minister who has the slightest thing to do with the Police.

(A VOICE: A JOKE!)

It is sheer undiluted ignorance that has caused the honourable member to make that remark. Let me repeat; there is no constitution in the British Empire today—I say British Empire as distinct from British Commonwealth—in which any minister has anything to do with the Police Force. We have, on the other hand, put up certain proposals. The Police remain, like the Civil Servants, in the hands of the Chief Secretary for matters like promotion and ordinary operations, but in other matters the Police Force is not to be taken out of the hands of the Minister. This is the only Colony in which the Colonial Office has constituted that. It is obvious that, if the Police are to be at the mercies of the particular government in power, we would soon degenerate to a position as it was in the old days of the Christ Church Vestry when a person canvassed for one party and that party won the elections, that person was appointed to the office of Inspector of Poor. When that party lost the elections and another party won, that person would lose his job. That is not fair. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that neither Civil Servants nor the Police should be at the mercy of the particular government in power. It will be wrong if any government in power have to make a policeman or a civil servant lose his promotion if he did not bow down to a particular minister of the day. It is absolutely wrong and therefore we cheerfully accepted that the Police and the Civil Servants should be completely free of political influence.

Paragraph 4. ends:—

“I note also that all consulted agreed that any system introduced now should ensure that the public service and the police should not in the future come under political control or influence. I regard the maintenance of these principles as essential.”

Paragraph 5 states:—

“Save on certain points I do not propose to comment in detail in this despatch on the proposals put forward. They appear to me to be generally suitable for achieving the objects you have in mind.”

Paragraph 6. states:—

“I should be prepared to agree to the title ‘Principal Minister’ which is suggested in para. 13 of Mr. Turner’s despatch for the principal minister. If, however, the title ‘Premier’ were preferred this would be acceptable to me.”

Now, as regards paragraphs 6, it was suggested by the Acting Governor that the title which should be used is Principal Minister. I am told that, in the interviews between even some members of the Opposition and the Acting Governor, Mr. Turner, it was suggested that the title ‘Premier’ should be used, and that is the title which we have insisted on. It may not be the official leaders of the Opposition but I am told that some leaders of the Opposition—some non-socialist members—did put it to the Acting Governor that the title should be ‘Premier.’ We see the Chief Ministers of the Canadian provinces are called ‘Premiers’ while the Chief Minister of all Canada is called Prime Minister, therefore, we are asking the House in its reply to His Excellency’s message to say that we wish to use the title of ‘Premier’.

Paragraph 7. states:—

“Subject to what follows about police I should be prepared to agree that the subjects listed in paragraph 13. of Mr. Turner’s despatch might suitably be made the responsibility of ministers in Barbados and I should regard their distribution as between ministers as a matter for the Governor’s decision in the light of local circumstances and the advice of the Principal Minister. The inclusion of police in the portfolio of the Principal Minister might be considered to infringe the principles referred to in paragraph 4., above that the police should not come under political control or influence. The arrangement proposed in paragraph 14., of Mr. Turner’s despatch, however, appear to me to provide reasonable safeguards against this danger and, subject to their adoption, I should be prepared to agree to the proposal. I attached importance to the establishment of an advisory Police Board such as is proposed.”

Paragraph 7, applies to the police again, and honourable members will see, in the course of that paragraph, that it was discussed and agreed that the British system relating to police should be adopted. It is proposed in matters distinct from the operations or the workings of the police that there should be an advisory committee. It is felt that the non-operational duties of the Police should be in the portfolio of the Premier, and that he should have as in Great Britain a Watch Committee advising him. I may here state that the institution of ministerial system would not abolish the Hospital or Education Boards which are purely advisory boards.

Paragraph 8 refers to what has been set out here. I quote:

“The proposals in paragraph 15 of Mr. Turner’s despatch for the administration of departments of Government, not included in any of the ministerial portfolios would be acceptable to me. I should be prepared to agree that the title of the Colonial Secretary should be changed to ‘Chief Secretary’.

"This would necessitate an amendment of Article 'XXI of the Letters Patent."

I pause merely to say that this is just sentimental to change the title of Colonial Secretary to Chief Secretary. We feel the word "colonial" should be dropped as soon as possible wherever it occurs: just as we now have the title "Colonial Postmaster" we intend to change that to 'Postmaster General'. Honourable members will have to discuss later on whether they are content to be called "members of colonial parliament" or whether they would drop the word "colonial" and take the title "Member of the House of Assembly"—M.H.A. As I have said, the only reason for that is sentiment. We are trying to get rid of colonialism, and to get rid of it we must get rid of the title too.

The next paragraph—9—deals with salaries. It states:—

"I should regard the salaries to be paid to 'ministers as a matter primarily of domestic concern. I should similarly regard the question of 'payment of salary to the leader of the Opposition, 'but I note that the feasibility of such a provision 'would depend on whether such a person could be 'identified."

As can be seen, the Secretary of State for the Colonies says this is a matter for the House. I want, at this stage to say that the contents of this paragraph must be the most moot point which is passing through the minds of honourable members of this House. We should approach this question of salaries most dispassionately. As a matter of principle, if we are following British practice, we should attach a salary to the post of Leader of the Opposition, but the person holding that office should be identified in that position. You should be able to say he is the leader of the Opposition. The idea of Great Britain has been that the Leader of the Opposition may have overnight to step in the shoes of the Prime Minister and carry on Her Majesty's Government. Because he is in that imminent position, he has to be acquainted on the matters of foreign policy and a lot of things which have to be dealt with from day to day. It must be remembered that, if the Conservative Government in England lose power at any time, the relationship between Great Britain and the rest of the world has to be carried on just the same. Therefore, the Leader of the Opposition must be an active politician. I am perhaps stressing the obvious. The appointment of Leader of the Opposition has nothing to do with us. The appointment of Leader of the Opposition rests in the hands of the Governor. He is the Queen's representative. Just as Her Majesty the Queen sends for the winning party after an election, or by convention she sends for the Leader of what would be the winning party, if the pre-winning party had not won—that sounds Irish, but honourable members understand what I mean — it is the duty of the Governor to send for, by convention, the person elected by his party if that party wins the election, and ask him to form a government. It is the duty of the Governor, as the Queen's representative, to send for the person whom he feels would in all probability be able to command a majority and be able to carry on the government. Let me repeat. The appointment of a Leader of the Opposition has nothing to do with the Government. It is purely a matter for the Queen's representative.

Paragraph 10 reads:—

"I do agree that if a system on the lines proposed is adopted it would be suitable that the 'Principal Minister should normally be appointed

"to be a member of Executive Council. I share 'the view that the changes mentioned in paragraph '19 of Mr. Turner's despatch should not be made."

I think that is quite clear.

Paragraph 11, reads as follows:—

"I should be prepared to agree to the formula 'proposed at the end of paragraph 20, of Mr. 'Turner's despatch for regulating the Governor's 'decisions in Executive Committee. I note that the 'formula is not intended to affect the procedure in 'regard to assent to legislation."

As regards paragraph 11, reference is made to paragraph 20, of Mr. Turner's despatch, but as honourable members will see from the Governor's message such matters are to go by party conventions. If honourable members need any further explanation they might ask me, but I believe they know what that means. I need not read the last paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, in this ministerial system, there must be collective responsibility. If a member cannot conscientiously agree to the policy of his party as propounded by the Prime Minister through party conventions, he must keep quiet or resign. I say that with a full sense of responsibility. A Prime Minister, who is so stupid as to abuse his position or to act contrary to the feelings of his Party, will find himself pushed out as Mr. Chamberlain was pushed out of office during the War by his own backbenchers. I do not see any danger of people feeling that there is going to be any question of dictatorship, because it would be a stupid Prime Minister who would want to dictate to members of his party. He should work with them in harmony. If he is in doubt, if there is something that crops up that is not in his — if I may say for our party our manifesto — Labour Marches On — it will be our duty to appeal to our political council, as representative of the Labour Party, to get their views. In short, I am merely repeating the normal conventions that operate the parties in Europe. It will be our duty to hold annual party meetings to get the feelings of the delegates all over the Island as to what our policy should be. Then we would put our policy before them, get them to accept it and then come in here and get it carried. We have got the party system in Barbados, which we intend to work one hundred per cent. on British party system lines. I do not think it is necessary for me to say more, except to refer in more detail to what I consider is the most important thing that has to be done by this House in this message; and that is to deal with the financial proposals.

Let me say here and now—although I am giving ammunition to honourable members to hit back at me — that the financial proposals sent down in this message to which we as members of the Executive agree are very economical and, if we have made any mistake, we have made a mistake in trying to be too economical. The experience I gained — and I speak not merely from reading Mr. Turner's report, but I speak after having conversations with persons in the other Governments — is that you cannot run a ministerial system of government and expect it to be efficient if you run it cheaply. We know how critical Barbadians are in this respect. We know that this House is composed of Barbadians in every sense of the word, and we have endeavoured to pare and cut down and cut down to what we think is the irreducible minimum to run this system. Honourable members do not have to go to Great Britain to know this. Ministerial departments are not all lumped together in a single building. They are all over the place in London. Even in British Guiana, Trinidad, Jamaica

and so on this is true. We are starting with our set-up, as you know, in the upper part of the western wing of the Public Buildings, but in the long run, we will have to make arrangements for a complete set-up for each minister by himself. I would also like honourable members to know that, after all, permanent secretaries run countries. A super permanent secretary runs the United Kingdom and you will find, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot have an efficient ministerial system unless you have an up-to-date, permanent secretariat attached to each minister. But because of physical considerations, we are unable at the present moment to have luxurious quarters and offices. It will therefore pay us by starting with all the offices in that part of the Public Buildings, from one end to the other. The suggestion, as honourable members have seen, is to move out the Public Trustee, who would have to be moved out in any event and put next to the Courts, and to clean out the whole of the top part of that building so as to have the five ministries there. That is the short-term policy. It would be possible, therefore, to have each minister plus the Colonial Secretary housed in that one block. Let me say here and now that the Colonial Secretary is not going to be a minister. This is the only Colony in which there will be no official minister. We have insisted on that. The Colonial Secretary will continue to be responsible for personnel and establishment, defence and security, external affairs, ceremonial and secretaryship of the Executive Committee. Those will be his functions. It will be possible in a short-term policy to have a single permanent secretary to serve two ministers, but in the long-term policy this may not be possible. Owing to the Registry downstairs and all the ministers to be housed upstairs in those three rooms, they all can have the use of the single Registry; but when you have separate ministerial offices each minister must have his own files in his office; therefore the necessity for these extra clerks will arise. The proposals are before honourable members. All are not necessary to be carried out in their entirety now. As an instance, we do not propose to buy the motor van now, but, when the ministries are housed in buildings scattered about Bridgetown, a very cheap pick-up will be necessary. At present, we will continue with motor cycles. Sir, these proposals are inevitable. Doubtless, some honourable members have carefully studied them already. I am aware that the Honourable junior member for Christ Church—I am hoping I am right—whom I promised to give a little longer time to study them, is anxious to have the opportunity to study them in greater detail with his colleagues as well as non-members of the Government. Doubtless, they will go through them critically and make suggestions which they feel should be made. I repeat, not by way of trying to be funny, but with our eyes wide open, we are doing what our better judgment told us. We have cut down to the bone with these financial proposals. Everybody whom we enquired from in the neighbouring Colonies has told us “you can’t run it on the cheap.”

As regards permanent secretaries, I would just like honourable members to look at the salary paid to the Jamaica Permanent Secretary, the man through whom everything has generally to pass to be put on the Principal Minister’s desk. That is the man who, if a minister asks a question, if he could not answer it at the time, he could find the answer shortly afterwards from his files; he is the man who has to make the précis of all the information of a particular subject to put on the minister’s desk. As regards the salaries of ministers, I think it is only fair to tell honourable members, who are not mem-

bers of the Labour Party, that two years ago, the Labour Party had a sort of Scarborough Seaside Conference at Bathsheba, and salaries in the neighbourhood of what you see proposed here were agreed upon. Since then, the British Guiana proposals came along and we had a look at them. There were £1,500 a year for each of the six ministries. I therefore ask honourable members to accept this just as the fact that it was suggested in the Turner Report as regards salaries, following on Sir Alfred Savage’s speech at the beginning of the 1951 Session that, however hard it was to look for increased taxation, we could not afford to let our salaries drop so low that people who were living here, specialists in the first place, would have to give up their work and leave the country for a better salary. Without following that blindly, we might look at the British Guiana salaries, though, when our figures were first mentioned, the British Guiana constitution had not come into operation. That is why we suggested the sum of £1,500 for our ministries, and that is why it has come down here to that extent with a modification and with the Premier given a slight addition. When that salary was proposed for the ministries in British Guiana as well as that for the Trinidad ministries, there was a feeling that a difference should be paid to the Premier, but, as can be seen, each was allotted the same amount.

There are one or two small points which I will make before I sit down. One is—and I say it because, as I have said earlier—it is rather surprising to find the chief writer in the *Advocate* newspaper deliberately saying things which he knows to be dishonest and untrue. He is suggesting things which he knows to be dishonest when he says we have no party government in Barbados, and that we are not following on British traditions, because members of the Government will be holding incompatible offices. Neither my colleague nor myself can hold offices in the Barbados Labour Party when we accept ministries. We know that, because we may have to advise against the very Union or act in a judicial capacity. As I have said earlier, we never made a secret of it that, when we became ministers we would resign. All hon. members probably are just as disgusted as I, to think that the only daily newspaper of this Island constantly makes dishonest references about this Government. The last pronouncement, just two days ago, in that same newspaper under the caption of Mr. George Hunte was that he was waiting to see what would happen. Isn’t that strange when in that very newspaper, on the front page, it carried an article which stated that I said Bustamante should resign from the Head of the Jamaica Workers’ Union since he is holding the office of Prime Minister of Jamaica. It is a convention that a minister should not hold incompatible offices and we are going to observe it.

The other point is to answer the question by Mr. George Hunte. Can it be more dishonest than what Mr Hunte asked about answering the question? He is asking the public to believe that we intend to hold incompatible offices when we are ministers. Too often we let judgment go by because we do not reply to such questions. We may be doing wrong by not answering that question. Could it be more arrant nonsense than what he says further that a minister should, at question time, answer questions put before him, on the spur of the moment. In the House of Commons every question that is brought in is handed to the Clerk and the Speaker has to approve of it and see that it does not conflict with the rules of the House of Commons and so on. Sometimes it takes weeks of laborious work to find out whether that question conflicts with anything. I know that there are a few

M.P.'s who ask questions of finance involving prolonged research in order to save themselves the trouble of doing it. Therefore, it is arrant nonsense for anyone to say or to write that, as soon as a M.P. asks a question in Parliament, the Minister must get up and reply. The question must go to the department first and the reply handed to the Minister in charge. What does happen is that when a Minister replies to a question, supplementary questions are allowed arising out of the answer. If it happens that the supplementary questions are numerous and vary from the question, the Speaker is tactful enough to call on the next M.P. and say "your question". The suggestion that when ministerial status comes into being a minister will have to get up and reply to a question as soon as it is put is misleading the public and Mr. George Hunte knows when he says that, that he is misleading the public. Mr. Hunte is a gentleman who has spent many years in London. A question will have to be put to the appropriate member of the Executive before a reply can be given.

Sir, we will go on as usual with the procedure of this House. I do hope we will tighten up a bit in such things as a particular member repeating himself. Barring such things, we do not intend to depart from the procedure we have been following all the time.

Having spoken at so great a length—I did it deliberately because this is the most important thing in the lifetime of any of us sitting around this table, probably the most important thing since Slavery, and it was necessary that I should do so in order to cover every bit of ground and not to leave out anything for any honourable member to think that I purposely avoided it—I am willing to adjourn this House early in order to give a chance to honourable members, especially to the honourable junior member for Christ Church, to put their thoughts together before speaking. Government certainly is more than willing—I say anxious—to give them every possible opportunity. As I have said, this is not a party matter. It is an important development in our history. If honourable members think at this stage that there should be an adjournment, whatever they are willing to do, the Government is pledging that it will do. I would say this, that it is absolutely necessary that this debate be finished before the next two days, when two honourable members from the Executive, including myself, will have to leave the Island. Therefore, I hope that we will finish debating this question if we take to-night, to-morrow night and Thursday night to do it in.

Consequent on the Message from His Excellency, I am asking honourable members to agree to a reply along these lines. I have a written Address but it is not in sufficiently good form—only portions of it. I am therefore going to move an oral Address, if the House will permit me. I am moving, and I hope honourable members will agree to it, that the House agree with the proposals of His Excellency's Message and the financial proposals set forth therein. I will get a printed copy ready as soon as possible to put in honourable members' hands, and then, if they wish to do so, they can move amendments or amplify on it.

Perhaps some honourable member can second the motion for the passing of this Address and then move the adjournment if the House so desires. It is only fair to say that the honourable junior member for Christ Church, who seems to be the official Leader of the Opposition, has asked me to grant him an adjournment until to-morrow, when he will be able to address the House, and I am quite willing to do so. I am not forcing matters. If the majority

of honourable members would like to have a little more discussion tonight, perhaps some other honourable members may speak, but I would assure honourable members who may be ready to speak to-night that, as far as I am concerned, I am not desirous of closing debate on this matter tonight.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second the motion. In so doing I wish to say that the Leader of the House has indicated that the Leader of the Opposition —

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member seconding the motion for consideration of the reply?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am, Sir. As I was saying, the Leader of the House has said that the Leader of the Opposition has indicated his willingness to have a postponement of this debate. I am not challenging that, but I do know that there are Members of the House other than members of what is called the Official Opposition who would like to have an opportunity of speaking on this matter tonight. I do not see why they should be deprived of that opportunity because three particular members want to discuss among themselves a matter which they have had for the last seven days, and with which they have not yet found time to deal. In an important matter such as this there should be, I think, a statement of policy right away.

I rose only to second the motion so that the debate might go on, although there is nothing much that I can add to what the Leader has stated. This is not a Party matter. Much has been already said about Ministerial Status. This House passed an Address in 1949 on the matter, and I do not feel that there should be any member of this House today who has not yet made up his mind as to whether he is in favour of it or not. I used to hear at one time from the Opposition that there were certain things with which they would agree if we had Ministerial Status, and what worries me now is to find that there is such a thing as an Opposition Party, and that on this question which was one of the platform planks of the Party they have not yet made up their mind one way or another on the general way of debating this question. There is no mass of documents to study. The only document that needs study is Mr. Turner's document. From the opening of this House in this Session the Leader and Members of this Party have made it clear that this question would have to be debated. You cannot excuse anyone for saying that he did not know anything about it, or that he has not sufficiently read these papers to make up his mind.

I think that the point that you will have the greatest discussion on—and the Leader of the House could not have spoken on it as someone else could—is the question of salaries. I know that that question is going to be the greatest source of worry for some people. Of course Ministerial Status would be all right, but the salaries proposed is a different matter. I suppose they will feel that the Leader of the House is a lawyer and could make £1,500 or £2,000 a year. Some lawyers tell you that they cannot live on less, and the Leader is not one of those sand side lawyers who make that amount. So they will not regard that salary as too much for the Leader. The Deputy Leader is another professional man, and there is no suggestion that he is not in a position to earn this salary. I may be wrong, but I think I am interpreting what the Opposition will say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from our point of view we feel this way. The Premier or the Leader of this House should not be in any inferior position to any official other than His Excellency the Governor. Working on that premise a salary of £2,000 a year for any man who is Premier and who has received

a mandate from the people is not too much. I feel that the Leader or Premier should not hold any position inferior, to, say, that of the Colonial Secretary or the Chief Justice. The salary which Mr. Bustamante gets is not superseded by that of the Colonial Secretary of Jamaica, and I do not see why in Barbados there should be any question of inferiority in the position of the Premier in relation to the Colonial Secretary. The Ministers should be in a position to carry out their Ministerial duties.

I do not want to be personal, Sir, but the Clerk of this Chamber gets a salary in the vicinity of £1,250 per annum. No one will suggest, with all due deference, that Ministers whose responsibility supersedes that of any Head of a Department, in that the Minister is not answerable to the Governor but to the public, should draw less salary than the Head of a Department. The Minister's conduct has to be such as to satisfy the wishes of the majority of the people of this Island, or he will have to give up his post. For him there is no pension and no security of tenure. The only security of tenure he has is the support of the electorate, therefore I cannot see how any person in his normal senses could begin to look at the salaries and to say that they are exorbitant for Barbados. You must either have Ministerial Status on a proper scale or not at all, because if you attempt to run it on a cheap scale it will become farcical.

Someone was suggesting that I should not make this reference. You should not hide your head in the sand like the ostrich. Just as in the scriptures they asked the question, "Where are the nine?", the moot question to-day is, "Who is the fifth?" I shall first of all say that there are as yet no Ministers at all. The Ministers will have to be selected by the Premier, and to my mind worrying oneself over who will be the fifth is worrying oneself unduly. The fifth Minister is a jackpot question. I think it will be a good thing for some organisations that run raffles and sweeps to have a hat sweep with the 24 members of the House and ask people to take out the fifth Minister and whoever gets him will draw the first prize.

I think I have said enough. We are not the Members who want to go home, or who have not yet made up our minds on this matter. We shall not be afraid of any newspaper which writes about our discussing matters at mid-night. If any matter deserves to be discussed at midnight, discuss it at midnight and half an hour later. The Members of this Party have walked about until morning campaigning in this country. Not at twelve o'clock in the day. Those who opposed us told the public not to vote for us, but the people still elected us, and there is no use worrying about a newspaper. I would not have any difficulty in discussing such a matter as this at midnight. If anyone wants to go home, let him go. There is no lock on the door. When we want to discuss certain important matters at mid-day certain members stay outside and do not come in to form a quorum. I have seen many a Member in the Lobby, refusing to come in and you, Mr. Speaker, had to adjourn the House for want of a quorum. If we are accused of discussing public things at midnight we do so in the public interest, and not in the interest of any individual member.

Mr. Speaker, I think enough has been said. The Leader of the House made an excellent speech. It was a speech that any editor or sub-editor worthy of his name would have published in full, and I hope that that speech will be published in the *Beacon* newspaper or in pamphlet form so that the people can read what he said. I feel that we are too prone

to let pass as just another event historical occasions such as this. We do not revere them enough. We should preserve the best of the speeches that have been made on such occasions. I feel that the speech which the Leader of the House has made is one, the reading of which should not be confined to the privileged few who read the Official Gazette. The Official Gazette has too small a circulation for it to be said that you should publish what members say in the Official Gazette so that the people should be able to read it. You do not expect the only daily newspaper to think of carrying the Leader's speech in full. They have to reserve space for advertisements, which are more profitable and paying. But we hope that other organs which are not concerned only with making money but who are also interested in propagating good news, will see that this speech is published in full.

I have much pleasure in seconding that motion.

Mr. MAPP: Mr Speaker,—I had hoped to speak on this question this evening after listening to the views of Honourable Members on the other side. I feel sure that the Opposition must have views on a matter of such importance. I had therefore hoped to retain my fire — if any — until that time, but I see them all remaining comfortably in their seats. On a question like this which is of national importance and not Party importance, I feel that Members of the House should not be lax in stating their opinions. After all, Sir, we have read from Mr. Turner's report that Members of the Opposition and other groups whom he did not mention discussed this matter with him, and expressed their views, and their views have been taken into consideration, so we have to assume that members on the other side were acquainted with what was going on, a privilege which some of us until recently did not have — I mean the Back Benchers of the Labour Party. The other side knew what was going on, and therefore they do not require any week or two weeks to make up their minds as to what approach they will adopt towards the question of Ministerial Status.

I will start off by saying that as the one who handled the Address which was introduced into this House in 1949 urging Ministerial Status, I am very glad indeed to see that after a long interval it is before us in concrete form. I will say, Sir, that as far as the "Bushe Experiment" is concerned I think that this House and the people of Barbados as a whole should extend a tribute not in any Party spirit, but above Party spirit, to the manner in which the four Members of the Labour Party on the Executive Committee have worked that experiment so far. A tribute like that would not be generous; it would be deserving, because we are the only Colony which has worked such an experiment, and the experiment being a half-way house, is difficult to work. If it has been worked successfully we know that it is due a great deal to the fact that at the head of the Labour Party and at the head of the Government there was a man who was strong enough to, and who could instil a sense of discipline into the Party. I pay that tribute to him because it was a system which needed a strong personality to work it. We, the Back Benchers of the Party, have often felt a sense of frustration at the way in which things were working at one time under the experiment, and there was sometimes a clash between some of us and the Leader of the House because in his vision of the future he always tried to have a disciplined Party, whereas the Back Benchers knew that we could not put the blame on someone if things were going wrong in certain departments. We had at the same time to preserve a sense of Party discipline, but as I have said, it led on

certain occasions to a sense of frustration and some clashes that were due particularly to the fact that we were working a half-way house, and the members of the Government could not assume complete responsibility and could not be blamed for certain things. At the same time we were told that heads of departments must not be criticised because they could not publicly answer the criticisms. We were therefore very anxious to see that halfway house come to an end, and to see the system go on to something further, something more concrete, something based on a better foundation than the experiment was, and that something inevitably had to be Ministerial Status.

I say inevitable because it is the only logical development of the "Bushe Experiment." It had to happen sooner or later, and the sooner the better. The Leader of the House has already explained the reasons why we could not have Ministerial Status before. The "Bushe Experiment" was an inefficient system of Government, owing to the fact that the pseudo Ministers did not have complete responsibility for the departments with which they had to deal in this House and in the Executive. I, Sir, welcome the proposal for Ministerial Status, and I heartily applaud the speech of the Leader of this House which he has made here tonight. As a writer in a Trinidad newspaper has said, he can really speak as no one else can for the people of Barbados, and if the people of Barbados did not have the Labour Party and the Progressive League working and speaking on behalf of the people of Barbados I do not see how we could go forward to self-government. It is only because the Gold Coast has a disciplined Party that Dr. Nkrumah can speak for the people of that Colony as a whole, and that they have got where they are to-day. It is only because Jamaica has a party system with two Parties that they are where they are today. Trinidad is in a chaotic state, and I do not know if they know where they are heading because they have not got a Party system. Barbados is in the fortunate position that we have a Leader and a party to speak on behalf of the people of Barbados, and to tell the Colonial Office our views. I think that a tribute should be paid where it is due, and Barbados in future will realise the debt that it owes to the pioneers of the progressive movement who to-day can take the foremost places in working towards Ministerial Status and self-government.

I, Sir, at this stage would like to suggest this. I do not see the British Government, especially when a Conservative Government is in power, giving small islands like Barbados complete self-government. The Leader mentioned in his speech internal self-government. I do not know exactly what he means. Probably this is what he means: That we cannot claim complete self-government until we have self-government in matters affecting other countries. Obviously we are too small. Even in internal affairs I say that the prospects are limited for running our own affairs completely unless we enter into federation at the earliest possible moment. That is my opinion. It was my opinion when I was in England during the Festival, after having talked to some members of Parliament and hearing what stress they put on Federation, and how willing they are to see us federated, and how they say that it is only when we federate that we will have self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that I hope that constitutional developments in the individual colonies such as this will not hamper federation of the West Indies because however you look at it, this is an important step for Barbados, but it is no

substitute for Dominion status, and Dominion status, I am assured, will only be achieved when we enter Federation. That is why I say that I hope these constitutional developments in the individual colonies will not impede our progress towards self-government. I hope that we will still devote our time and energy to achieving Dominion status through having a West Indian Federation.

I will now return to Ministerial Status. I am very glad to see that there has been a departure from some of the proposals put up by Mr. Turner. I am not going to be critical of the attitude of the Colonial Secretary, but, Sir, it must be a pleasure to all Barbadians who want to get away from Colonialism to hear that the Leader of the House has definitely stated that the relationship existing between the Queen and the Cabinet of Great Britain will also be the relationship existing in this Island between the Governor and the Ministers. I think, Sir, that the public of Barbados will applaud that statement because all that was contained in Mr. Turner's suggestions simply meant having a few Ministers and making the members of Executive Committee Ministers, while in substance we were not getting anywhere at all. So I am pleased to hear the Leader of the House say what he did. Obviously, it is useless to have a Premier in name who cannot act as such. You will only have a high-sounding name and salary, and when you get down to brass tacks it will be the Governor or the Colonial Secretary who will be having the real power and who will be bossing the show. If you are going to have a Premier he should be the boss. He must say what the policy is. If a Minister does not agree with him fundamentally the Minister should resign. If he is man enough he will do as Mr. Bevan did and resign from the Government. He will give up all the lures of his office and come back and sit as a Back Bench. So I am very glad to hear that the convention which obtains in Great Britain will obtain here also, because there is no use having a Premier in name and not in fact. Let him be the Member of the Government interpreting the views of the Party along with the other Ministers. Do not let us have the policy of the Colonial Secretary or that of some other official coming before this House instead of the policy of the Party. That is a fundamental step forward. That is the real thing. That is the really important step forward in these proposals. Whichever Party is in power that Party will be responsible for dictating the policy of the Government. The Ministers will not only be coming down to the House and acting as mouthpieces, but dictating the policy of the Government in all the Departments of the administration of the Government. When we have arrived at that stage we can say that we have progressed.

Now, Sir, there is little more that I can add to what I have already said about these proposals. For us who have discussed this matter very thoroughly already it is difficult to say much more than we have already said until we have heard contrary views. So far, those contrary views have not been put. Obviously this matter has already been agreed upon, not only by members of the Government but by members of this Party who were consulted on every aspect of the proposals. So, as I have said there is not much that you can add unless you hear contrary opinions.

The honourable junior member for St. Peter referred to salaries and costs. I agree with him that if Ministerial Status cost nothing at all many people would not object to it. As long as it does not affect their taxation it would be all right. Although it is costing the barest minimum possible they still raise a howl and say that we cannot afford it because it

is too costly. Such views are obviously conservative. Those people are not looking at the spirit of these proposals. They are merely concerned with their pockets. But they do not speak for the people of Barbados. They do not interpret the wishes of the people of this Island. They are small souls who can only measure things in terms of money. From what I have seen in these proposals I do not think they mean one extra cent in taxation. One writer has said that we have a big staff in the Colonial Secretary's Office, and he has asked why we need to bring in more staff, but he does not know, and has not even read that we are using the present staff of the Colonial Secretary's Office in the proposals. There is an old saying that "a cheap thing is no good". But there are people who would not like to see Ministerial Status succeed at all. They would prefer to go back to the days prior to the "Bushe Experiment" and back to the dead weight of Colonialism. So they would like to see Ministerial Status collapse. There are some people who are disappointed that Barbados is not like British Guiana. Many people are hoping to postpone the implementation of these proposals for a long time. But people on the other side have already discussed it. They want a lot of postponement because they want to see Ministerial Status collapse, and I think I am right in saying that that view may be shared by some high officials in this Colony. They want to say that the coloured boys cannot run anything. The Malays do not want to see the Nkrumahs come up by their side.

This is something that concerns Barbados as a whole and the West Indies. It does not concern Barbados alone. Eventually it concerns the whole West Indies because we are a part of the West Indies, and if we cannot run our own affairs how can we find representatives to run West Indian affairs? I say again that there are some mean-spirited people among us who on the surface may not be offering opposition, but deep down they want to impede the progress of this Island, hoping that this further constitutional development will end in a failure. I hope, Sir, that whatever our personal opposition may be we will put it on one side in this debate and discuss these proposals from the highest level. So when it comes to costs, I say again that it is very easy to approach the matter in a partisan manner and to say that it is too expensive. But the people who say so are those who want it to break down. I have seen nothing in these proposals to suggest that what the Leader of the House has said is not true. Ministerial Status will be worked on the barest minimum possible. Sometimes, Sir, I wonder if some people in the West Indies really deserve self-government. When I read the speeches made in certain Chambers and recently in the Trinidad Legislative Council and see certain actions of the Trinidad Government I wonder if they realise that our destiny lies in our hands, and unless we act like men and not like children we cannot go on to greater things. When you read about the attitude of native West Indians to fellow West Indians you are bound to wonder if these mean-spirited people know that they are hurting the cause of the West Indies as a whole. I say we should make sure that we in Barbados rise on this occasion and champion the cause of West Indian freedom and West Indian progress by looking at this question from the highest possible level, and approaching it in the only way in which it should be approached. Leave out partisanship, personalities and Party, and look at the Island as a whole.

I have referred to the Trinidad Legislative Council debate. If one particular speech stood out during that debate in that Chamber it was one in which it was stressed that in a thing like Ministerial

Status the Members of the Government and the Colony as a whole should make sure that they do not try to work it on too cheap a basis. If you say that you regard a Minister in the same way that you regard, for instance, a man on the lowest rung of the Civil Service, you will eventually cheapen the whole idea of self-government and the whole status of the representatives of the people. So Sir, I feel that the fears of the junior member for St. Peter are really unnecessary so far as this House is concerned, although he did not address his remarks to this House alone. But as far as this House is concerned, I am sure that we will approach this question from a high level and that we will not indulge in any cheap talk about these salaries.

There is another important point on the matter of cost, that is, the question of offices. I have considered these proposals very thoroughly, and I must say I prefer the system used in British Guiana. I am in favour of having a block of Ministerial offices where the Ministers will be close together, and where they will be close to Government House, so as to avoid having to purchase vans, etc. In fact, Sir, although this House has not yet made a final decision, the question of Parliamentary buildings was discussed in the Five-Year Plan. I feel that, in the light of these proposals, it would be a good idea to use the spot near Government House for Ministerial offices, even if we do not build new Parliament buildings. I say again that the system which obtains in British Guiana is the best one. It can be said that there is no need for any priority, as far as Parliament buildings are concerned. We are very comfortable here, although we do have to use fans when it is hot, and it is true that the acoustics are very bad except when honourable members are indulging in asides. I think that Government should give some consideration to having the Ministers' offices in one block, even if they leave out the question of new Parliament buildings. I have been told that we have the best Parliament buildings in the West Indies, so we should acquire the lands at Government House as suggested in the Five-Year Plan, and use it for the erection of ministerial offices. I am more in favour of that than of having ministerial offices put all about the place. That may be necessary in London where there are many Ministries, but I do not think it is necessary in a small Island like Barbados. Put the offices close together so as to save unnecessary time having to run long distances.

The Leader of the House has referred to some writer who likes to see his name in print and who writes all kinds of nonsense. This writer has written about question time in the House of Assembly. It has been said that question time is the backbone of democratic government, because it is the time when the representatives of the people can find out things from the Ministers and from the Government about their constituencies, little things that you do not get in debate. But as the Leader of the House said, it is foolishness to talk about giving an immediate long reply to questions put by members. Members should give advance notice of these questions, so that the Ministers can look up the matters asked about and get the necessary information. What I am hoping is that simultaneously with the bringing into effect of these proposals Government will act on the recommendations of the Printing and Debates Committee as to staff. You cannot have an efficient system of Government without an efficient and up-to-date Parliamentary staff. I think we should attend to our own Parliament and see that it is run efficiently. (A Member: What is that to do with Ministerial

Status?) Some honourable member has asked *sotto voce*. What is that to do with Ministerial Status? The Leader of the House has said that he hopes to have the Party system working so well that you will have delegates in order to keep the people in constant touch with what the Ministers are doing, in order to keep the public opinion alive. I am hoping that the Government will see to it that this House also keeps the people fully informed about what we are doing, and that they will take steps to have an increased and more efficient staff, so that we can get debates out properly and quickly after they have taken place. I think that is a very important question.

After all, Sir, one of the reasons why we look forward to Ministerial Status is because in the past we were not satisfied with Ministers having to work for their own living outside, and not being able to give full time and attention to their ministerial duties. One of the advantages which will arise from the new system is that Ministers will have at their finger tips all the matters relating to their departments. They will be in office day after day seeing after their departments. They will be acquainted with everything going on in this Island and in the administration of Government. They will be able to give us more information in this House so that we can pass it on to our constituents. But it will be useless to have them working full time and for them to be able to give this House a better account of what is going on and then to have a long delay in the publication of the debates, so that people will not know what is going on and what has been said in the House of Assembly. So I hope that implementation of the proposals put up by the Debates Committee of which Committee I am a member, will come down in the near future.

Now, Sir, I am well aware that this is a natural evolution of the system of democratic government, specially in a small country. You cannot get everything at once. You have to advance gradually, but if there is one thing I would like to see ended in the near future it is the system of having nominated members sitting in the Government, even though they may not agree with the Government's political views. Many times the honourable senior member for the City has said in this House that he knew what the Government was about to do before the members of this Party knew, and the Honourable Leader of the House has replied by saying that the honourable senior member for the City had ears that other people did not have. But we can guess where he gets his news from. Anyhow, Sir, I will not pursue that point any further. I am not by implication or otherwise saying that people bring out secrets. What I am saying is that the system of having nominated members in a Cabinet can lead to a serious situation where you have people not elected by the people and who do not agree with your political views sitting and listening to all that you are saying. I know that we are a small Colony, and we will be told we have to evolve, but I hope that we will not take a century to evolve. I do not think the Leader of the House will agree to take a decade to advance to that stage. I am just throwing it out in the hope that in the not distant future we will see a further step forward in which this anomaly of having nominated members who do not agree with you sitting on the Government will end. As a brilliant constitutionalist has said, the fundamental point about the British Cabinet is that you advance to a stage where there is as little compromise as possible. We do not want to have a Dictatorship. The constitutional evolution of British Guiana reached a stage where it was necessary that the Governor and the Ministers should work at least in some form of co-operation. I do not see how a Governor could dis-

miss the Ministers or call for an election and get around the constitution in this way without the constitution breaking down. I am referring to the constitution of British Guiana as it was before the recent crisis. But Barbados is ahead of British Guiana. The Members of our Government have not been influenced by Communism. They could not be influenced by it. A level-headed Barbadian would have to go off his nut to do what Dr. Jagan and some others have been accused of doing. We are a bit too stable, and even too conservative in certain aspects of our nature.

Sir, I say again we have reached a stage beyond being just another territory in the British Empire. If we have reached that stage and have caused the British Government to have confidence in the people of Barbados why retain such a drawback in our constitution of having to compromise unduly? Happily, where you have strong Leaders and where you have a strong Premier you do not fear that there will be much compromise. But we are not working this system for to-day or for tomorrow. We are going on from there, and we should be in a position where our policy will not be dictated by outside people who are nominated by the Government and who are willing to water down the policy of the Party. That is the next stage. Another step is to tell the Legislative Council exactly what their relations to this House must be. Obviously, that is a question that must be decided upon in the very near future. We cannot leave it to chance or leave it in mid air. We should have some Parliamentary Bill passed regularising the relations between this place and the Other Place.

I say again, Sir, that I feel that the people of Barbados, who have seen the "Bushe Experiment" worked and who have seen the way in which the members of the Government have worked that experiment, welcome this new step forward as an expression of confidence in the abilities of their leaders. I hope that we will approach this matter from the highest level and that there will be no unnecessary delay in replying to the Governor's Message. The future of this Island, Sir, lies not in the hands of the Colonial Office but in the hands of the people themselves, and of their representatives. It lies in the hands of the people they elect to speak on their behalf. I feel sure that we will go on to higher things and eventually attain greater responsibility in directing our own affairs.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, — On a Message of such importance having such an important bearing on the life of every man, woman and child in this Island, I feel that each and every member of this Chamber should make some contribution. (Cheers) In the position in which we are to-day we have either to go forward or to stand still. Whether we accept Ministerial Status as a forward movement or a backward one we should decide here and now whether we accept it or not. I am not quite sure if we should. My mind is not yet made up on that point. What I can say is, that the result of our decision to-day will re-echo down the ages to countless unborn generations. (Cheers) If we are truly responsible men sent here by the majority of the electors to represent their interests by taking decisive action we must either support this Message or reject it. Every change is a risk, but as responsible men and women we are bound to take risks. This is a constitutional change we have either to accept or reject. We have often boasted that we are the oldest responsible Government in the British Dominions. Well, to-day we are called upon to put this boast into concrete action by accepting or rejecting Ministerial Status. I hope that it will be

accepted for more reasons than one. There is an old adage which says, "Good things no cheap", therefore if we dwell on the financial implications we will never get anywhere. We have to look further than that. If we are to join the rest of the world in constitutional development we have got to accept this. If our voices must have any influence with the people of Tobago, Trinidad and the other West Indian islands we are bound to accept this, and let posterity tell us whether we did wrong or right. We have to accept it now.

I do not think that this Message calls for prolonged debate because I feel that we are people in our full senses, and we understood about this matter long before now. We have to make a decision as to whether we want to join the rest of the civilised world and go on to victory or to stand still or to go round and round in circles in the morass of time. We are presented with an opportunity to inscribe our names with a golden pen on the pages of history and to tell posterity that 23 men and 1 woman have decided that this is a step that Barbados should take.

I would like to say this to the Honourable Leader of this House. We have got to have Ministerial Status, and I would suggest to him to use the most brilliant men in his party to fill these posts, so that the interests of Barbados may not suffer because of the putting of the wrong men in the wrong positions. (Cheers).

DEBATE ON ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 8.45 o'clock.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—It seems to me that every one is waiting to hear what the Opposition has to say. I am going to move an amendment to the motion that has been made. I am going to move that the House adjourn until tomorrow at 3.00 o'clock. I am doing that for this reason. When the Leader of the Opposition was leaving he told me that the Leader of the House had said that he would adjourn at 8 o'clock. (Mr. Adams: I said, if it was the wish of the House). That is right. If it was the wish of the House. It is not that we want to get to bed early, but in view of the fact that the Leader of the House has just drafted the reply to the Governor's Message we were hoping to get a chance to study it. Just reading it through is one thing, but studying it is another. May I be permitted to say, Sir, that the reply which is drafted by the Leader of the House will be a reply to himself, so to speak. I am sure that he will give us an opportunity of saying whether or not we agree with everything in that reply, and if we want to make some amendments to it. Even if honourable members have some anxiety about passing the reply tonight I am not making any reference to adjourning the House for two or three days. I appreciate the fact that the Leader has to leave for California on Friday. What I am saying is that we should adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow so that we on this side might make our contribution to the debate on these proposals. The members of the Party are few, but I will say that when this matter was being discussed at a very high level it was clearly stated that there was need for the Opposition, small as it is, to put in its views. I do not think that anyone will deny us the opportunity of making a full contribution although it is the right of the House. The Leader of the Socialist Party and other members of his Party have made their contribution to this debate. It remains for the members on this side of the table to make their contribution. I have

just got the reply drafted by the Leader of the House, and we have had no time to go through it. I therefore beg to move that the House adjourn until tomorrow at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I am speaking purely on the motion for the adjournment. I did tell the honourable junior member for Christ Church that I did not want to give the impression that the Government has its eye on any particular person as the Leader of the Opposition. No one will deny to members who want to speak an opportunity to speak. No one would dream of stifling debate on such a subject. I am not pressing one way or the other. I wish I were in bed now. The honourable member is speaking as if we were trying to force a decision tonight. That is not so. We want everyone's views. But if there are other members who want to come back after dinner and speak why stop them? Let the honourable members who want to, come back tomorrow and speak, but do not stop anyone who wants to speak tonight. If honourable members vote for the amendment I will go home cheerfully. If they vote against it I will sit cheerfully and listen. I did tell the honourable member for Christ Church that if the House was not opposed to it I would wind up the debate at eight o'clock. I am in the hands of honourable members.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am going to second the motion made by my colleague. I have endeavoured to assist the House and to assist you, Sir, in harmonising conflicting views. I was told by the honourable junior member for Christ Church—

Mr. SPEAKER: If honourable members will desist from making speeches which are not intended for my ears it will be of great benefit to this House. If they persist in making such speeches which certainly are apt to throw the honourable member addressing the Chair off his feet, I will certainly claim disorder in the Chamber and may adjourn it.

Mr. LEWIS: As I was saying, I was told by the junior member for Christ Church that there was difficulty under the rules, and that the Leader of the House had told him that he would adjourn at 8 o'clock. The Leader of the House knows that if he wants the House adjourned it will be done, and that on the strength of that the honourable member for Christ Church left this Chamber.

I will say, Sir, that the reply to the Message has only just been handed around, and it will serve no useful purpose to press the House to continue tonight. This is a matter which deals with setting up Ministerial Status, and members of the Labour Party stand to benefit from it. I would feel proud of the fact that I did give way on this occasion and allowed the debate to continue tomorrow rather than insist that it be continued or to let it go on as it has been going on. The proper thing would have been for the Leader of the Opposition to have started to debate the reply after it had been moved and seconded. I feel that the Secretary of State for the Colonies would take a dim view of this debate if it was said that the Leader of the House promised that he would adjourn and then objected to doing so.

Mr. ADAMS: I have said already, and I am saying it again. I wish to heaven I were in bed. I said that I would adjourn if it was the wish of the House, but in any event I believe that the debate will go on until Thursday. There is no question of stifling debate. The honourable member is making a suggestion that I gave my word to the honourable junior member for Christ Church and am now falling back on it.

Mr LEWIS: It is a known fact that if the honourable Leader wanted this House adjourned now it would be adjourned. He knows that, so it is no use hiding behind the fact. He knows that it can be adjourned now if he and his Party want it. He has referred tonight to newspaper articles. Why provoke newspaper articles that will have so much truth in them that the honourable member will have difficulty in denying them? I am asking him to see it in that light. It will be difficult for him to explain that he wanted the House adjourned but honourable members would not adjourn it. To my mind, adjourning the House until tomorrow would be an easy way of whipping the Opposition, because they would have to find some method of finding something to say tomorrow. I do not think that it is a matter which the members of the Labour Party should be pressing through the House. I think it should be debated in a manner that would give credit to this Chamber and to Your Honour. I think that the House should have an opportunity of expressing itself about what has taken place already. For that reason I am seconding the motion made by my colleague.

Mr. ALLDER: Your Honour, I would like to know, if I sit now, if I will still be entitled to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member sits now.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion for the adjournment, I have followed the last honourable member's remarks and I really cannot understand why this House should deny any honourable member from speaking tonight if he wishes to do so after the dinner adjournment.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I must rise. The Leader of the House has already assured the Leader of the Opposition that he would adjourn the House by eight o'clock. It would place me in an awkward position, having seconded the motion for the adjournment until tomorrow.

Mr. MAPP: The Leader of the Opposition should be present. He should be present at any important debate such as this. As a matter of fact, I feel any honourable member, who is interested in the progress of the Island, should be here. Why should we deny any honourable member in the Labour Party the privilege of speaking tonight, if he wishes to do so? Why deny him? We have agreed to give a chance to every honourable member to speak. The members of the Labour Party agree to that. As a matter of fact, this matter is of so much importance that it is expected every honourable member will speak on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the amendment first. The question is that this House do now adjourn until to-morrow at 3 o'clock p.m. Honourable members in favour will please say "aye" and those against will please say "no".

The motion was resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TALMA, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY and Mr. VAUGHAN.—(5).

Noes: Mrs. BOURNE, Mr. MAPP, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. COX, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. MILLER and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY.—(10).

The question that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour was then put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. Speaker: "I think the *Ayes* have it."

Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly. On re-assembling.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, from the outset I would like to say that, in view of the fact that there is some

feeling on the part of some members, including the two honourable members for the City, that we, the members of the Government, along with members of the majority party, are inclined to force this question, without giving members of the Opposition the chance to express their point of view, I would say that that is far from the truth. I think the honourable junior member for the City went as far as to say that, when the Secretary of State for the Colonies reads the debates on this question, he will see the injustice of our action of departing from our promise to the Leader of the Opposition in not adjourning the House at 8 o'clock. Of course that was not a statement made on the floor of the House by the Leader of the House to the Leader of the Opposition. It was only the honourable junior member for the City who made that statement and, of course, everybody knows the type of mentality which he possesses. Now, it is further stated — we have read it in the Press from time to time — that this House carries on its business until the wee hours of the morning and does not give members, particularly members of the Opposition, the opportunity of discussing various questions intelligently. In other words, this House does not give that due consideration which is absolutely necessary to legislative matters and other things for the good government of the country, because of the fact that it prolongs its meetings until late hours. I want to say here now that it is immaterial to me what the Press writes at times. The Press will write as the mentality of its writers directs them. Sir, we fought the Elections in 1951 and I am sure every honourable member will agree with me, as well as the public generally, that members of the Opposition, who are absent from the House at this moment, campaigned until the early hours of the morning during that election campaign just as members of the Labour Party. As a matter of fact, I wondered at the time how some of those old Conservatives, who never before took the opportunity of putting before the Electorate their point of view, not even in the daytime let alone at night, withstood the rigours of the cold nights, especially in the northern parishes of the Island. If they could, in such circumstances, remain out of doors until so early or so late — as the case may be—I cannot see how it can be argued with justification at this stage that they are not capable — whether by health or whatever the case may be — of coming into the House and remaining until 8, 9 or 11 o'clock at night.

I want to say here and now that we, the members of this Government, never had the intention of stifling debate on this question. As a matter of fact, it is too important to do so. This question to me is of great concern, even greater to me than the emancipation of slavery in the Island of Barbados. Therefore, I would like to listen to all views, all expressions and all notions on this question. The Leader of the House made it crystal clear in his opening remarks that he was prepared to discuss this question to-day and then to go on to-morrow and on to Thursday and the only reason he stopped at Thursday is because of the fact that the honourable junior member for St. Peter and he are scheduled to leave the Island on Friday morning on a very important matter. As most honourable members may know, they are going to the United States to negotiate for work for the many unemployed we have in this Island.

As I have said, we cannot afford to stifle debate on this question, therefore I am very glad the honourable senior member for St. John has supported this motion for a short adjournment and has given me the opportunity to speak now. At this

stage, I would like to thank the honourable junior member for St. Philip for the contribution which he has made to this question. It was a very important contribution and you could see that he spoke from his heart. Now, Sir, this advancement which has been offered to this House is one which every member of the community, who is conscious of improving the conditions of this Colony, would grasp with longing arms. I say that because I happen to be one of those persons who were associated with the Barbados Progressive League ever since its formation in 1938. We all know that, due to the misrepresentations which this Island have had for over three hundred years, in 1937 throughout the West Indies and including Barbados, there had been disturbances of some sort or the other and, after that, there was a growth of political bodies, not only in this Island but in the whole of the West Indies. From then, the Barbados Progressive League set out to improve the conditions of the down-trodden people of this Island by means of sponsoring candidates to the House of Assembly in order that social legislation might be introduced and passed by this House. As the honourable Leader has said, a programme of action was drafted by some leading members of the Party in 1940 and from then the Party started to propose and put before the public members for the House of Assembly in whom it had confidence and who would go there and propound and support the policy which was put up to the electorate. Since then, it was made crystal clear by the Labour Party to the electorate as a whole that the Party's aim was to capture the Government of this Island, with a view to running it in the interest of the people generally. From time to time, the Labour Party has put manifestoes to the people to which they have agreed; and on the last occasion they have elected the abundant majority of sixteen members of the Labour Party to this House. I wish to say that was largely due to the fact that, in 1941, we passed a Bill giving the right to every individual who had reached the age of 21 whether he was educated or not, to have the right to say who should represent him. That was a very important factor in the political life of this country and I may say of any community, because I am sure that, if the people in the Bahamas and the Bermudas had representative Government as we have it to-day, racial prejudice and discrimination, which exist in those Islands, would not exist, in view of the fact that the people of those Islands would be able to elect members to their government those who would represent them in truth and in fact.

After the Elections in 1951, these proposals as you have here were put up in keeping with the promises to the people, and it took us some time to get them completed. As you will see, there were many discussions and, as was to be expected, certain proposals could not have been agreed to by us—I mean executive members from this House—and we fought and fought until the proposals which you see before us are more or less the proposals which we agreed to. Now, Sir, as has been ably put by the honourable junior member for St. Philip, the question is whether we are fit for this advancement. I am sure every intelligent individual must agree that the time has come; so far as Barbados is concerned it is ripe. If for no other reason than that the people of Jamaica—I do not say this with any derogatory intention—are given the vote and in exercising it they have to use signs or symbols: and similarly, is this true of the people of Trinidad and British Guiana and yet all these three colonies have

achieved ministerial status, which leads up to self-government; surely if this is so, Barbados, a colony which is said to have less illiteracy in the West Indies than any other should be ripe for this advancement. Quite recently we have been discussing this question of illiteracy with the Director of Education and he told us that, in so far as the literacy test is concerned, it is something like 99%. That in itself justifies the advancement which is proposed in this memorandum before us. My own feeling—and I say it irrespective of however it may be interpreted—is that I am more than glad to see these proposals before us to-day. I am glad because, as I have said, I am one of those few stupid fellows who, in the days of old, used to assemble when it appeared to the lords and gods of this Island as treason and sedition to do so. I am one of those who suffered in those days, who sacrificed my everything for this cause and did everything that was humanly possible in my small way to improve the conditions of the people from whom I have sprung. I am proud to say this. It was always my intention, irrespective of what position I may reach, to keep my feet on the ground and to remember the people who were responsible for any success I may have had. It is up to others if they do not appreciate it. That is why I say that I am so glad for this advancement. I do not care two bits whether I am a minister or not. It is a matter for him who has to appoint ministers. Any individual who reads what happens and what goes on in the outside world and who knows the treatment that is meted out to people who look like myself and knows that we do not have a chance of ruling ourselves by virtue of the fact that we are so few, would be glad to see this change here and to see that people like myself have such an opportunity. Therefore, we should grasp this opportunity with both hands. We should be more than glad of this opportunity to govern ourselves and to run this island. As it has been expressed, it is better for us to run it badly than to allow somebody else to run it for us, because they cannot have the same ties or the same aspirations as we have.

There has been a lot of talk about the coming into operation of this ministerial set-up. It is going to cost the Island something but here again I would like to quote the hon. junior member for St. Philip when he said "good thing no cheap". It is true that it will cost something, but the people of this Island make a sad mistake if they believe, as has been told them on many occasions and as has been written in the Press that the rich people used to represent them in past free, gratis and for nothing.

When this Labour Party took over the Government, through this representation of free, gratis and for nothing, there were the appalling conditions of bad tenantry roads, actually no water light and proper schools. All these things were absent because representation was had for nothing. Now there is some consideration for the masses, the people must be prepared to pay for the services which they get. We cannot continue to give our services freely because we are hungry just as any of them. That is plain talk. It is far better to pay a little money and get something done than to pay nothing at all and get nothing done. I remember very well when it was proposed to pay members of the House a salary, some of the members got on the floor of the House and opposed it tooth and nail. The proposal was passed by the Legislature eventually and, on going into the Treasury for my pay on the first occasion, I happened to meet two of the members who opposed it. They had got there before me. I said to them "I thought you were

opposed to the principle of paying members of the House, therefore I was of the opinion that you did not want any money from the Treasury." They said "well, you know, it is the law of the land. We would have to comply with the law." Rejoining, I told them that the Act does not say "the members shall draw" it says "they may draw," therefore "you need not draw." Sir, whichever party gets into power, whatever is done, its ministers are going to the Treasury and draw their salary. If the Conservatives get into power, they are going to draw their salary. If the Conservatives get into power, they are not going to say "We are rich people, we do not want the money." I think it will be a good thing the sooner our people realise that they should pay the representatives whom they want to represent them and agree to pay to keep them there. I am not saying that as a bribe. The people should make sure that their representatives know the source to which they can go for their everyday bread. When they realise that and do it they reduce to a large extent the chances of bribery and seeds of corruption. It is true that there will be some individuals with a mentality that, never mind how much you may give him, he will always stoop to some mean things; but, on the other hand, I can assure you that there are people in this Island who even in adverse circumstances will refrain from doing those sort of things. To my mind, the question is not how much to pay a minister or how much this set-up will cost, that is not the most important part. The most important question is shall we at this stage go forward as a people to self-government or something close to self-government, or shall we remain here as the honourable senior member for St. Thomas put it in a half-way house. I am sure every intelligent individual will see that the time has come, after seven years of our trying the Bushe experiment, when we should go forward. It is true that from time to time there will be questions as to whether that person or that person should be entrusted with the Government of the country, but that question can easily be settled by our fighting an election and finding out whom the people will elect. Whosoever the people elect should fill the offices and also draw the salaries.

There is hardly anything more for me to say. I do not want to prolong the debate much longer, but as I have said the proposals have been put here and I think this honourable House should be in hearty agreement with them. Perhaps if we were in a hurry to get anything, any sort of constitution — to get any ministerial status — ministerial status would have been put into practice already. It is because we wanted the best and nothing but the best for this little Island that there has been this delay. I sincerely hope that members of this House will discuss this question on a high level in view of the fact that it is one of the most important constitutional developments in the history of this Island. We should discuss it on the highest level and show to the world that we are capable of so doing. I do not want to resort to any offensive terms but it was rather strange to me to

see that, within twenty minutes after the honourable senior member for St. Joseph started the debate on this question, the honourable junior member for Christ Church who had a copy of these proposals in his hand since Tuesday last—a week ago — jumped up from his seat to ask for and did make a motion that this debate be postponed. It was rather strange to me because he did so without even listening to the proposals as were being explained by the Leader of the House. If, after having heard the proposals explained, that honourable member made a motion for the adjournment, one might have appreciated that; but the honourable member without hearing the proposals explained jumped to his feet and asked that the debate be postponed so as to give him the opportunity to discuss it with his party. Who is his party? His party is composed of four members along with himself, and the other three members of his party with whom he wished to discuss the matter were in their places. When you find that behaviour it is very regrettable, and more so when you find it in this Place which is responsible for the good government of this Colony. To say that you had not the time to study these proposals is, in my opinion, just another move to postpone indefinitely the question of ministerial status.

Sir, I think the time is ripe for the introduction of ministerial status. We, the four members of the Executive from this House, have gone into this matter very carefully. Besides that, members on all sides of this House have for the last three years expressed their point of view on this question. Addresses have been passed as you will have seen from the memorandum by the then Acting Governor, Mr. Turner. Having that in mind, I cannot see why it would take any length of time to discuss these proposals. I feel we have been waiting quite long enough for these proposals to set up ministerial status in this Colony. In my opinion, it should have been in practice already because as soon as responsibility is placed on individual members on whom the public can direct censure if anything goes wrong the better it will be for the whole community of Barbados. I sincerely hope that members will discuss this matter on a high plane and will support these proposals; not only do I hope they will do that but as soon as these proposals are put into effect that they will assist in making this constitution work successfully, always bearing in mind that any failure is not merely upon the ministers who will be in charge but it must also reflect throughout the ages on future generations. Sir, I think this is a great innovation and I ask all honourable members to co-operate, if and when these proposals are agreed to, in the carrying out of them successfully.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House be now adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, at 3 o'clock p.m. in the afternoon.

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