

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1956—61

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th December, 1956

Pursuant to the issuing of Writs, the hon. members elected to constitute the General Assembly for the Legislative Session 1956—61, assembled in the General Assembly at 10 o'clock a.m. today for the opening of the Session by His Excellency Brigadier Sir Robert Duncan Harris Arundell, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Island of Barbados and its Dependencies.

Hon. members elected by the several constituencies were present in the Assembly Chamber as follows:—

Messrs. G. H. ADAMS, C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Senior Member for St. Joseph*); J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Junior Member for St. Lucy*); DR. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Junior Member for St. Thomas*); Messrs. W. A. CRAWFORD, (*Senior Member for St. Philip*); M. E. COX, (*Senior Member for St. Michael*); L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Junior Member for St. Joseph*); F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., (*Senior Member for St. Peter*); E. D. MOTTLEY, (*Senior Member for the City of Bridgetown*); R. G. MAPP, (*Senior Member for St. Thomas*); K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Junior Member for St. Peter*); T. O. BRYAN, (*Junior Member for St. Michael*); F. C. GODDARD, (*Junior Member for Christ Church*); F. E. MILLER, (*Junior Member for St. George*); E. ST. A. HOLDER, (*Senior Member for St. James*); V. B. VAUGHAN, (*Junior Member for St. John*); C. E. TALMA, (*Senior Member for Christ Church*); MRS. E. E. BOURNE, (*Senior Member for St. Andrew*); Messrs. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (*Senior Member for St. Lucy*); C. B. SEARLES, (*Junior Member for St. James*); L. ST. A. THORNE, (*Senior Member for St. John*); D. D. GARNER, (*Junior Member for St. Philip*); H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E., (*Senior Member for St. George*); T. W. MILLER, (*Junior Member for the City of Bridge-*

town) and F. G. SMITH, B.A., (*Junior Member for St. Andrew*).

MEMBERS SUMMONED TO COUNCIL CHAMBER

On receipt of a Message by the Acting Sergeant-at-Arms that His Excellency the Governor was awaiting their presence, honourable members proceeded to the Council Chamber where they answered their names, took the Oath of Allegiance and signed the declaration as to their qualification to be elected members of the General Assembly. At the request of His Excellency, honourable members repaired to their Chamber preceded by the Marshal carrying the Mace cradle-wise, to make choice of their Speaker to be presented for His Excellency's approval.

ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER

Hon. Members being in their places.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Clerk, I have great pleasure in proposing the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, Dr. Cummins, as Speaker of the General Assembly for this Session. Dr. Cummins has been for a very long time before the public eye. He is in public life older than the rest of us in this Chamber and older than most members of the Legislature generally. It is therefore unnecessary for me to say much in recommending him to the Assembly as their Speaker. His dignity, his years of experience, his ability, and what I may describe as his parliamentarianism—if the House will pardon me for coining a word—make him eminently fitting to be our Speaker. I therefore repeat that I have very much pleasure in proposing the honourable junior member for St. Thomas, Dr. Cummins, as Speaker for this Session of the General Assembly.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Clerk, if I am going to be considered as straying from the conventions by

honourable members, let me say at once that I am doing nothing more than what the Premier has done. In my time in this Chamber, I have not seen a change such as this which has been attempted today by the Premier; therefore I am at a loss to understand the reason for so doing. I have enquired from honourable members whom I have heard designated as the Majority Party as to whether there would be any change today and I have not been informed of any change. I have also enquired from other honourable members for the Party which holds the second largest number of seats as to whether any change was suggested and I have been so informed. It is true, Sir, that it is not necessary, because the Government Party with its strength of numbers might well put their candidate up for election. But, Sir, I say again that in my time in this House—and before my time—it has always been the practice to re-elect the retiring Speaker unless he was not re-elected to this Chamber: and if that was the case, then the question of who should be Speaker would be discussed beforehand so as to avoid any division of opinion; so that when the Speaker was formally elected there would be no doubt as to the feelings of honourable members.

I am at a loss today to understand why there has been this change and for what reason the junior member for St. Peter, who was Speaker of the Honourable Chamber during the last Session and for the past eight years, has not been nominated as Speaker. [Cheers]. I would consider it as folly if any member of the Opposition had risen this morning to oppose the nomination of the last Speaker as Speaker for this ensuing Session and would think that they left the election feeling behind. Personally, I would be the last person to stray from the convention, but for one merely to rise and nominate another person as Speaker because of his experience in Parliament, or his experience by virtue of age, without any word of tribute or anything at all about the last Speaker who had presided over this Chamber, to my way of thinking, is a censure upon the last Speaker.

I am not therefore, going to be a party to it, regardless of whether any hon. member thinks that I have something against the junior member for St. Thomas who has been nominated as Speaker by the Premier. It is a matter of indifference to me what honourable members might think. I must repeat that I cannot for the life of me understand the reason why it has been done. If the Honourable Premier had intimated to us that the last Speaker, the honourable junior member for St. Peter, would be elevated to some other office or had declined to allow his name to be put up as Speaker, I would have no kick at all.

There are those of us who have been sitting in this Chamber under the last Speaker who have had to disagree at times with his rulings; but in some instances with our own family we disagree. Because of the frailty of human beings two persons cannot always agree; but because I have had to disagree with the last Speaker on occasions by reason of the fact that his rulings might have hurt my pride, that nevertheless will not prevent me from saying that against us we believe he had the most honest intentions and that his rulings were motivated by the very highest principles. Therefore, Sir, when early this morning one heard that another member would be nominated as Speaker, it became a shock.

That is why I listened most carefully to hear what the Premier would mention with regard to the hon. junior member for St. Peter who had served in this capacity; but having heard nothing, one won-

ders if he would be going too far to say out of courtesy—one hears all this procedure and one would have expected to hear the Premier mention it to other members of the Opposition because if he had mentioned it, we would have been able to discuss the situation and the situation would not be as embarrassing as it is going to be today.

As has been rightly said, Sir, the Speaker must be above Party as soon as he is elected to the Chair. I have every reason to believe that any member who is elected will try to observe that. But I am wondering if some explanation — This is not any appeal to Party members, this is an appeal to honourable members' sense of decency of what is right or wrong. Let me say today, "the stick that licks Bob will lick Dick!" What happens to you today will happen to the other fellow tomorrow; I do not think it is right. I remember the years when I sat in the gallery of this House when Sir Harold Austin was Speaker—when he was in England this Chamber had to elect, I think, Douglas Pile. I recall that the speeches then made it clear that to elect Douglas Pile in place of Sir Harold Austin when Mr. Austin had been re-elected to this Chamber would only be done with the distinct understanding that Mr. Pile would, on Sir Harold's return to the island, back down in his favour because it would seem really some form of censure upon a member who had served. It is true that in my time this happened in the House of Commons, when the Opposition—not the Government—nominated someone to fill the place, I think it was of Mr. Clifton Brown. One could readily see that Government carried everything before it at the time, but the Opposition wanted to let it be realised that they were still in existence, and Mr. Winston Churchill then said that to have done a thing like this would be sort of bringing Parliament down or words to that effect. Now that came from the Opposition when they nominated somebody and the Government fought it. What example therefore is the Government, the learned men of the Government who talk so much about the dignity of the House and observing rules and all sorts of things? What example is there when in this Chamber you begin the first debate on the floor of this House and you see such an action to a man who has served not only in the last Session but for the past eight years—a man who came in as a novice and fitted himself within a short time as one who could demand the respect of members? But what happens today? Today, you find, Sir, that Government without any reason has done this action. I do not think I can repeat it too often, Mr. Clerk, that the Government could have given the Opposition a reason, as the last Speaker was a member—and, I take it, is still a member—of the Party. Among the first reasons would be declining to have his name put up. I am going to speak on this today and nothing is going to stop me. I am wondering if during these proceedings the hon. junior member for St. Peter would be able to tell us if he has declined. I know nothing of it, and therefore, I think I am on safe ground in saying: I beg to propose the hon. junior member for St. Peter, the Speaker of the last Session, to be Speaker of this House for this Session.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Clerk, I have much pleasure in seconding the nomination by the hon. senior member for the City, and in endorsing the remarks he made. I will begin by saying that this House has been subjected at the beginning to the greatest discourtesy that one can find from the Leader of any Government, because, out of ordinary courtesy if for no reason at all you do not propose the former Speaker, you should pay him some tribute, even if it is only rhetorical, or even if it is only platitudinous. You do it as a mark of courtesy and respect to put it at its lowest ebb of de-

cency. Now Shakespeare said: "Cowards die many times before their death: the valiant only taste of death but once." This is a classic example of power getting to the heads of people seconded by other people in fear of what loss of power is likely to be. Because of this, they would behead the most innocent and just person. I have had to fight in the last political battle with my colleague and I will fight with him again on the same grounds; I fought four months ago. I am not doing this on the basis of friendship, because I would not like it ever to be said that anything I do today is done because of friendship; but I can see before me standing clear that some of us have to operate today to fight a dictator who is looming up in our midst. I am one who can see it looming up, and I would suffer death rather than sit in this Assembly and allow this to rise. I am prepared today, if my relatives were prepared, to die and others would die too. We cannot allow this to go on any longer.

What do you find? Today a member who has been in this House of Assembly for the last eight years, was actually hustled out of his home on the morning of the Session in 1948 in order to accommodate the Government as Speaker of the House, because they could not agree to the honourable junior member for St. Lucy becoming Speaker. The honourable junior member for St. Peter was boosted up in order to satisfy their lustful, insatiable appetite for power. The honourable member was taken out of his home and cajoled and forced and coerced to become Speaker of the House; he was an innocent man used for the power-mad to become powerful. Now, you find that others are sitting in judgement and saying: "We are going to join with you in dethroning someone because someone else wants more power unto himself." I have gone out into the fight by myself and I stand supreme and alone; there is no question of any combat now.

The honourable junior member for St. Thomas has not shown that he knows any single aspect of Parliamentaryism; he has not shown that he knows three Rules by heart, and why was he not asked in 1948 to be the Speaker? He is no more matured now than then, and he has shown a positive lack of interest in the things which went on. It can be clearly seen that some of us can take our lives in our hands and fight anybody now; the honourable senior member for Christ Church and myself should be examples to people in this Chamber to let them see that some of us can stand up, and the people will back us anywhere.

I hope that this will be a lesson for honourable members, not the least being the honourable junior member for St. Peter; he has not only been demoted from an Office in the history of this Island, but we have not been able or seen fit to agree to the Speaker who has been nominated. If the honourable senior member for St. Joseph had made the motion which he has made in different circumstances, this state of affairs would never have taken place. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph would not remove certain people from their places, but he has no use for small men who are neither Doctors nor Lawyers; his intellectual snobbery has come forth on the eve of the Election. I see that the honourable member is grinning, but he will grin more as we rise up. He will have to give way to us. If it were a Doctor or Lawyer, he would not think of demoting him today. He would now say that he took the honourable member from being an Elementary School Teacher and made him Speaker of the House.

If your conscience is not veiled, you can quite clearly see the gross injustice which has been done to a man who has been holding a high office. The honourable junior member for St. Peter has had

most rough treatment at the hands of the Proposer of this motion, and it has been felt even by the smallest member of this Assembly. I wish I was old enough to die and others will die with me. This is an occasion on which the blood of men must rise up. There are those people who should not be allowed to remain in this Assembly to lead others; it is a disgrace that we have not even got anything in the way of tribute being paid to the former Speaker, but we find that another Speaker was merely been proposed, and today they are out to crucify the former Speaker. You find that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has put up the honourable junior member for St. Peter as one of his candidates and not for one moment did he tell the Electorate that he felt he was putting forward a man who was not capable of holding the position as Speaker of this House! Today, he is asking this Assembly to reject the same man who he has put up. Today, you want to have oligarchic rule; you have something which is an amorphous monstrosity with this oligarchy in the middle; you call it the Labour Party, and you bring some of the soft-footed members into judgement, people who have got seats in this Assembly.

Has it been mentioned that the honourable junior member for St. Peter is incapable of being Speaker of this House? Has it not been said that he is a gentleman and I am a vagabond? I am sorry that I am not in a better mood to deal with this matter today! This is a classic example of the type of dictatorship which we are going to have. Your position is reduced in this Assembly now; what is the honourable senior member for St. Joseph going to offer members like the honourable junior member for St. George and the honourable junior member for St. John?

All the Ministries are being based on offers; if you do not vote for me, then you do not get any post. You find that in Parliamentary circles you want to coerce people on the basis of what posts they are going to hold; that is the position to which you want to reduce people who have faced the Electorate! I wish there were more members in this House like me; we would weed certain honourable members out.

Some of you are not fit to be members of the community, furthermore of the House of Assembly. I will say this: The Premier on one occasion told the former Speaker that he was going to put me in Court for threatening him. You (the Premier) are a lucky man.

Mr. CLERK: I will kindly ask the honourable senior member for St. Peter to deal with the question of Election of Speaker.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will not say anything more.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Clerk, I must begin by thanking the Proposer and Seconder of the motion for my election to the Chair. I must tell this House early that I am willing to serve as Speaker if re-elected. [Cheers]. I am extremely willing [Cheers].

Now, gentlemen, it seems to me as if the Speakership of this honourable Assembly is regarded by some people as a position of accommodation. I have never been able to look on the Speakership that way. I was elected Speaker and during that tenure of my office I tried to maintain that balance of judgement and mete out that quota of judgement that any Speaker in any Assembly ought to do. My conception of the Speakership of a General Assembly is that it must ever be above party. I want to point out to some new honourable members of this House that in casting their vote they must not be deceived. Never mind how much experience in Parliamentary life the person who presides over this Chamber has. They must eradicate that from their own mind.

Some people may have listened to rumours and may have been led to believe that I have been offered a Ministry. I have not been offered any Ministry. What has been offered to me is tantamount to what is uncertain and what really amounts to something like a Parliamentary under-Secretaryship, or junior Minister without portfolio, without any salary attached to it. What is more, I gave the Premier the assurance at one time I was willing to accommodate him. Since then, I have revised that judgement as I have the right to do, and from Sunday last on two occasions I told him that the uncertainty of that offer left me no choice other than to be re-elected as Speaker.

If honourable members attempt to allow the Speakership to drop in prestige only to accommodate somebody who has not been allocated a Ministry, the moment honourable members begin to stoop to it, the prestige of the House is bound to suffer.

I am telling hon. members that I have accepted my nomination and am willing to serve in the best and highest tradition of Speakership of this Hon. Assembly. I believe that the highest traditions of Speakership which obtain anywhere in the Commonwealth should also be observed in Barbados. I want it to be crystal clear to hon. members that what has been offered me I have had to decline because it was uncertain. In my 51st year of life I cannot hold on to anything uncertain. I cannot accept uncertainties. Therefore I am willing to serve as Speaker and if I am defeated, I will stand down and serve as best as I can. Gentlemen, I thank you for having nominated me.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Clerk and members of this House, I thank the Hon. Premier and the hon. senior member for St. Michael for having proposed that I occupy the highest seat in this House. If I am elected, I promise hon. members to carry on with the highest tradition of this office.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Clerk, during my nineteen years' membership of this Chamber, I can remember of only one other occasion that a similar state of affairs obtained as this morning. In 1946 (I think that is the year) was the other occasion when there were two persons proposed, not for this highest office, but for the office of Deputy Speaker of this Hon. Chamber and on that occasion, the hon. member who has been proposed as Speaker by the hon. and learned Premier and myself were the two members proposed. When that matter went to the vote, as older members of this House will recall, I was elected to that office.

That applied only to the junior office, that of Deputy Speaker, but on this occasion it is the office of Speaker for which there are two candidates proposed.

I will say this: we in Barbados with our advanced constitutions and our ancient traditions make our proud boast of being in the vanguard and have always endeavoured as much as possible to follow the traditions of the Mother Parliament. As you well know, Mr. Clerk, it is the tradition of that mother of Parliaments, the Imperial Parliament, which suggests to whenever possible that there should be no competition at all for the office of Speaker. As you know, Sir, when a Speaker is appointed, he is expected (and to do otherwise would be out of concord with parliamentary tradition) to renounce membership of his party and to do nothing more than to subscribe as handsomely as he can to the fees of the party. He is not to take part in political meetings, so that it may not appear if he gives a ruling from the Chair that that ruling is guided by partisanship.

Mr. Clerk, you also know that it is a tradition of the Imperial Parliament (and I think most of us in this Chamber are familiar with that) that when Mr. Speaker vacates his office he is usually created a peer and by that honour he relinquishes his membership of the House of Commons and goes to the House of Lords. That is the tradition of the Imperial Parliament. So important is his office as Speaker that he is not allowed to sit as a floor member of that same House when he gives up the office or it is terminated. So important is his office that one would not expect to have at the same time two Speakers, one the actual Speaker and one the Speaker from the floor. As I have said, it is so important that the dignity of this office be maintained that when a Speaker vacates his office, it is the custom for him to be elevated to the House of Lords. In this case, our Mr. Speaker of the previous session has not vacated his office. He has intimated his willingness to serve again. He has not been elevated to the other Chamber and no reason has been given, and there is no suggestion that he is incapable of continuing or resuming the duties of that office.

We will not, Mr. Clerk, overlook the fact that after he was appointed to this office that he had the benefit of certain courses abroad whereby he through the good offices of the British Council and the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, had the opportunity of making a careful study of how to perform the duties of Speaker and he sat at the feet of the Gamaliel of the Imperial Parliament. He observed and returned to Barbados giving us the advantage of the experience and the knowledge which he had so gained. I hold, Mr. Clerk, no brief for the former Speaker, but I hold a brief for the perpetuation of British Parliamentary tradition. For nineteen years in this Chamber I have always regarded, whether I agreed or disagreed with them, the rulings of the Chair as final. In the Law Courts whether the Judge's ruling is right or wrong, you accept it without any demur, but then of course when you are convinced it is wrong you go into the Court of Appeal. When it comes to this Chamber, we accept the Speaker's rulings because he is the final and ultimate authority. We appoint him because we feel he has the background, the competence and the inherent ability. We have in the case of the hon. junior member for St. Peter afforded him the opportunity of giving him leave to avail himself of the occasions which were presented to him whereby he might study parliamentary procedure from the headquarters of the British Commonwealth and Empire, and I would not feel justified,—I cannot feel other than ashamed today if I did not cast my vote in favour of the hon. junior member for St. Peter, who has been Speaker since 1948, and who has by and large discharged those duties conscientiously and efficiently. It has been my privilege during my tenure of office in this Chamber to have served under Speakers; there was the late lamented Major Sir Harold Austin, a commercial man and a gentleman; there was Mr. Douglas Pile, a planter and a barrister; there was Mr. George Evelyn, His Majesty's King's Solicitor; and there was Mr. K. N. R. Husbands, the first coloured occupant of that Chair. How I look at it, Mr. Clerk, is this: it might well appear throughout the British Caribbean Federation as a reflection of that coloured man who was the first occupant of that Chair in our time if we were to replace him when he has not relinquished his office at the polls. It may look as a reflection on our worthy and esteemed fellow coloured subjects if we were not to offer the hon. junior member for St. Peter an opportunity again to preside over the

destinies of this Chamber, and Sir, for the reasons which I have given and which I feel very strongly, I am happy on behalf of Her Majesty's Opposition in this Chamber to support the nomination of Mr. Kenmore Nathaniel Rhystone Husbands as Speaker for this Session.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Clerk, I am at a loss to discover why the Barbados House of Assembly, with three hundred years of British Parliamentary tradition behind it, should be asked today to act completely contrary to the accepted principles of British Parliamentary tradition. No reason was served in advance why the members of this House should refuse today to re-elect the Speaker who filled the Chair when the Legislature came to an end. Personally, Sir, I regard the nomination of another member as a direct and gratuitous affront to the last holder of the office. It is a severe reflection either on his ability as Speaker or his character as a member of the public for the manner in which he discharged his duties. Those of us in this Chamber are fully aware that regardless of what allegations might be made outside this House against the last Speaker, while he filled the Chair in here, he filled it with dignity, with impartiality and with considerable capability. He has shown a remarkable aptitude for the technicalities of parliamentary procedure; he is fully appreciative of the niceties of parliamentary practice. The other hon. member who has been nominated this morning has never demonstrated the slightest interest in the technicalities of parliamentary procedure. As a matter of fact, in the previous position which he held, he has portrayed the utmost ignorance of all the rules which go for the good government of this Chamber. If hon. members are men and not marionettes, if they are not prepared to dance when somebody else pulls the strings, they will refuse to be party to this insult which it is proposed to perpetrate on the person of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. If the Government intended making such a change, they are morally and otherwise obligated to acquaint the members of this House with the source of their dissatisfaction of the last Speaker, or at least with reasons why they intended making such a change, the are morally accepted principles of British justice and British Parliamentary tradition. I suggest, Sir, that hon. members appreciate the fact that what we do here in this Chamber today reflects on the entire country as a whole. If for no reason whatsoever we pull a man from the high office as Speaker of this Chamber and demote him without any justification given to ourselves or to the public, it means that we are not fit to be entrusted with the positions we now occupy. If Mr. Clerk, the Government of Barbados, in its actions is to carry on what goes on in the Kremlin where people are demoted and condemned and sacrificed merely at the wills of a dictator, if Mr. Clerk, we are to begin in Barbados to make it known to the public that the twenty-four men in the Assembly are there merely to conform with the desires and wishes of one man, then, Sir, we will refuse to endorse the traditional principles of Parliamentary procedure and demote the hon. junior member for St. Peter from the office as Speaker.

If, Sir, on the other hand, we are to assert ourselves and endeavour to stop these corrupt morals of dictatorship which are generally enmeshing all aspects of political life in this Country, if we are to endeavour to preserve the freedom for which Democracy stands then I see no alternative at all but to support the nomination of the hon. junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of this House. Within the

last three or four weeks, over 25,000 people have sacrificed their lives in Hungary in opposition to the evils practised by certain people who wanted to dictate every aspect of the Country's activity and to reduce it to their own whims and caprices. In this Island today, we are seeing, in the seats of Government, inability being rewarded by premiums merely because people are prepared to be subservient and to sacrifice any manhood they may have in the cause of personal advancement. That is not what we were elected for; I submit that in the nomination of the honourable junior member for St. Peter as Speaker, the House has the opportunity of establishing once and for all that in this Session, we are prepared to stand by all the principles of freedom and justice.

What is this but mockery? Is it being fair and just that after the Government at a public service last Sunday evening invoked the blessing of Almighty God and pledged itself to act in the spirit of all that is fair and just, its very first action in the Legislature should be to do something unjust? This is completely contrary to all the accepted principles of moral justice and even completely contrary to the principles on which humanity itself is normally supposed to exist. If we cannot be fair and just to our fellowmen, then we have no right being alive.

I am sure that members of this House who cherish their self-respect and who are prepared to give the public the impression that ideals of justice and democracy mean something to us—I am sure that those honourable members will do nothing to convince either the Country or the outside world that in Barbados in 1956, there are men elected to public offices who cannot be trusted, who have not got the confidence of the people and who are prepared to sacrifice the highest principles of democracy merely on the question of personal aggrandisement.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Clerk, I, perhaps of all members, have most reason to object, if I were so minded, to the nomination of the honourable junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of this House. I should like to be realistic enough to say that the honourable member and myself have not seen eye to eye in this House during the last Session, and on most of those occasions I still feel that I was right. However, I have never had the impression that the honourable member did what he did out of spite or partisanship, and I always felt that the Government Party had amongst its ranks at least one person who understood something of the ways and customs of Parliament. Speaking even as an individual member of this House, although I have had my differences with the honourable junior member for St. Peter, yet he was entirely satisfactory to me as Speaker of this House, because I saw in him a person who, first of all, was interested in his job and tried to do the best of it.

Here we are faced with this situation; the Government party has made the office of Speaker of this House a party issue. If it is to be a party issue, we must criticise them on that basis and some very drastic uncompromising things will be said in this House. Who is the person whom they have recommended to us to be the Speaker of this House during this Session? It is the honourable junior member for St. Thomas who in the last Session was the Leader of this House; that is to say, he was the member of the majority party charged with the duty of conducting the Government's business in this Chamber. In addition to that, he was the Minister of Social Services and Deputy Premier. There is no honourable member who has sat in this House who does not agree that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas has shown an utter incompetence

in the carrying out of his duties as Leader of the House and Minister of Social Services. If they wish to foist him upon us now, they must realise that they are doing it in the teeth of bitter opposition and that they have no confidence in and respect for the decency of the office into which they are now trying to push him. He should decline the office on the ground that he cannot expect to have the support of the whole House because he will be Speaker only of a part of the House.

If he is elected to the Speakership of this House, we will serve notice on him now that he will find the carrying out of his duties a most difficult task, because it would have been told to him beforehand that he does not possess the confidence of the House. Of course, you can put him in the Chair, but he will be your Speaker; he will not be the Speaker of the House. The one person whom they took to lead and rehabilitate people into public life is the very person who nearly caused the downfall of the Government; he is the person whom they now want to elevate to the highest office in this House. There was scarcely one Tuesday during the last Session when we did not complain about the wrong presentation of Government Business in this House; there was scarcely one sitting at which we did not have to draw to his attention that he was not doing his duty properly, and that, as Leader of the House, he had allowed all the procedure and known ways of doing things right to fall from him and had shown complete incompetence.

All that is known is known not only by us but by honourable members who were in the last House. It is also known by the Premier himself and all of his fellow Ministers, and it must have been known by repute to those honourable members who are in this Chamber for the first time; therefore the scales are off the eyes of everybody. There is no need to fool anybody in this Chamber or outside that it is the wish of the whole House that the junior member for St. Thomas should be made Speaker. Even those on that side of the Table who would be willing to support him would not be supporting him because they have undoubted feeling in his confidence; they would be supporting him for two reasons, (1) that the Premier wants him to be Speaker, and (2) he is getting rid of him as a Minister so as to make room for someone else to get a Ministry. Conventions are made for people and offices are made for the accommodation of persons who are not fit to carry out their duties! If they wish to reward the junior member for St. Thomas, there is an easy way to do it. They can ask him to step down from the seat which he now holds and ask him to take charge of the business in the next Chamber, and all the prestige would be still his. Also he would have every opportunity of conducting his wide and ever-growing private practice. All of these opportunities would be taken care of by so doing; but of all the ways of doing things, they have chosen in this case the most outrageous and most ungracious.

I wish to say quite plainly and without mincing my words that if you have him as Speaker of this House you would be having him as Speaker of only the Majority Party. He would be Adams' mouth-piece because he is not a capable person. What he will do as Speaker, he will do through ignorance and he is bound to be biased. I am not mincing my words because we cannot afford to have him as Speaker because we would have more ignorance than we have had. It is a blessing which they wish to confer on parliamentary institutions by taking ignorance into the highest places and it is worse even than that. In doing this bit of wickedness which they propose to do today they have struck a blow not only at the solidarity of their Party but to all that

is decent in public life. Here it is, you have a member of the Majority Party who for two Sessions in Parliament has been Speaker of this Chamber. In public, no matter what you said in private, you never complained of him; and there are people in this Island today, loyal supporters of theirs, who would be surprised to hear of what they have done to him. Even in his own constituency, the former Speaker of the Party made his electors to believe that he was going to sit in the Chair again and the Premier also gave them that assurance. Ask the Premier if he did not give that assurance at Diamond Corner. If the hon. junior member for St. Peter knew him as I do [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: And I.] he would not have had the bitter experience to which all of us have been subjected and which he is getting now because he would know that when the Premier says that you are going to be So and So he does not do it. He is now learning his lesson and I am very sorry that he is learning his lesson at the expense of the traditions of this House. It is for that reason I am standing here.

Mr. Clerk, Mr. Husbands was Speaker for two Sessions. They relied on him, and I think the junior member for St. Peter would flog me for saying this. I do not mean to be offensive but I should like to say that they even relied on him to uphold their end on every possible occasion but he managed by skilful knowledge of his position to do his duty which is to maintain the highest tradition of his office without prejudice; therefore, he did not get himself involved in much of their doubtful manoeuvring. Now, they feel they want a more pliable person than him. They want a Speaker whose very ignorance would be a shield behind which they can outrage the constitution of Barbados. But I am sure that no honourable member who has had the bitterest clashes with the junior member for St. Peter when he occupied the Chair doubted his sincerity or would wish to see him in this dishonourable position. If he is re-elected to the Chair today, there is only one person in this whole Chamber who will dislike it because much as I criticise the junior member for St. Thomas I know sufficient of him to know that he would not willingly push himself into this, therefore, he would not be a disappointed man if he is not elevated to the Chair. The one disappointed person will be the person whose black hand [Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: And black heart.] has manoeuvred all of this to bring disgrace upon this old and ancient Assembly in order to gratify his whim. He does not want the junior member for St. Peter, his old colleague, to be Speaker now; he wants to keep the Chair in such a position so that he can put you in there and pull you out as he pleases. He now wants to take Dr. Cummins out of the Ministry and put him in the Chair and he can do it because he has a number of people with him who are not prepared to serve in the interest of justice, but serve through fear of him to keep their places in this Chamber. They have become creatures of his and that is why we are witnessing this disgraceful scene today.

I have heard the remarks: "What a shame it is to keep the Governor waiting." The least said about that is the better. We have not kept the Governor waiting unlawfully. We came here today to do what was right and honourable and to lend our voice and votes if necessary to send the junior member for St. Peter back to the Chair which he occupied with such lustre during the last eight years. It was a task which we could have done with despatch; but the Leader of the Government has chosen to interject for best reasons known to himself an atmosphere of bitterness and controversy into the debate which is after all mere formality; therefore we find ourselves arguing it out point by point.

Mr. Clerk, we on this side of the Table feel very strongly and bitterly on matters such as this.

We do not feel the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to be a competent or knowledgeable person in these matters.

Among such gifts as he has, judgement, discretion and fair-play are absent. There are the three things you need apart from the knowledge of Parliamentary procedure in the person to be elevated to the Chair of this House. The Government Party would want to preside over them a person who caused them such acute embarrassment as a Minister through mismanagement of matters, of matters which to their consciences they could not support. It is a question of letting the honourable junior member for St. Thomas carry on his practice, there is nothing wrong with doing it as an ordinary member of this House. I am told — I was not here at the time — that there must have been medical men who were members of this House and still managed to carry on their practice; there is nothing wrong with it at all. There are members who are barristers and who still manage to live (although my colleague tells me they live rather precariously), but I take it we do not have to make these manoeuvres, these wicked arrangements and shameless betrayals of decency to do these things. That is why I say that my support will go to the honourable junior member for St. Peter because of his competence, because I think he has been very disgracefully and disgustingly used by his colleagues and because, thirdly, I do not feel it proper that this House and its traditions should be prostituted either by the vanity of an almost half-cracked person or to the requirements of satisfying arrangements between members of that Party. If you have five Ministries to disperse with, look for five people and give them to, and whoever do not get one, do not get one. You do not have to shift around people merely to put in somebody else within your ranks on the basis of how well they can serve the country. To shift the incompetent Minister, the past Leader of the House, who for want of a better word might be called the past "mis-Leader" of the House into the Chair, the highest gift of this House is an insult to the intelligence of the House.

Mr. T. W. MILLER: Mr. Clerk, I certainly agree with the last speaker, the honourable senior member for St. Lucy when he referred to the disgraceful affair here this morning; not only disgraceful, but I believe it is the first time in the history of this country that the Governor of this country was subjected to this long delay, and not only he, but the guests who are all waiting in the Legislative Council. I am sorry that the honourable member for St. Peter is not in his seat because I hate to say anything good or bad behind one's back, but he is the cause of this disgraceful affair here this morning, and to say that the honourable junior member for St. Thomas is incapable and incompetent and things of that sort, one can very well ask when the previous Speaker, the honourable junior member for St. Peter who at the time only had, I believe, about eighteen months' experience in this House as against years of experience by the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. I repeat, he only had eighteen months' experience, so what would have been his *bona fides* when he was appointed as Speaker as against now if we take it upon ourselves to appoint the honourable junior member for St. Thomas? I repeat it is disgraceful; and not only disgraceful, but the honourable junior member for St. Peter allowed himself to be goaded by members on my left to say what might have been meted out to him and to go further and express some distrust by the Leader of the Party to say that for no earthly reason this had been done. Without anymore ado I am going to sit and I know the honourable junior member for St. Thomas will be appointed.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Clerk, today is the first occasion on which I have the honour of representing my constituency in this Chamber. It was my privilege in the past to come here and witness the debates and squabbles of members who were honoured by the electorate. I had hoped that on my first occasion I should have been able to carry away this morning very happy memories. I regret very much that today I am a bit disappointed in the attitude which has been adopted by honourable members on that side. During the elections the Party to which I belong came in for very severe criticism, and it was even said of this side of the Table that we had five Premiers. It was a tribute to us to think that in our Party we could have five Premiers, whereas on the other side of the Table there is only one, and therefore today listening to the arguments put forward in that Party on the Other side, you have on the first day of the Session a dispute between the Party members as to who should be Speaker of this honourable Chamber. While we have our dispute, and I do hope the time will come when it be known, His Excellency the Governor is unfortunately waiting but will have to wait. When we on this side are going to elect a Leader of the Opposition, I can assure them that the Leader of the Opposition will be elected without dispute.

I rise to support the honourable junior member for St. Peter, because to me there is a vital principle at stake. I am not particularly concerned with the domestic running of the Barbados Labour Party; I am not concerned whether the honourable junior member for St. Peter is thrown to the wolves or whether the honourable junior member for St. Thomas is elevated to the high office; but I feel very strongly and this is why I feel very strongly in this matter. In an election, when a writ is issued you are asked to elect fit and discreet persons to this Chamber. The Party in power sponsored the honourable junior member for St. Peter and he was one of the patriots in the entire campaign. They sponsored him, they told the electorate of that parish that he was a fit and proper person to represent them in this Chamber and even went further and said that if he were re-elected he would again be Speaker of this Chamber. There is no substitute for honesty and integrity, and I am expecting that in this coming Session members will stick to the promises they gave and that they will honour the pledges they made to the electorate and show that the Barbados which has in the past enjoyed the highest traditions of Parliamentary Government, will continue to enjoy these highest privileges. But what is being done on that side of the Table is a positive disgrace, and I am a bit hurt myself because I think this matter should have been threshed out before if they are democratic as they say they are. This matter should have been threshed out in their parliamentary rooms because it has often been said of members who in the last Session came in this House that after they had agreed on Monday nights at Fairchild Street, they came into the House on Tuesdays and turned down Government. This matter should have been settled by you and today we should not have been saying these things. The honourable junior member for the City like myself is a newcomer to this Chamber, and of course, I am amazed that a man of the Speaker's reputation and a man of his own party is causing disgrace today. I am sorry he is not in his chair but I do hope he will not allow himself to be used as a scape-goat for the members on that side. I want him to be a man in this Chamber as I intend to be.

Mr. Clerk, I am here for five years and I hope for this coming Session not to see such disgraceful parade by the members on that side. What have you got against him? Is he immoral? Has he no integri-

ty? Is he dishonest? Is he partial? What have you got against him? Get up and tell us. Because you have fifteen members on that side of the House, you are going to do this thing; but I am going to vote against it because you have not told us that he is immoral in political matters.

I would be against him today if you told me that he had no integrity in political affairs, or that he is partial and dishonest and that his rulings were biased and prejudiced; but I cannot be against him, because I have not been given any reason why he should be brought from the high office which he has occupied for the past eight years down to the arena where I know he can make a more useful contribution than many hon. members, because of his background. I do not care if His Excellency the Governor waits until 4 o'clock, because this is a vital principal which we are defending. When one comes into this House, he must respect the Chair. I am prepared, even if I have to disagree with the Speaker, to abide by the Ruling when it comes from the high office. I have come to this House in order to help the people of Barbados, not merely to help myself. I am here to fight the cause of the people, and I think it would be an honourable gesture even at this stage if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas were to give way. After he had seen the attitude of the Opposition and of the members sitting around this table, after he had heard the tribute to the hon. member who occupied the Chair as Speaker in the past Session, he should turn to the right and say to the Hon. Premier: "Mr. Premier, I have noted the conviction of the members on that side of the Table and I think that we have perpetuated this disgraceful scene for too long today. I will back down." The hon. junior member for St. Thomas will then have my undying gratitude and respect.

The Hon. Premier knows that in respect of anything which he brings forward in this Chamber it will receive approval because he has fifteen seats; however, today he can only get fourteen votes. How is he treating today a man whom he himself will claim that he has elevated? He has just proposed the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as Speaker of this House and has made no reference or anything of the sort to the former Speaker of this House. Did the Hon. Premier intimate to this Chamber the intended elevation of the hon. junior member for St. Peter to a higher office? I am proud today to belong to the Opposition where I can make my strongest criticism against anything which is brought forward by members on that side of the Chamber. As other hon. members see the hon. junior member for St. Peter being sacrificed on the altar, their consciences will prick them because none of them knows whose turn may be next; just as the hon. junior member for St. Peter was supported by the Premier not so long ago, today he is being kicked from the high office which he once occupied, and that only shows what is in store for each and everyone of us. As I look on that side of the table, I see that the hon. junior member for St. Philip is relaxing in the knowledge that he is back here once more and that he is likely to be elevated to office; but the moment you stick out for a principle, everything ceases.

Mr. Clerk, this happening will go down in the history of Barbados not much to our credit; but whatever is recorded of what took place, it will be recorded for all time that the Opposition took a stand to preserve the highest traditions of Parliamentary democracy and to preserve the highest

principles which should guide politicians in their actions. If the members on that side of the House are supposed to be representatives of the working classes, then the display which they are giving today must prove to this Country that the people have elected them to this Chamber under false pretences.

I do not want to say anything more at this stage. I am supporting the nomination of the hon. junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of this House. Apart from any love which I may have for him, I represent the parish of St. Andrew, but I do not think that what has been done is fair to the hon. member. Those of us who perpetuate this state of affairs will have to answer to Almighty God for it even although he is merciful to deal with them. I am asking hon. members to stand up for principles. Let them ask themselves the question as to whether they have discussed this matter in Parliamentary group and whether it is fair to promise a man a Permanent Undersecretaryship which does not exist in the constitution of Barbados. Fortunately, the hon. junior member for St. Peter has the sense to know that this office does not exist. Even although the Hon. Premier was prepared to defend the disgraceful scene which has been presented today, let them ask themselves if it is fair to offer a man a job which does not exist. It is true that the Premier has said that the only thing which he cannot do is to turn a man into a woman, but should he promise a man something which does not exist in the constitution of Barbados?

He promised him something which does not exist in the constitution of Barbados! Of course, the junior member for St. Peter was only too willing and happy to accommodate the Party. Whatever may be said of the junior member for St. Peter when he was occupying the Chair, he never gave a Party ruling. He considered that it was a nebulous offer and he intimated to the Leader of the Party that he could no longer accept what they were offering him. He has changed his mind and has rightly changed his mind, and I do hope that in this coming Session if the present motion moved on this side of the Table is defeated—and it can be defeated because they have the numbers on that side of the Table—that honourable members over there will watch what is happening today to the honourable junior member for St. Peter. I do know that almost immediately, in a very short space of time, he will meet with complete political liquidation and will be pushed out of the Trade Union. I am sure it will not be too long. I am sure he will not be in the party too long and what is done to him today will be done to the others later. I admire his courage to stand up and tell honourable members that he is willing to be nominated as Speaker. Very few on that side of the Table would have had the guts to do it.

Mr. Clerk, I think there are other honourable members whose consciences must have been pricking them and who would no doubt like to say something on such a vital principle. Of course, as I look over there, I see the easy calm resignation and intention. You can almost read it in their faces. I have a feeling that is the attitude which they will adopt not only on this matter but on all matters which will come before us during the coming Session.

I have also the feeling, Mr. Clerk, that in this coming Session the Speaker will be investigated with greater powers to curb honourable members on this side of the Table in their deliberations and that is why it is so vital a thing to have an ardent party man as Speaker. If the Speaker of this Assembly is invested with the powers invested in the Speaker of the House of Commons, then you can see how de-

bates from this side of the Table will be stifled: how opinions will be curtailed; and as a result, this the House of Assembly will be merely fascist, and the people's wishes as voiced by the Opposition will be in jeopardy. It must be borne in mind that all members on this side of the Table have been elected by the people of Barbados and we represent the views of somebody; therefore, we must have some voice to express on their behalf their views. Therefore, it is extremely vital to have in the Chair, particularly where the Opposition is so small, a man who is guided by the highest motives and fairplay and one who, while he would not allow the Chamber to be a talking shop, will still give this side that freedom of speech which the Speaker, when elected, demands.

I have said all at this stage which I can usefully say. I was talking to the good consciences of members on the other side of the Table. At this stage, I leave it to other honourable members if they feel so disposed to make any addition and to express their views. I shall be supporting the motion as moved by the honourable senior member for the City.

MR. GODDARD: Mr. Clerk, I made two attempts to get up but on both occasions I gave way to junior members who have come into this Chamber and that is the reason why I am so late in speaking. The former Speaker of this House of Assembly was Speaker for as long as I have been a member and I can say that in my constant attendance of the House I have been able to observe the manner in which he has conducted the affairs of the Chair and I have also had ample opportunity of assessing the honourable junior member for St. Thomas. Without doubt my choice would be with the junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of this Honourable Assembly. If he has not lived up to all that was expected of him from time to time, I would not say that it was entirely his fault, because it is well known to the entire Chamber that he has been attempting to bring the rules of the House up to date for the last six years, and that he is the one person who has been most strenuous in his efforts to get the Committee appointed to revise those Rules and bring them up to date so that he would be armed with the necessary authority that would enable him to conduct the affairs of that Chair with more dignity than he might be able to do otherwise. He has exercised great impartiality in all his dealings and is aware of the Opposition and members of the back bench. Because of that we would want to elect today for the coming Session someone who would conduct the affairs from the Chair with that state of impartiality which we have always known in the past. The alternative selection today has been the junior member for St. Thomas. He is undoubtedly a very loyal party man and from what we know of him we cannot expect that impartiality if he is appointed to the Chair as we would get from the junior member for St. Peter who has never been a Minister. The junior member for St. Peter came in as junior member for St. Peter and he was appointed soon after to the Chair and most of his time in this House has been spent as Speaker of this House.

I have not seen anything nor have I heard from Government any reasons why the Speaker has been asked to stand down and make room for the Minister who is now about to be elevated to the post of Speaker. We wish to see the rights of the individual preserved. Although I will agree that at times some debate might have been curtailed, I cannot say it is the fault of the Speaker or that he might have been lacking in his knowledge of the rules. You have found no fault with the public life nor the parliamentary life of the Speaker, and I will again support

him in the nomination as Speaker for the next Session.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Clerk, not being next to the beach where the grapes grow and not having a grapevine, I arrived here to find a situation which leaves me dumbfounded to a point of shame to be a Barbadian. The act that has been perpetrated here or that is being perpetrated is one which I had no belief the Hon. Premier of this island would attempt to do. That mark will be the blackest mark that he will ever have in his career. There is a man the honourable gentleman appointed for the first time, he entered this House when I entered it. For the first time a man of colour was taking the seat which for three hundred years had not been so; a man, young, and the most junior member at that particular time; a man who by dint of endeavour and by dint of assiduity, for the first few months of the Session showed his ability to be the honourable Speaker of this House, and it appals me, Sir, to see honourable gentlemen and lady who sit on the opposite side with their smug looks on their faces, and when I only heard—I suppose that can be only by nearness to the members on this side—the hon. junior member for the City get on his feet and say such words, it is unfortunate he is not close enough for us to be able to get something into his brain. For you honourable members (or are you honourable, I wonder?) to sit there and see a man who has made his name in this honourable House being activated against by a group who say they have principle! Are you going to sit there honourable members and be mere cyphers? Are you going to sit there and see a man who has acted and has gained recognition for himself in that capacity as Speaker being treated this way and not say a word and rely on your principle? Have you no conscience, no ability, no reason, no righteousness in you to see that this is wrong? Surely honourable gentlemen and lady, you cannot continue to sit there and be absolutely silent in a matter of this sort. This as I said is the most serious act that will ever be done by the Honourable Premier. It is to me remarkable when he knows that he was the one who on the first supported him, when he knows that he has been out of the island, he has gained ability, he has gained knowledge by experience. For him to suggest that he be changed without any word at all, for no reason, is a very wrong action. Surely, you honourable members on that side can see that this is not an issue of Party. This is an issue which faces your Government on the first day of its history, the first day when the Government and this House for the next five years must entertain the most momentous decisions. We should have in that Chair someone whom we all know has ability. We do not know of the hon. junior member's for St. Thomas ability in the House of Assembly, because certainly, Sir, in my sojourn in this House, he has never shown any knowledge of the Rules of the House, [*Cheers*] and I defy anybody on that side of the House to say that the hon. junior member for St. Peter does not know the procedure of the House of Assembly better than the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. That, Sir, is a fact, and a fact which the Honourable Premier cannot change. I am to think that while the Premier and you members on that side know of that fact, you know of his experience; you have sent him out from time to time to study his parliamentary procedure. He has reached the peak of his career. This House as a whole accepted the hon. junior member for St. Peter and he has carried out his duties during this time constantly and definitely in the interest of the seat in which he sat. For him today to be treated in such a manner is a blot on the other side because he has given no earthly cause to show that he is not capable of carrying out that office. I can say that this Party decided against running somebody in St. Peter and they

were told not to run anybody against him [*Cheers*]. Sir, are we really ready to enter into an era which will be, as someone said, one of absolute power? Surely this is not the fault, as I have heard one say, of the hon. junior member for St. Peter whether he acquiesced or refused to acquiesce or anything else. In my opinion, whoever in the first place made the offer is the one that is seriously wrong. This House knows the hon. junior member for St. Peter as a Speaker; this House has abided time and again over a period of eight years in confidence of the hon. junior member for St. Peter; and this House has also the knowledge, apart from his delivery as he sits there, of his bonhomie and impartiality. Therefore if the hon. senior member for St. Joseph—the Premier—would consider carefully this step he is making now, he would see that it is an unnecessary step, a step which is a step in the wrong direction when we are hoping for federation and good things for the future.

I have made an appeal from the bottom of my heart; I am wondering if the members on the other side are going to continue to sit there and smile or whether they are going to get up and clear their consciences of this absolute iniquity.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Clerk, if there is one thing that I have learnt in part politics, it is that personal sacrifice is essential to collective victory. There is one man and only one man on whom the vacillation of one character on which the estimate of judgement and history will fall. The hammer of that judgement will fall on the head of one man today for the disgraceful departure from tradition which this House is now experiencing. Anyone with any depth of judgement will know who that one man is.

Mr. HUSBANDS: After listening to what was a very empty speech by the honourable member who has just sat down, I can assure this House that that honourable member is not in a position to speak at all. [*Laughter*]. That honourable member has committed himself and he should be ashamed to stand in this Assembly and say anything today. I am speaking from knowledge of the facts. I will say no more.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Clerk, in a debate of this nature which will guide the destinies of this Chamber for another five years, I think in fairness to the thousands of people who have sent me here on an independent basis, I have an absolute duty to perform in giving the reasons for the manner in which I shall vote in another few minutes. When one considers the numerous outstanding qualities of the former Speaker, when one considers his political career, when one considers his ability to comprehend Rules, Standing Orders and the Law in general, when one further considers that after eight years of service and experience in the Chair he is now even more matured than he has ever been, when one considers the fact that he has been specially trained for this work, that he has had the opportunity of serving and securing the necessary experience not only in this Chamber, but also abroad, one could have had hardly expected that treatment of such a nature would have been meted out to him.

I am saying that if it were a matter of the calibre, intellectual or otherwise, of this type of individual, one could readily give way, but when one looks at the succession of failures which nearly lost the election for the Barbados Labour Party this year, if the Premier had not appeared on the scene at the appropriate time, when one considered that the destiny of this Chamber is put into the hands of a Leader who must, of necessity, understand elementary principles, the Rules of the House and the Standing Orders, and who must at least have an ordinary knowledge of May's Parliamentary Prac-

tice and things pertaining to Parliamentary procedure, when you compare the two members side by side, when one considers the numerous things we have promised the electors during the next five years, we need not only the very best person in the Chair, not only the most able, and the most impartial, or the least biased, but we need a person of fairly strong character, a person who would not be guided or mis-guided and who would not have the assistance or advice of any Permanent Secretary or some able Lawyer or some other Officer. The Speaker of this House will be called upon at every stage to make momentous decisions in the shortest possible time; he will have to sit like a Judge or Magistrate in the Law Courts. He has to administer justice without the assistance of any Permanent Secretary or without the assistance of the Premier—at least we hope not—and he will be called upon to make decisions simply and alone, decisions which will guide the destinies of the people of the community.

If those decisions are not properly made, they may prevent some hon. member who is willing and anxious to do something for the benefit of the people, from doing it. I can see all of that. [*Cheers*]. That is the state of affairs in which we are likely to find ourselves; I do not have to wait until next year in order to comprehend or understand what awaits us as far as rulings or misrulings are concerned; I see them before my eyes. If I fail in my duty to my constituents, it is because a Speaker of the wrong calibre is attempted to be put here; the Speaker must be able to understand the Rules and to govern us from the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Clerk, I notice you attempted to rise. I am warning you. I heard the stupid expression that it is a disgrace to keep the Governor waiting. No one regrets the keeping of the Governor waiting more than members of the Opposition. Let me say that I pay respect wherever respect is due. I have the highest regard for Her Majesty the Queen's representative. However, if you analyse the case, you will see clearly that the Opposition has no responsibility for keeping Her Majesty the Queen's representative waiting. Absolutely none at all. It is none of our responsibility nor is it because of any act of ours.

I am saying that we should not attempt to elect Dr. Cummins as Speaker of this Chamber. What happened in 1948? What happened all the years before? In 1948, Mr. George Evelyn who was the then Speaker of this Assembly was not re-elected to the House. I am absolutely certain of that and I mince no bones about it. If Mr. George Evelyn were re-elected to this Chamber at that time, the Premier would have bitten off all of his ten fingers before he nominated Mr. Husbands to fill the place of Mr. Evelyn. I think nobody is more conscious about that than the hon. junior member for St. Philip. The Premier would not have come in here whether he was in the present position or whether he had 23 members of his Party elected with Mr. George Evelyn as the 24 Member and adopted the attitude towards Mr. George Evelyn as he has adopted today towards the former Speaker. There are some things to me which are like the fingers of my hand; they cannot be separated. Despite all that was said in the election campaign, that is over. Do not let anybody fool you. It is with great pride when I sit in this House and see nominated as Speaker someone like the junior member for St. Peter—when I see a man of African descent nominated as Speaker. I would say it is with justifiable pride. I am not mincing any matters about that. I am going to say what the hon. junior member for St. Andrew said: if the Premier could put up a case justifying the removal or the non appoint-

ment of the last Speaker as Speaker for this ensuing Session I would hang my head and would realise that I could not vote for him as Speaker. How can you say that we are keeping back the Governor? You can record for me that I apologise to the Governor for the inconvenience. However, what about the policemen sitting on the horses? Are they not inconvenienced too? As I have said, I have great respect for the office and the position which the Head of the Administration has, but on the other hand, I have a duty to perform not only to the constituents of Bridgetown, but to the people of the island. There has been this remark by my colleague that what a shame it is for us to keep the Governor waiting. To those of us who know that we only owe our seats to the electors of our particular constituency, we have the courage to get up and express ourselves but to those who owe their seats to the senior member for St. Joseph let them sit in their seats and let them remain there to subscribe to this most dishonourable act.

I want the public to understand that Mr. Husbands, the former Speaker, is not a member of this Party; he is not a member of the Opposition; he is a loyal member of the Barbados Labour Party. Let me say in passing, it can be said of the junior member for St. Peter that he was Secretary of the Lee-ward Division of the Old Democratic Organisation which was formed by Dr. O'Neale and for years I have canvassed for people who were diametrically opposed to people like him. I can say that at no time would the junior member for St. Peter give in to people who were not of socialist views. Either a thing is right or wrong. For years, as the senior member for St. George said, this Assembly has been going on and this state of affairs has never happened. But because it has never happened, I would say that if there is reason that it should happen now, it should happen; but you have not given us any reason. All that Hon. and learned Premier has said today is: "I rise to nominate the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as Speaker." I subscribe to the view expressed by the Premier that the junior member for St. Thomas as Speaker." I subscribe to to ask the Premier this: was not the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, Dr. Cummins, a genial man all his life? He was a genial man even when the Premier would not have him in his Party. Let me ask the Premier this also. When the junior member for St. Peter, Mr. Husbands, came in here as a member; was he not in here for not quite a year when from that side of the Table the Premier got up and proposed him as Speaker? How long was the junior member for St. Thomas in politics before that and was not he a genial man then? I am going to put it this way. At one time there were few who were willing to undertake the office of Speaker. This is something which the hon. junior member for St. Peter may not know. Am I correct in saying that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was offered the office of Speaker at the same time as the hon. junior member for St. Peter and he declined? [A VOICE: Is that true?] I am telling you what is the truth.

Dr. Cummins was then offered the office if he would accept it but he declined! [A VOICE: Is that true?] Man, I am talking; I am telling you what is true. He had a tremendous lot of experience in public life, he was always a genial man; he was offered the post then but he did not accept. The most junior member of the House then, Mr. Husbands, had been elected for St. Peter; he had been in here one year and later on in this debate you will hear more about that. He was offered the Speakership and accepted it. Let me ask this question for the public of Barbados. This is what we want

answered. You took from your own party a very strong supporter of the party, not of the Opposition; you made him for eight years the Speaker of the House of Assembly. In this election campaign up and down this island—let us forget the bitterness of the campaign. I regret having to come here today at all to raise any question, and I repeat I thought we all would have been out of this Chamber by now doing our business and that the Speaker would have been home, but what are the true facts? The Premier merely says "I rise"—(not in keeping with tradition or custom) "I rise to nominate the hon. junior member for St. Thomas, Dr. Cummins." We ask one simple question. Tell us if the former Speaker declined. No reply has been forthcoming; the Speaker himself tells us, "Gentlemen, I have not declined, I am willing to serve." What is expected therefore of the Opposition but to support the last Speaker if he says he is willing to serve? If we can hear from the Other Side that there was something against his character, his ability to serve, all well and good; but I want to throw this warning out now to the Premier. There are some of us in this Chamber whom I know that it is the ambition of the Premier to remove and I have no doubt I am included among those. I know that the Premier has expressed the view that he is going to tighten up on the rules of this House and give the Speaker more power, and I am throwing this out. You can give what power you like, you cannot buy my conscience with \$160 or \$600. Give whom you like the Speakership, get in the Chair yourself; there are some of us in here who are going to talk and I warn you that we are still going to get elected too. I know the Premier has expressed the view of tightening up, and if the last Speaker did not know, I am letting him know now. If therefore, Sir, the idea is to place in the Chair someone who will dance like a marionette when the strings are pulled, I am warning the Premier it is not going to be as he thinks. I say like the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, when the Speaker rules and the Government Bench adheres to the ruling and does not do as the Premier has been doing in the last Session, questioning the Speaker's rulings, then members of the Opposition will adhere to the rulings. The most learned man in the House is the Premier, the most knowledgeable, the most responsible, and not once or twice, but on several occasions the Premier stood on the floor of the House and challenged the Speaker's rulings; what else must the Premier expect from members of this House who are in the Opposition? Well, maybe, Mr. Clerk, it is for that reason that the Speaker has not been proposed by his Government Party today. I said before of course we in the Opposition were at times hurt with his rulings against us, but nevertheless we have always felt that if he made mistakes, he made them in good faith; and we recall on occasions when he was not satisfied, he would adjourn to look up the point of procedure. We all realise that fact, Sir, but it is as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, "Power". If some of the hon. members of Government did not have to depend for their existence on what they received from the Treasury as member of this House, their conscience would lead them to see that what the Premier is doing is bordering on immorality. Why are you removing this man? In your campaign you got at Diamond Corner and told the people that if this man was elected again, you would see that he was made Speaker of this House of Assembly. You ran the man in the constituency against another man and asked him to

support the man Morris. He has a tremendous pull in the constituency. You told the people "If this man is returned, I will make him Speaker again,"—not the men in the House, but "I," the all-powerful "I." When the Ministerial System was brought in it was said the Premier must give up his practice and all persons working must work privately. Consistently the members of the Opposition got up here and said the hon. junior member for St. Thomas and the hon. senior member for St. Thomas were both engaged in private vocations: one was working at the Beacon and the other was practising his profession. Well, you know that I myself have always said that it is rather difficult for a man who has been working at a profession for all the years to leave his profession as a medical practitioner and throw it to the wind all of a sudden to become a Minister; I have always taken that attitude.

Now today, for reasons unknown to this Chamber, we find that the Hon. Premier comes in and merely says: "I propose one of the senior members of this House, Dr. Cummins, as Speaker." That hon. member has been very genial and he has been here for years before Mr. Husbands, but he did not accept the offer of the Speakership eight years ago. Naturally, there was no Ministerial System then. The position of the Speaker entails greater responsibility than the ordinary member of the House; it entails a lot of research, a tremendous amount of reading, the looking up of constitutional practice and so on. The hon. junior member for St. Peter accepted the post and was accordingly appointed Speaker of this House. It is not fair, therefore, to throw him to the wolves in this matter; as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said, it must be a settled matter by the members of the Government party before we come in here. Not having had any information in the matter we feel that this is absolutely wrong; we cannot subscribe to it; as a matter of fact, we will not subscribe to it.

When my colleague refers to the fact that the former Speaker is a party to this behaviour, and a party to this disgraceful conduct, I am quite sure that on reflection he is bound to see that he was talking so much nonsense. When a man can say: "I am willing to serve you again, tell me what I have done," how can you say that he has subscribed to something when you cannot prove anything against him? What greater system of dictatorship can you find? What is this today but bribery? Mr. Clerk, we are very sorry that the Governor has had to wait for so long, but it looks as if he will have to be kept for a much longer time waiting. I suggest to the Premier that he should allow the Governor to know that he can take his leave and get his lunch.

Even although you hope to put in the Chair a Speaker who will name me, I am prepared for that. I feel that this is one of those things in respect of which the public must be acquainted with all the facts. The public may feel that you have the Opposition coming into this House today and starting off by making a row; to the contrary, we are not making any row. We have come in here to defend a principle and a custom; and above all, here is the Ex-Speaker, a Unionist, and here is the Premier who is supposed to be a Unionist. I wonder if the hon. junior member for St. Peter went somewhere and found somebody who said: "I have been employed here for eight years doing my job well, and now I am told to go back home," what would happen; there would be a march through Bridgetown! I am wondering today if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas had been Speaker of this House for eight years and the Opposition had got up in here

and said: "Well, you have been Speaker for eight years and today we have come in here and we are nominating the hon. junior member for St. Lucy as Speaker," what would be the position? We would hear the Premier saying that we are dragging the House of Assembly into the gutter and we would be called the worst people in the world, if we had got up and committed such an act.

The hon. junior member for St. Peter, as Speaker of this House, has shown himself as impartial as it is humanly possible to be. The facts are very simple; it is customary for us to come in here and for the two senior members of the House to propose and second respectively the nomination of a member as Speaker. That is all finished within fifteen minutes, and the Speaker is robed and taken back to His Excellency the Governor. That happened in 1948 when this House was divided into practically eight members on each side, and the Speaker was selected and His Excellency was informed of the selection. In 1951, the Labour Party got a majority, and the same thing happened; but today, the Premier comes in here and says: "That is what it has come to: 'Husbands has been asserting his individuality; let me propose Dr. Cummins.'"

I believe that most people must be aware of what must be a great injustice. Here you have Mr. Husbands, a staunch Party-man with several years in the teaching service in this Country, who threw that service to the winds and joined the Labour Party. He has been a man who has been a very staunch supporter of the Party. Every member of this House get \$160 a month except the Ministers and the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. The Speaker gets \$240 a month, the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees get \$180 a month each. As far as the Speaker is concerned, he is a man who has thrown all his teaching service to the winds and as a teacher today, he would be getting much more than \$160 a month. As a Minister, the hon. junior member for St. Thomas gets \$650 a month and he is giving that up in order to become Speaker of this House, because he can go on with his private practice.

The Speaker is told that he can be Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Premier, but no salary is attached to the post. It is one of those things which all of the Ministers put together and give enough to make up his salary. That is in theory all right but are you asking us to say that that will be the position? We are not idiots. Unless you belong to the Barbados Labour Party Government, you will not do that type of thing to a yard boy! Mr. Husbands was getting \$240 a month; he must step down for Dr. Cummins to step up. I do not believe the idea is for Dr. Cummins to draw more money because he is giving up the posts of Minister which carries with it a salary of \$650 a month and he is accepting the office of Speaker which is at \$240. Everybody in Barbados knows the amount of criticism which was levelled at Ministers who were pursuing their own callings at the same time as they were Ministers. You must face realities. We have been hearing that it was drawn to the knowledge of the Colonial Office what the Ministers were doing and Colonial Office is not pleased about it. I see members on that side of the Table smiling as I said that. Whether Colonial Office was pleased or not, under these circumstances, when the public is called upon to judge, I am sure that they will see that it is contrary to what my colleagues has got up in here and said that it is disgraceful for this House to keep the Governor waiting. I do not subscribe to the view that there is anything disgraceful about it at all. This House

is no Sunday School; this is a place where every member is permitted to come and express his views; as long as he is doing that, I do not subscribe to the view that it is anything disgraceful about it. What is disgraceful and immoral is the fact of coming in here and putting aside custom and tradition and for no reason at all nominating another man to become Speaker and then for us to sit and listen to the former Speaker saying: "I am willing to serve; I asked for time to consider."

Mr. HUSBANDS: No; I said that I rejected what was offered me on two occasions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: He having rejected it, what is the most decent, moral thing to do? Whatever arrangements were made, they should say that they would have to carry on in the normal course until other arrangements are made. If arrangements must be made to accommodate the honourable and genial Dr. Cummins, do not make these arrangements of sacrificing Husbands on the altar. Why make such arrangements? Do you mean to say it is because the Labour Party put them in the House and because there are those who feel that the Premier has the ability to get up on a platform and sway people? "The same stick that flogs Bob will flog Dick." If you dare have the guts and the courage to get up and say you are wrong you are sacrificed. If this is not immoral, then there is nothing of which I know which is immoral. You had a man as a Speaker for eight years and you are now offering it to Dr. Cummins. You offered him eight years ago, and he declined. Because of that, you put Mr. Husbands in the Chair. You put Mr. Husbands in the Chair when other people would not accept it. He has served as Speaker for eight years. You had the choice of the same two men — Dr. Cummins and Mr. Husbands — in 1948. Mr. Husbands accepted, Dr. Cummins declined. When Mr. Husbands became Speaker, there was no salary attached to the office. Now, there is a salary attached to it, and the Premier wants to accommodate Dr. Cummins. Naturally, the doctor loves to practice and he cannot lose financially by this change. Because of the criticism which he got as a Minister, this accommodation is being made.

I agree with the Premier when he says that Dr. Cummins will fill the office of Speaker with dignity. I agree that he is an amiable man. When I have to criticise the doctor, I criticise him. I will say that for him. However, I must say that all those members who are lending a hand to what Mr. Adams is doing are as immoral as Mr. Adams. Dr. Cummins has a profession. Mr. Husbands gave up school teaching to become a Speaker. As I have said, you offered Dr. Cummins the office of Speaker in 1948 and he did not take it. Mr. Husbands accepted it. Do you mean to say that because Mr. Adams knows that he brought you in here and because he has a lot of marionettes to say 'yes' when he says so that you must do this? I repeat, if this is not immorality, then what is immorality? Why should you take Mr. Husbands and sacrifice him on the altar?

I have a greater vision than other members on this question. We really must look at Dr. Cummins as an elder statesman. He has been in the fight for a long time, but let us look at it in this way. Doctors and lawyers lose nothing by being in politics. Do not let them fool you that they lose through it. Dr. Cummins has lost nothing; but Mr. Husbands gave up his job to enter politics; therefore, why remove Mr. Husbands from being Speaker without a cause? Why remove Mr. Husbands because you want to accommodate Dr. Cummins? In other words, you are allowing Dr. Cummins to step down and to go on with his practice because the criticism which was

aimed at him cannot be aimed at him any longer. He is giving up \$650 for \$240 per month.

If you are removing him you should tell us the reason. Have his rulings been partial? Has he been leaning towards the Opposition? If so, he has been doing what has been said by a Speaker of the House of Commons, that is to give greater appreciation to the minority groups in the House to express their views. The minority groups in the Opposition should be given latitude to express their views. Is it because they have disagreed with his ruling? That is the only thing I can think of. I am nothing to do with who have been selected as Ministers in the Government. I feel that way about it; if I were Premier and I had to make a selection I would not question that. I am not interested, and I am sure the members of the Opposition are not interested. The gift of Speakership is that of the members of this House, and it is true that because the Government has got the majority of members they can win when they put it to the vote; but as I said earlier today, it is always settled before hand. What makes it more immoral, is that the Premier realised that these groups in the Opposition have not even been told one word. That is another sign of what the feeling is, but I always say: "Whatever goes up must come down." You have won the Government and you can run the Government now, but you have started off today with the greatest blunder of all times as the hon. member for St. George has said. Whenever the records here are read, it will be seen. What is the reason for Adams not carrying back one of the strongest party members as Speaker? What has he done? I say this: when a lot in the vanguard are turncoats who ran here and there with other parties, Husbands was the one man who was saying, "I am a socialist and I am not moving." Now you put him up as Speaker, and as Speaker of the House of Assembly when a Minister is wrong he must say he is wrong; when a backbencher is right he must say he is right. What is the true position? I am hoping the public will judge. There has not been an explanation to this hon. Chamber why you are removing him. Husbands himself tells you today he has been offered some kind of office without any remuneration for it. He has been told to be a nice little boy, "I am going to take you out of the Chair and make you Parliamentary Under Secretary to me, but there is no salary attached." That is not fair, and I say this, Sir: I think it would be a very kind act by the Hon. learned Premier to go and let the Governor know.....

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE

The Sergeant-at-Arms entered the House.

He cannot send a message now. This House is in Session; we are talking. If the Premier wants to do anything, let him say to the Governor that we apologise for keeping him there, but he must go home for lunch. [A VOICE: It is a breach of privilege] I did not get elected by the Premier or anybody else in the Government. [The Premier rose.] Stand up there; I am standing up too. This is an all-out debate and I must say it is a most immoral act by Adams in removing Husbands without reasonable cause.

Mr. CLERK: I am speaking

Mr. MOTTLEY: We are not having it.

Mr. CLERK: I must point to the hon. member that under the Rules of this House any debate can always be interrupted by a Message from the Governor.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You do not know it is a Message from the Governor. Now, Mr. Clerk, I and the hon. members in the Opposition feel....

Mr. CLERK: I am addressing the hon. senior member for the City....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Clerk, you have to show me a reason to shut me down.

Mr. CLERK: The Sergeant-at-Arms has attended from His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. MOTTLEY: How do you know that?

Mr. CLERK: By the Sergeant-at-Arms' presence.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is nothing you can do to shut me down and the Governor can come and receive the Speaker tomorrow or some other day; not today.

Mr. Clerk, as I was saying, I do not think this matter which is before us is one we can take very lightly. I consider that there is no fault that can be attacked to the Opposition in this matter. We came here today with the fullest sense of responsibility and willingness to co-operate in expediting the business of this country so that we can get on.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Clerk....

Mr. MOTTLEY: What is he standing on? I am speaking. He might be a dictator here, but he must observe the rules of the House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Whatever may be ..

Mr. MOTTLEY: I consider this a most immoral act by the Premier of this country to railroad Husbands from the Chair to put in Dr. Cummins so that he can continue to practise. I feel very strongly in this matter, and we feel that however he feels we are talking sense, and we ask the Premier to give an explanation and he has refused to give one. Why is he removing Husbands? Let the Premier understand this: I will talk in here as long as this House of Assembly remains. You had to come back from England and try and get them back in here. You are not doing this to me; I am speaking on a matter which is near and dear and most important to me—the question of justice, morality and what is right and wrong, and we stand for such things. You are not working for Adams, Mr. Clerk, you have a right to rule; you have no right turning your back on me. The rights are mine as well as his....

Mr. CLERK: I am addressing the hon. senior member for the City. Rule 78 of the Rules of this House reads:

"The debate upon a question may be interrupted: 1st by a matter of privilege suddenly arising; 2nd, by words of heat between members; 3rd, by a question of order; 4th, by a Message from the Governor or the Council; 5th, by a motion for reading an Act of the Legislature, an entry in the journal or other public document relevant to the question before the House."

The presence of the Sergeant-at-Arms is enough testimony to me that there is a Message from the Governor.

Mr. MOTTLEY: What would you like to send and tell the Governor? Get up and talk; let everyone get up and talk because I do not depend on the money I get from in here. You dare not say what you want to say, because you know it is a dishonest action.

Mr. Clerk, I am willing to hear what you have to say because worse things have been said about me before now. This is no Sunday school. I am in here to debate a matter. Mr. Adams came in here today and the public should know we came fully prepared to support the outgoing Speaker, and he without reason proposes Dr. Cummins in place of the hon. junior member for St. Peter in order to accommodate Dr. Cummins; we are saying it is an immoral act.

Mr. CLERK: I will point out to the hon. member that I am not trying to stifle the debate. I only want to hear the Message.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot stop this debate. As far as this House is concerned, we are not near that Message now. This idea that the Premier is running this House wrong. However, Mr. Clerk, out of courtesy for the Governor and for you, I will sit and let you hear what the Message is; I will allow you to receive His Excellency's Message with the understanding that I am not sitting down before closing the debate. I have not yet concluded my speech Mr. Clerk, you may receive the Message.

At this stage, the Acting Sergeant-at-Arms presented the Message as follows:—

His Excellency the Governor wishes to inform the Hon. Members of the House of Assembly that he proposes to adjourn the proceedings until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, the 19th of December, 1956, when he will attend in the Legislative Council Chamber to receive their Speaker-Elect and make the Speech from the Throne.

[Hon. members of the Government started to leave the House.]

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh! No, No!

Mr. MOTTLEY: Let them leave, we have the numbers to form a quorum.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Clerk, I would like you to observe what is happening in this Chamber, and see that it is recorded in the annals and in the history of this ancient Assembly.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The attitude of the Premier is another sign of the immoral attitude towards the last Speaker of this House. *[Loud Asides]*. We were saying, Mr. Clerk, that this debate today will go down in history as one which has not been caused by the Opposition; as a matter of fact, I think the most shameless man in this country is the Premier, if he can face this position today. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas is allowing himself to be used in a position to hurt the outgoing Speaker when the Premier has not given one single concrete case for his removal. If the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is being a party to this wicked conspiracy for the removal of the hon. junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of this House, without giving any reasons for so doing, that is something which he will not live down in Barbados or in the West Indies for that matter. This is not a question as to who should go on a trip to America or Canada; this is a question of a man who stood side by side with you and when others declined to serve as Speaker, he served in the office for the last eight years. This is the sort of thing which happened in the House of Commons: the obvious choice for Speaker was not a member of the Government's Party, and someone proposed a member of the Government's party, Mr. Winston Churchill told them that they were dragging the House into the gutter. The Premier is pulling this House down into the gutter because he wants to give the Speaker power to curtail behaviour; as soon as he cannot get people to do what he wants them to do, this is the sort of behaviour we find. The Governor sends a Message down to this House and the Premier tries to carry the House with him. I say that when they conspire to remove the hon. junior member for St. Peter from the Chair without giving us one reason for doing that, that is the greatest immoral act this Government could have perpetrated. I say that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas should have his name withdrawn if he has any normal character or courage about him. Would he like his own child to be sacrificed like that? Look at the members on that side of the House! Would any of them like any of their children to be sacrificed like that?

In the interest of this country and of this Hon. Chamber, he should have his name withdrawn. I am going to say this, Mr. Clerk. If Mr. Husbands had declined to become Speaker, I doubt that any member would have opposed Dr. Cummins as Speaker. I am almost sure that not one member would have done it. If Mr. Husbands had said: "I decline"; who would have opposed Dr. Cummins? He is an elder statesman, a man of experience, dignified and I am sure every member would have said: "yes, this is the right man." With all that, Mr. Husbands has not declined and you are lending yourself to this immoral act. You are sacrificing a young man on the altar, a man much younger than you. By your action, Mr. Husbands will drop in salary \$80 a month. He gave up his school teaching and you are now saying: "I am going to put Dr. Cummins in the Chair." Do you not think that it immoral? I do not know whether they are increasing the salary of the Speaker. Rumour may be a lying jade but I have heard that they intend to increase it to \$540 per month. As I have said, rumour may be a lying jade; therefore, I am not attempting to say that.

Mr. Clerk, I am going to sit for a minute and allow somebody else to carry on because we regret very much that this has occurred today. I do not know what has happened behind closed doors at their party meetings. What is noticeable is that Mr. Husbands is big enough to get up and make a statement which is not contradicted. My colleague has said that we are responsible for keeping the Governor waiting and that Mr. Husbands is responsible for our action. Mr. Husbands himself has told this Chamber that what was offered him he did not accept. He asked for time to consider it. The Premier made a straight statement in nominating Dr. Cummins. Mr. Husbands has said: "I am prepared to offer myself again as Speaker if I am elected." He further said that he was allocated Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Premier which is a misnomer with no salary attached to it; therefore he would have to come down to \$160 a month. That has not been contradicted. One would have expected the Hon. Premier to have given Mr. Husbands the direct lie to that: had that been done, it would have been a guide for hon. members to follow; but not one single word has been said by the Premier to dispute it. We must therefore believe that Mr. Husbands is speaking the bare unvarnished truth. Mr. Husbands has been asked to step down. He has been relegated so that Dr. Cummins should be Speaker. Mr. Clerk, that is not good enough and we are not prepared to let that go through this Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have really expressed my views in no uncertain terms on this matter already and only rise again because of the irate remark by the hon. junior member for the City. He claims that the Opposition is guilty for detaining the Governor. Now, I want it to be perfectly clear in the record that we are not responsible for what has transpired here today. If the Government Party had not endeavoured to supersede the last Speaker by an unfair and unnecessary appointment, nothing of this kind would have happened. Sir, in my opinion, if the Government Party did not desire the Governor to be detained, long ago they would have withdrawn the nomination of the junior member for St. Thomas. They themselves are responsible for this disgraceful act, in my opinion, by insisting that his nomination stands in spite of the determined opposition by almost half of the members of this Chamber. As a matter of fact, I will go as far as to say this: if the junior member for St. Thomas, Dr. Cummins, had an accurate appreciation of moral values and could appreciate what the position of

Speaker demands, he would immediately withdraw his own nomination. It is inconceivable, Mr. Clerk, that in any part of the Empire a Speaker would allow himself to be elected after the remarks that have been made against him in here. I know of no part of the Empire where a member of Parliament, whose election ought to be almost unanimous, should desire to serve in the office of Speaker after the remarks of the Opposition engendered here today.

Having made that clear, I will now turn to something else. I have with me here remarks made in 1948 when the senior member for St. Joseph, the Premier, nominated Mr. Husbands to the Chair. It must be borne in mind that Mr. Husbands at that time was even a very junior member of this Chamber; he had been in here for only a year. He accepted the nomination as Speaker when a number of parliamentarians older than he refused to take it. This is what Mr. Adams said when he nominated him:—

"Mr. Clerk, I am glad of the opportunity which I have—the first "opportunity since I have been a member of this House—to propose the Speaker of our General Assembly. The office of Speaker is so honourable, so exalted, and so important in the life of the United Kingdom and all her colonies and dependencies which follow in her footsteps in their forms of Government, that I am glad, as a Barbadian, to be able to say that we in this historic Assembly, one of the oldest of all British Parliaments, have, in the past, had many excellent Speakers to guide our destiny. The office of Speaker, I repeat, is so exalted that it rises above strifes, partisanship and petty party politics. I feel sure that every member sitting around this table today is anxious that we should maintain the tradition that Barbados has maintained in this respect for over three hundred years.

"Never, as far as my researches have been able to satisfy me, never have we had the spectacle that occasionally has taken place in Great Britain where the Speaker had to be held down in the Chair in order that the work of the House of Commons might be proceeded with."

He in 1948 was patting himself on the back for the excellent manner in which the Speaker discharged his duties and for the manner in which we elected our Speaker. Today he comes with no justification and endeavours to break this tradition and make the Barbados House of Assembly the laughing stock of the Colonial Empire, because he cannot quote one single instance in the British Commonwealth in which in any Parliament after election there has been an attempt to do what is being done in here today. As a matter of fact, as the hon. junior member for St. Lucy pointed out, Mr. Brancker, when the Speaker leaves the Chair in the House of Commons the Crown is asked to give him a Peerage; so that if Mr. Adams wants today to maintain the tradition accepted in the Commonwealth and in Great Britain and wanted Mr. Husbands out of the Chair, he should have recommended him for a seat in the other Chamber. Instead of recommending him for a seat in the other Chamber, he is asked to go back on the floor and occupy a junior and less exalted position to the one he previously occupied. Now, Sir, I go on to read from what Mr. Adams said when he nominated Mr. Husbands in 1948.

"Although we have had misunderstandings with some of our Governors—and indeed it is a traditional Barbadian past-time,—yet we have never had the sort of misunderstandings with our Speakers that occasionally have taken place in the Parliament of Great Britain."

He, Mr. Clerk, was expressing the Barbadian gratitude and pride and gratification that in the past the relationship between the House and the Speaker had been always harmonious; and yet today, Sir without any justification whatsoever he wants to disturb that tradition and disturb that harmonious relation. Now to go on.

"I feel I express the wishes and the inner sentiments of every member of this Assembly when I say that our purpose and determination during this session and for the future shall be to maintain the dignity of the Speakership and to support the Speaker-elect, no matter to what Party we may belong.

Now I want to ask him if what he has done today is maintaining the dignity of the Speakership of this Chamber. There is no record in the entire history of Barbados in which there has ever been such scrambling and bickering, such strife and such undignified behaviour with regard to the election of Speaker as we have seen today. In the British House of Commons or in other Parliamentary Chambers, when the majority is conscious of the responsibility and conscious of the basic principles of Parliamentary decorum, if the nomination of a Speaker caused such behaviour, the nomination would have been withdrawn. It is incredible that with almost half the Assembly protesting in no uncertain terms about the nomination today that the Government Party, the Leader of which has gone on record as saying that he wants to maintain the traditions attached to the office of Speaker, should lend himself and not only lend himself but should be the author of what has happened here today. To go on:

"We had as Deputy Speaker (during the last session), the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and it is a matter of great personal regret to me—and I dare suppose to other members—that he has not found it possible to allow himself to be nominated for the Speakership of this Assembly during the ensuing session."

Now imagine that, Mr. Clerk. He regretted in 1948 that the Deputy Speaker refused to be nominated as Speaker for the ensuing session. He was so anxious to maintain the best parliamentary traditions that he wanted the Deputy Speaker in 1947 in the previous session to allow himself to be nominated for the Speakership for the ensuing session, and yet today Mr. Clerk, with no excuse at all he expects us to sit here and allow the Speaker to be turned from his office unceremoniously and without any attempt at reward or expression of appreciation for services rendered. As a matter of fact, Mr. Clerk, can you see a member of this Chamber getting up and proposing another Speaker without one word of expression of appreciation for the manner in which the previous Speaker has discharged his duties? It is common decency; it is the ordinary principle of parliamentary procedure if a member resigns his position or retires from the Chamber, that there should be on the floor of the House some expression of appreciation for the services he has rendered. The only inference from the action of the Government today is that Mr. Speaker Husbands has either disgraced the Chair or failed to maintain the dignity of the Speaker of this island, but they cannot say so; and even if they attempt to remove him they still out of common decency should make some reference to the manner in which he has served as Speaker for the last eight years. This Chamber is no convenience for the members of the majority party, and while they may be able in the confines

of their own party chambers to touch a man and move a man, to borrow an expression, or to pitch-fork people who do not deserve it over the heads of people, when they come here, it is an entirely different matter. If this House is to maintain the tradition which he claimed in 1948 he wanted to maintain, well, Sir, we have to begin by saying that from the first we should conform to all the existing principles of parliamentary practice and parliamentary tradition. To continue:

"Equally I regret that the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable junior member for St. James, who is our senior member, who has graced this Assembly with his presence for over 20 years and whom, I feel sure, the members of the Assembly are glad to see among us again, no matter what our political views may be, because of his extensive experience and ability in certain matters,—experience and ability which the rest of us can come nowhere near—I regret, I repeat, that the honourable junior member for St. James, because of his position in the House, is unable to accept the office of Speaker."

He regretted the Deputy Speaker would not accept the post as Speaker and he regretted the Leader of the Opposition who was the senior member in the House would not take the post as Speaker, and yet today neither the Deputy Speaker in the last House nor the senior member in this House is being asked to take the post as Speaker, and this is what he says. This is Mr. Adams himself talking in 1948.

"I understand that none of the honourable members on my left are willing to be Speaker."

In 1948 the present hon. junior member for St. Peter was the only man in the Assembly who would come to his assistance and take the post of Speaker; the Deputy Speaker would not take it nor the senior member would not take it; none of the members of the Government Party would take it at all and one of the most brilliant members in the House came to his assistance and took it; and after taking it and pulling him out of a hole he wants today to kick him unceremoniously in the pants.

"I understand that none of the honourable members on my left are willing to be Speaker. It therefore, becomes the duty of the members who belong to the Party which has the greatest number of members in the Assembly to propose one of our number as Speaker and it is our unanimous wish that the honourable junior member for St. Peter should be the Speaker of this Assembly. I now have much pleasure, Mr. Clerk, in proposing as our Speaker, the honourable junior member for St. Peter, Mr. Husbands."

Now, in 1948 it gave him all this pleasure to have Mr. Husbands as Speaker. Well now, we want to hear in 1956 why it no longer gives him pleasure. What has he done in the interim—not with regard to the personal relationship between Mr. Husbands and himself; that does not concern us. We want to hear in 1956 in what manner he has failed to serve as Speaker of the Assembly or in what manner his presence as Speaker of the Assembly will accrue to the disadvantage of the island and of the Chamber itself. You cannot take someone like that and turn one around the tip of your finger. I said earlier in here today that twenty-five thousand people lost their lives last month in Hungary because they were no longer prepared to exist under a tyrannical dictator. If Barbados is to become a Kremlin overnight and one man is to run the country, let us all resign our seats; but if each and everyone of the twenty-four members elected here were elected according to the legal manner proposed for election to

the Assembly and therefore is entitled, the one as the other, to express our views in the Assembly, it is our solemn obligation to protest in the most emphatic terms against the injustice and immorality and the lack of principle underlying the actions of the Premier here today, and to support the nomination of the previous Speaker again to preside over the destinies of this Chamber.

I repeat, Sir, that it is an act of shamelessness and ungraciousness in the acceptance of the post of Speaker in a parliamentary chamber for a member to permit his nomination to stand in the face of the hostility and the criticism and the strenuous objections which have been made today on this side of the Chamber with respect to the nomination of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as Speaker of this ancient Assembly.

Mr. TUDOR: I think all hon. members should be grateful to the hon. senior member for St. Philip for the way in which he has enlightened this House of the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph in 1948 when he proposed the hon. junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of the House for that session. That, I think, is sufficient to condemn him and to prove that he is a notorious breaker of pledges. I have heard the speech which he made in December 1951, and I may say in passing that something very peculiar is happening with the records of this Assembly. Here is the record of some of the debates which have taken place in this House from the 8th of January 1952 until well into 1953; it starts off with the speech which the then Governor delivered to the joint session of the Legislature when the Parliament was opened. It should have started off with the report of the proceedings on the 18th December 1951, but that is no where to be seen.

We have complained about the separation and removal of vital official documents; we wanted to have a copy of the debate which took place on the 18th January and it was necessary for me to borrow a copy from the Other Place so that I could read it. Here is the speech made by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph when he proposed the present hon. junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of this House. This is what the hon. member said:—

"Mr. Clerk, I have much pleasure in proposing Mr. Kenmore Nathaniel Rhystone Husbands, the senior member for the parish of St. Peter, as Speaker of the General Assembly for this coming Parliament. Mr. Husbands needs no recommendation from me or from any of us as Speaker, inasmuch as he has already presided over our destinies with that dignity which one expects from the Speaker of a Legislative Assembly and I may add, that extra dignity, if such a thing is possible, that one would expect of a Legislative Assembly which is the second oldest in the Colonial world. I go further and say, Mr. Clerk, that if one were to read the old debates of Assemblies that have taken place in the past 300 years of the life of Barbados, one could not find today any diminution in the care with which the proposed Speaker has conducted, as our guardian, the affairs of this Assembly. Mr. Husbands has shown that attention to detail, to procedure and the observance of the Rules of the House that one expects, as I say, from the holder of an office which is as old as ours. In fact, perhaps I should not say this, but there were times when I personally thought that Mr. Husbands was, if anything, too dignified, too careful and too much of a Speaker; but that is a good fault. One does not like to draw invidious comparisons, but it is far better for an old Assembly like ours to say that the Speaker is a rigid Speaker rather than a lax Speaker."

And the pledge-breaker has now completely turned around his words and is introducing a lax Speaker instead of a rigid Speaker. Just as he

promised that the molasses would not be shipped in bulk as long as there was a white hair in his head, the Premier goes on to eat his words. Let me read for the benefit of hon. members the language of one who is prosecuting this shameless state of affairs today. This is what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph went on to say:

"If Mr. Husbands continues in the way in which he has begun, I have no doubt that for the next 40 or 50 years his successors will have the pleasure of continuing in his dignified and correct administration. Again I have much pleasure in proposing the senior member for St. Peter, Mr. K. N. R. Husbands, as Speaker of this Assembly for the ensuing Session."

That, Mr. Clerk, is the record of the man which Mr. Adams proposed for the second time, a man of his own party, as Speaker of this Assembly.

Now, there are some people who would like to rewrite history, and in doing so would like certain words blotted out from the records, and would wish that they were not there to be quoted against them. Fortunately for us, and for posterity, we have the record of the words which Mr. Adams has spoken. Now, if he were dissatisfied in 1951, he would have been prepared to eat his words which he spoke in 1948. He was not dissatisfied in 1951. It was recommended to the then House that Mr. Husbands should be re-elected as Speaker. Mr. Adams spoke with great clarity and generosity when he said that Mr. Husbands was a fit and proper person to be Speaker.

Now, we come to this situation, what do we find? They wish to take Dr. Cummins from the heat and struggle of party strife because he had proved himself incapable and has been a severely wounded casualty. How best to bring him from the firing line so that the hospital authorities and the doctors could attend to him and nurse him back to health for what was to them near political death was their concern. There again, on rescuing that man, they had to put him into a position where his incompetence and incapability would be hidden and where he would reign with unchallenged supremacy over the very ignorance which his incompetence had created. In doing that, the fit and proper thing for them to do would have been to notify the members of this Chamber that they had reasons for thinking either that Mr. Husbands was unwilling to be Speaker, or that he was incapable of being Speaker again. But neither of those things the senior member for St. Joseph has done. There are two opposition parties in this House and there are two members of this House who do not belong to any party. It would have been a simple matter for the Government Party by letter or circular—or anything like that—to say that we are not proposing Mr. Husbands; but none of us on this side of the Table had any such information. Therefore the opposition members had come here today with a ready and willing mind to support for the third time the man, the hon. member, the junior member for St. Peter, who bears two recommendations from the leader of his own party.

We did not think that the Leader of the Government Party who had recommended to the House Mr. Husbands in 1948 and 1951 as our Speaker would go on to eat his words as what he is doing this time. We therefore find ourselves in this situation that we cannot acquiesce in supporting Dr. Cummins as Speaker of this House because we do not deem him to be the fit and proper person; and they themselves by wanting him to be Speaker show that he has exhausted every possible avenue of incapacity. This gentleman who presided over the Ministry of Health

has left it in ruins, and they are admitting that to us by not transferring him to another Ministry, not even the Ministry of Communications and Works. They regard him as a liability and that is the reason why they are asking us to help them out of the dilemma by elevating him to the highest gift within the power of this House to bestow. But, Sir, they will have to satisfy us. Tell us here now, before we go any further, why you find you cannot support Mr. Husbands as Speaker again? Is he unacceptable to you because you cannot manage him and cannot get him to do the dirty things which you want him to do? Is it because you have someone whom you can twist; therefore, you no longer need him? It is because you want a Speaker whom you manage, therefore you are casting him away? If that is your private quarrel with him, we have nothing to do with that. We are satisfied with him as Speaker.

[Mr. Clerk leaves his seat to speak with the Premier].

Mr. BRANCKER: Order, order, Mr. Clerk! Will the Officers of this House remain in their places?

Mr. TUDOR: What authority has Mr. Adams got to call you away like that?

[Mr. Clerk resumes his seat].

Mr. TUDOR: I was saying that if they have a private quarrel with Mr. Husbands, they must pursue it in some place other than in this House of Assembly.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Clerk, I rise on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy is addressing you. According to the Rules of the House of Lords, you must be standing in your place. You are being addressed by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. You must be in your place to be addressed.

Mr. CLERK: I had left that temporarily to Mr. Deputy Clerk.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Clerk, if they wish to pursue quarrels with Mr. Husbands, let them pursue them in that place where it is right and proper to do so; but do not pursue that quarrel with him at the expense of this House and the detriment of the traditions and customs of this Parliament. I do not think there are words sufficiently clear to allow me to make them understand that we do not want Dr. Cummins as Speaker, and if he had any sense he would withdraw from the position which he is now seeking unless he wishes it to be made more contemptible. How can you aim to preside over the House when in the act of getting elected you are the storm centre and the seat of such bitter controversy? I can see what my personal position would be in the Chair. He must name me if I laugh or not, and name me not through vindictiveness but through sheer ignorance. He would not know the traditions of this House nor would he know the procedure, because he has not studied them. You can tell who is and who is not going to be a good Speaker. If a Minister of the Crown is changed from being the Leader of the House and conducting Government Business thereby being the link between the Executive Committee of this Island and Assembly, and if on every occasion for five or three years you have so mismanaged that very important work it means either you do not know what being a member of the Executive Committee means or you do not understand the responsibilities as a member of this House. On no occasion has he been able to conduct the affairs from Government side of this House as to inspire confidence. That has been said over and over again. The senior for Christ Church has put it more clearly than I have when he said if it were a question of finding a more intelligent person or less intelligent person than Mr.

Smith when they proposed him; but that is not it at all. There are thirteen or fourteen of them, or twelve or thirteen, I think. You are prepared to put Cummins in the Chair, not even to make him Chairman of Committees or even Deputy Speaker. Here we have Adams telling you with his own mouth that if Husbands continues in the way he has begun that he had no doubt that for the next forty or fifty years no successor would have been there to continue the dignity and correct administration. Five years have lapsed, we know he fancies himself as God, therefore, forty years might be like for him as the Supreme, or even again forty or fifty years have lapsed, and according to him it might be time for Mr. Husbands' successor, but a successor will not have the knowledge and the aptitude to continue in that dignified and correct administration which has been laid down by the person whom Mr. Adams is here praising.

Mr. Clerk, I have only been in this House two Sessions; this is the beginning of the second Session; and for the life of me I have not been able to understand until today how traditions and customs of this Chamber have become prostituted, and I see clearly before me now several displaced; and one man and one man alone, not the man referred to by the hon. junior member for St. John, but one other man is alone responsible for the disgraceful situation, but that is only one example. They have members and if they can manage to exhaust us in talk they can get the Speaker they want, but in getting him they will be inflicting damage on this House and that is what I am here to prevent to the limit of my ability and strength. We do not want Dr. Cummins, because in our view he is not a fit and proper person. We would have preferred the junior member for St. John, and it is strange that they of all people who take it upon themselves whenever they are campaigning on public platforms to say who is a failure and who is well educated or who has university degrees, and overlook what should be to them a very obvious situation to know that his monumental incapability has brought them to the pass they are at now. They themselves have complained, Mr. Clerk, that he has been an embarrassment to them. Now, pride allows his colleague to say something behind his back and apologising for incompetence, and as he has no pride left they would make time for him to get out of this disgraceful situation now. If he leaves that to Adams surely he is a man who can ask for what he wants. Why not give him a knighthood or a seat on the Executive Council? Ask for what you want and get it, but do not allow yourself to be put in a position in which you can inflict the most serious injury on your country. Are you so wicked and vicious or so desperate that the one last injury you want to inflict on your fellow countrymen is to saddle yourself on them in the capacity of Speaker of the Legislative Chamber, doing the very worst you know how to do?

There is another aspect of this matter I had almost forgotten. All that we know of their position to Mr. Husbands is what the Premier himself has said. The junior member for the City is not familiar with all the aspects of this matter and therefore we do not quarrel with him for his mistaken view, but Adams alone proposed Dr. Cummins and Mr. Cox seconded; they did both these things before Mr. Husbands was proposed.

Since the hon. junior member for St. Peter has been proposed as Speaker of this House, neither of the senior members of the Party has thought it fit to give any explanation to this Chamber as to why he does not want that hon. member to be Speaker of this House. Therefore, in view of their silence on that side of the House, we must conclude that the opposition to the hon. junior member for St. Peter

is not as great as the opposition to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. The opposition to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has been most vociferous, loud, long and extremely bitter. Since no Speaker would want to take the Speakership of this House in this bitter atmosphere, would not the hon. junior member for St. Thomas see the folly of their ways and be prepared to back down because of the disgraceful state of affairs which has taken place today?

I have always thought that the Speaker should be paid better than he is being paid because I have seen the embarrassment to which he has been put, through not having a large salary at his command and a large entertainment allowance. Therefore, I am in favour of an increase of the salary, but the way in which it is being done makes it appear as if the hon. junior member for St. Thomas must have a big salary to match the size of the office. The hon. member will not suffer so big a loss in taking the Speakership of this House because the \$540 per month, which is the salary proposed for the office, is not much below the Ministerial figure. The hon. junior member for St. James will cut his political teeth in support of the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. John will support him, and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew will back him in anything he is offered; but they should not saddle him with the Speakership of this House. For the sake of the prestige of a great political party, they should not inflict the hon. junior member for St. Thomas on this House as Speaker; he is not the person for us and we do not want him. I do not think there is anything to be said more clearly than that we do not want the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to be Speaker of this House.

His Excellency the Governor has adjourned these proceedings until 10 a.m. tomorrow; is it their wish to start the proceedings this morning all over again? They have no means of inflicting the hon. junior member for St. Thomas on us as Speaker, except as a result of the exhaustion of the members of this House. If the hon. member wants to be the Speaker of this House in spite of all that has been said of him, he must know that he will be ruling over a divided House; if he wants that, he can have it, but only after there has been a prolonged fight. Let the hon. member withdraw because the situation for him by now must have become almost unbearable.

Mr. F. G. SMITH: One would have expected somebody from the other side of the House at least to attempt to rise in order to justify the Premier's proposal and the seconding of it; one would have expected some backbencher to get up and explain why it is that the decision was taken to propose the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as Speaker of this House, and not the hon. junior member for St. Peter. We have been elected to this House for five years; I might lose my seat at the end of that period, but while I am here I will see that justice is done to the people whom I represent, and that moral and honourable principles are maintained both on this side and on that side of the House. Today will go down in the history of this island as an important day; we are fighting for a principle which is vital, even if we are defeated today. I would say that the present Government got into power because the people elected it, but if the Premier had been taken ill on the plane, they on that side could not have obtained seven seats.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy has read out what the Premier said in 1951; he said that Mr. John Browne is a nice man but in the next few years he is a dishonest man. Today the Premier will say that the only decent lawyer who has left Grays Inn is himself. He fought the hon. senior member

for St. Peter like a dog so as to get him unseated, he carried about 78 policemen and tried to lock him up. Today, the man who had been fighting and impairing his health for the Premier, is the same man whom he wants to assassinate. We cannot remain here and see that man politically assassinated. Today also you have a man who, for the past eight years, was supported by that party; some of them fought for him, some of them said that he was an honourable and upright man and told the people to kick out Mr. Walcott and support Mr. Husbands. Gratitude is a good thing, but nobody can buy it. I have no doubt that if we were allowed to vote secretly, some of those members on that side would vote for Mr. Husbands as Speaker. Today we are supporting a member of their party, not a member of the Opposition.

We are supporting the ex-Speaker in preference to the ex-Minister. The member who presides over the destinies of this Assembly should be a man whose rulings every member should obey. Do you know why the ex-Speaker is sitting over there? He is sitting over there because he did his job remarkably well and could not be bullied. Let history record it. I come from St. Andrew where there are two Labour members. I may lose my seat but as long as I remain a member of this Chamber, neither the Premier nor any Minister will be able to get over there and tell me anything because I fought and am prepared to stand and fight again for election.

Let me get back to the point at issue. Ask yourselves this honest question. Is it fair to the ex-Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, that to-day he should be put on the political cross? He is on it now. I think he has got sense enough to know that both his seat in here and his job at the Workers' Union are in jeopardy and from now on they will start their intrigue to move him. It is merely because he had the guts to stand up and say: "I am willing to serve as Speaker if you re-elect me." I am going to warn him, although I think he is fully conscious of it, that from now on his political death is assured unless he plays his cards right. It is the fate of all these who got the guts to stand up and fight. Mr. Tudor, Mr. Brancker and everybody else who had any intelligence have never been able to stand with members on that side. Take the history of people who were once members of that party and you will see that is the reason why the ex-Speaker is on the political cross to-day. Before the Clerk of this House and before the people of this country, the hon. junior member for St. Peter stands to be crucified because of party politics. It cuts against a man's principles. I know to-day that the hon. senior member for St. John, a man who has taught children to have principles and has inculcated in them honesty of purpose, a man who has done his best for children, is sitting uneasily on that side of the table today because he realises that a man patterned after his own character, a man who has made his political contribution, is about to die politically.

Mr. Deputy Clerk, from what I see, I gather they are relying on their numbers. I feel very strongly over this matter. I feel if there is any honour left in the Government Party, the Premier should withdraw the nomination of Dr. Cummins as Speaker. Of course, he never yet lost his honour. [A VOICE: He lost his professional reputation!] Do not mind that. Of course, you cannot make honourable those who by their moral character, their political character or contribution, were never honourable, but if the Premier were honourable, he would see to it that Dr. Cummins should no longer be nominated as Speaker.

What is a Speaker's job? Is it a Speaker's job to be a party man? The Premier has actually said that he is going to give the Speaker power to name members. Is it a Speaker's job to name members or to preside over Parliament? I am saying that if he were in the Chair, I am sure he would name me but the Clerk cannot name me at all. Can anyone imagine that a debate like this on such a vital matter would have taken place? Of course, there are fifteen members on that side and we know that they have got the power to do as they please. The people have given that side the greater number but time is running out. The old people used to say: "Time is longer than rope." I am going to say that your turn is going to come. We have heard today that it is a shame for us to keep His Excellency waiting. We regret our causing His Excellency inconvenience. I must further say that I give the hon. junior member for St. James three months with that party. What happened today with the hon. junior member for St. Peter is going to happen to him. I am also warning the hon. junior member for St. Michael. Let them ask the ex-Speaker if what I am telling them is not true. I am warning them not to trust the Premier. I am warning them that their turn is going to come. I give the hon. junior member for St. James three months — may be four — with that Party and it is for that reason that I am appealing to them to support the hon. junior member for St. Peter for the Speakership. I am talking to the hon. senior member for St. John most particularly because I know that he has taught children to be fair and just and not to throw away years and years of teaching. I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. James because he knows that the action of the Premier today is not fair. I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Michael because he knows that his turn has come already and will come again.

I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. Thomas because he knows it is not fair to the hon. junior member for St. Peter, and the hon. junior member for St. Michael because your turn has come already and it will come again. I want you to support the matter on principle because over there they did this thing not from wilful intention but from ignorance. How in the name of heaven can they come before this Chamber in all sincerity and say, "we propose Dr. Cummins?" Does the Premier really think or has he gone mad? All he could get up here and say is: "Mr. Clerk, I beg to nominate Dr. Cummins;" he is an old man, he has paid no tribute to the man of his Party that impaired his health for this job. How can you vote for this thing? Could you not get up and say in the same breath why you wanted to change him? No tribute has been paid to the man who deliberated for the last eight years, but you can get up and say you propose Dr. Cummins. Have you got any conscience over there? You are going to pay the price for it. "God does not like ugly" and he does not like it too long. Do you mean you are going to stand up and see a man from your own Party sacrificed? You like the working classes over there, but you are prepared to sacrifice the General Secretary of the working classes and the Speaker. It is an insult to the Union to sacrifice the General Secretary of the Union. Now today we witness the second spectacle; they are prepared to sacrifice the Speaker on the political altar. It is unfortunate that the Assistant General Secretary has been opposing the General Secretary. This movement represents the working class people. We are conservative, we are not supposed to be representing the working class people at all, but today we say it was a privilege

to see the General Secretary on principle get up and second the nomination of the Assistant General Secretary who opposed him in the campaign. Mr. Clerk, this is a very important matter. Let them write in the *Beacon* "Sleepy Smith wants the Premiership"; write whatever you like; you have all nine pages to write. I say to you and I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. James who is a man I have always respected despite the fact that he is the Minister of silence. I feel that you are a true party man and should support your party man, the hon. junior member for St. Peter. You are not supporting a member of the P.C.P. in this House, an Independent member or a member of the Democratic Labour Party; he is a member of your own party. You can show the Opposition that you are supporting a man of your own party; the ex-Speaker is a man of your own party. I am appealing to you as true party men to support the hon. junior member for St. Peter, who was Speaker for eight years, who did his best after he came into the Chair with the utmost experience, who was impartial and gave each side a fair hearing. But what has happened today. Would any of you accept the post of Parliamentary Under-Secretary when the Constitution says nothing about it? The hon. junior member for St. Peter has been asked to accept something not in the Constitution and to leave a solid job such as Speaker to accept something the Premier is promising him. Would you expect a man like the hon. junior member for St. Peter to accept this promise? Start thinking; this is not a party appointment. I feel and I think you should feel if you vote for the hon. junior member for St. Peter you are not being disloyal to the party. I know the Ministries have been fixed by the Hon. Premier already and therefore not to appoint the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as Speaker would throw a little spanner in the works; get six Ministries and give one to Dr. Cummins; go to England next week on one of your periodical trips and see the Secretary of State for the Colonies and arrange for a Ministry for him. You have got fifteen members and you can get it through, but do not sacrifice a man whose pride, whose dignity and honour must be terribly hurt. I would not like to have presided over this Chamber for eight years, then suddenly to be brought back down to be an ordinary member to be ruled over by people whom you told to sit down when they were out of order. Ask yourself that question. The Premier cannot live forever and this election as I said before proved one thing. When he is out of this country you are liquidated, so start acting on principle now. When he is not in the island the D.L.P. will eat you like a cockroach before a fowl. Start acting honestly now with yourselves because when you come to the people without him you have got to be honest. Let there be no more talk about prestige and simple talk about a man who took people from crocus bag and people from obscurity. None of you can take anybody from anything. The Premier cannot live for ever and by law of average you should live longer. We know the hon. junior member for St. James is 64 and I warn you to start acting on principle now, because when the Premier has gone and you are running about to find a resting place you will find that there is no resting place down here. I went to the rock to hide my face but the rock cried out I am burning too.... Support the hon. junior member for St. Peter; I do not know what has happened; I do not know if you agreed unanimously that he must be sacrificed. I do not know what offers were held out; I do not know your plans or your policy and I do

not want to know; but I want you to realise that he has intimated to this Hon. Chamber today that he is willing to continue in the office as Speaker and willing to serve with the same dignity and decorum, characteristic of the position as Speaker. I would like you to go out and tell the Premier after this projected debate in the House of Assembly to ask Dr. Cummins to withdraw and when you come back in we will respect you more. This is the course, I want hon. members on that side to take. Don't you see that from the beginning you are going to get annoyance and naming people and threatening people? Don't you think it would be better because you yourself can have no objection against the hon. junior member for St. Peter who for the last five years has done his job very well and who was recommended by the Premier who thinks he is the Lord Almighty? What has he done to affect you that you today must assassinate him? There are nine or ten over here who are in favour of him and you feel that he should be there, but you are afraid of the Premier because he gave you a place. Go and meet him in the Lobby and say "Grantley, or whatever you call him, we are in favour with the opposition, and to prevent the House from being rowdy, ask Dr. Cummins to back down." I ask you to be reasonable. If the hon. junior member for St. Thomas had any guts, he would get up and tell us why they want to do this thing. I know it was the live-long ambition of the hon. junior member for St. James to get into this Chamber at 64 and so too the hon. senior member for St. John. Tell us why you would not vote. I have always respected the hon. junior member for St. James and I want my colleague, the senior member for St. Andrew to tell me why she cannot support the nomination of the hon. junior member for St. Peter. This is no party thing; this is a question of principle, and you are going to answer the people in St. Andrew for it too. Today is the first day that I sit in here and you will have to answer the people for it; you are going to tell them about "Labour, labour," so you will have to tell them why you could not support the hon. junior member for St. Peter who is the Assistant General Secretary of the Workers' Union.

Why cannot you support the hon. junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of this House? When you have to do the thinking for several people, you cannot be too old. I regret that I should be standing in this Chamber making a speech like this. If the former Speaker of this House, the hon. junior member for St. Peter, had not said that he was willing to fill the office again, there would have been no debate, the Governor would have made his speech and everybody would have gone home happy. I was surprised this morning when I discovered that something was wrong. Let the Hon. Premier tell this House why he is preferring the hon. junior member for St. Thomas to the hon. junior member for St. Peter as Speaker of this House; let the Hon. Premier tell us that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is a dishonest man, and we can get some right away. Let the Hon. Premier say, "I have proposed the hon. junior member for St. Thomas as Speaker because the hon. junior member for St. Peter was dishonest and therefore I cannot propose him as Speaker."

I will say that during the Session, I will treat the Government with the utmost courtesy, but I want hon. members on that side of the House to be honest with hon. members on this side of the House. I also think that the Ministers should be treated with respect, but we must have information when we ask for it. We want information now; we want to know why the Hon. Premier has proposed the hon. junior member for St. Thomas for the Speakership

of the House in preference to the hon. junior member for St. Peter. Is that too much to ask of the Government on the eve of the Session in which legislation must be passed in the interest of the people? Is it wanting to know too much just to know that? It would not be in the interest of the hon. junior member for St. Peter to happen to find himself in this arena. I will go into the Lobby in a minute, but let us try and inform the public of the issues which are involved in this matter. Is it that the hon. junior member for St. Peter is dishonest, and corrupt? If that is so, I shall not vote for him; but they must give us that information, because we want honesty in public life. The Ministers must be courteous to us; otherwise there will be a lot of rowdiness unless the Speaker is impartial. We want to be treated with courtesy and respect; even at this late stage, even at this eleventh hour, they can give us the information as to why the hon. junior member for St. Peter is not wanted as Speaker of this House and we will vote against him.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. junior member for St. Andrew has made a first-class maiden speech; it shows to us the kind of talent which we have in this Island and the kind of talent which people do not want to come to light. The reason for that is that they want to assassinate the hon. junior member for St. Peter. There are paid political assassins who will assassinate people; they tried to assassinate me by the same hon. junior member for St. Peter, and the stand I took on his behalf is a lesson which he should have seen coming along five years ago. The hon. senior member for St. Michael is supposed to be Vice President of the Labour Party; about six years ago, he was asked to step down and become Treasurer in order that the hon. junior member for St. Thomas might become Vice President of the Party and he said "No". The hon. senior member for St. Michael did not want to step down for the hon. junior member for St. Thomas; but the Hon. Premier did not want the hon. senior member for St. Michael to be Vice President of the Labour Party because he was a taxi driver and the hon. junior member for St. Thomas was a Doctor.

Mr. CLERK: I really do not want to interfere with the hon. senior member for St. Peter but I just want to direct his attention to page 252 of May which says that the debate must be in relation to the claims of each candidate.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am sure that you are not one of those people who cannot appreciate an analogy.

Mr. CLERK: What the hon. member is saying is not an analogy.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Clerk, today the hon. junior member for St. Thomas is asked to take the position of Speaker and his nomination is supported by that Party in preference to the ex-Speaker, the junior member for St. Peter. We know that the junior member for the City is very courageous, but we must remind him that five years ago the same Dr. Cummins wanted to assassinate him politically and I was the man who stood up for him and said that this is a democratic place and I am going to speak on his platform. His brother was even afraid to speak then for him. They cannot say that I climbed up on their backs. Mr. Tommy Miller has come to their rescue this time. He has not been in this business too long; therefore he does not know the connivance of the people on that side. Dr. Cummins was a failure in his Ministry and they are now elevating him to the Speakership when they know that he has not the aptitude for reading matters. Ask

him when was the last time he read a book. I warned the hon. junior member for St. Peter a long time ago about this job of Speakership. He heard me saying something about it on a platform during the campaign and he was annoyed over it, but the same person proposed for Speaker today told Mr. Hugh Springer and myself something at Indramer Guest House which I have not forgotten, even though it is over five years ago. They will not tell the hon. junior member for St. Peter why he was used so that I might lost my seat. They said at Diamond Rock in the schoolroom which the headmaster allowed them to use that I was the worst thing in creation. You can clearly see now that the junior member for St. Peter was being used to get me out of this House of Assembly, but he failed. As the part in which he was to play did not succeed, they are saying today that it does not matter if he goes now. I told him that if the other person whom they ran with him did not get in this House of Assembly that they would not offer him the Speakership. They have not offered him. They tried to use him to assassinate me.

The hon. junior member for St. James is in here at the age of 64 years and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is appealing to him to vote in favour of the hon. junior member for St. Peter but the hon. junior member for St. James has to fall in line with the Premier. The Premier is their fairy god-mother; therefore, there is no question of appealing to him.

Mr. Clerk, the nomination of DR. CUMMINS in place of MR. HUSBANDS could not have been done with a proper motive. This is what the Premier said when he proposed MR. HUSBANDS as Speaker on the last occasion:—

"MR. HUSBANDS has shown that attention to detail, to procedure and to the observance of the Rules of the House that one expects, as I say, from the holder of an office which is as old as ours. In fact, perhaps I should not say this, but there were times when I, personally, thought that MR. HUSBANDS was, if anything, too dignified, too careful and too much of a Speaker, but that is a good fault."

That is the extravagant language he used then in proposing the junior member for St. Peter as Speaker. I know this: he cannot do anything to prevent me from getting in here; I will do him something first. That is another threat. He said that if I got in here he was not coming. I do not know how he managed to come in here today.

You have got a good time coming; you have got to go and fry your fat. I am going to tell you something and that is so far as St. Peter is concerned you are a cooked goose now and forever. If the hon. junior member for St. Peter had the guts he had today before the elections, you could not get in at all. You could only get a little way in Speightstown but you could not pass the hill, and therefore you let the hon. junior member for St. Thomas go down there. Now, they have a Speaker to assassinate. I continually warn these people that this thing wants killing; when you liquidate a man he can come back again, but when you assassinate him he is out for good; and what is more, the members can sit down there and know what is being said is true. As I said already, this is not based on friendship; it is based on principle, because I can see the handwriting on the wall. I warned him, I could see what they were after; they were after me and as long as they were after me, any one could be used to get me out. They told Mr. Manley to tell me this; I have a letter from Mr. Manley, from

Philip Sherlock and from Mr. Hugh Springer; Mr. Manley wrote me a letter (which never occurred before.) To get me out of St. Peter they got with the hon. junior member for St. Peter to attack me and leave the door open. The hon. junior member for St. Thomas threatened this same man in Speights-town to attack me in Black Bess and now we come to the time closing the breach between the two of us I am back here and he is with me. You can see if I were not elected and Mr. Morris got in, it would not be a question of offering you something that does not exist like the Parliamentary Under-Secretary post when no such thing exists in the whole Establishment. They bring in the hon. junior member for St. Philip and offer him a Ministry when they called the man a thief; all these things I am waiting on them for the next five years which is going to be the sweetest five years of my life. You are smirking, but you can go and read the Bible, because I know you don't; you could call God's name if I gave you five shillings, because you do not believe in Him. I know what you believe in. [A VOICE: He is a Christian!]. Christian at the altar of £.s.d. That is what you get, and this after seeing these things you will say: "It was true what Frank said, I should not have accepted this Speakership five years ago."

(To DR. CUMMINS) You do not matter now, but you were the person to keep the first meeting in Boscobel. People should have given you some lashes; you deserved them and you are going to get them before long too. Talking about genial, you may be affable and genial, but you are a wicked man. Do not worry. God is in Heaven and will deal with all like you. Coming and conniving with one another; putting the junior member for St. George against the senior member for St. George. That is how you work it; you go in St. Peter working with the junior member against me so as to get me out. The senior member for St. Thomas has said he is the most obsequious person he has ever met and now they are looking at each other like smiling pussies. I hope that I will live to be fifty-one which is eleven years from now that my political future will never rest in one man's hand, and especially in the hands of the Premier. They say they have no confidence in the Millers and I can go and kiss any Bible chapter and verse that I know all you have said about them. You have no confidence in the Millers and you accuse them of bringing out secrets. I was never an unwanted child; I went before the people for support and I have come back with all of you. I know they would put me on the altar, but I am in now; you do not need him any longer because you have others who will support you. The last time there was a squabble for the Ministries and the junior member for St. Michael had to sell out his shop. When the Premier told him he would have to give up his practice because he wanted to make a post to suit him, he said he had no intention of giving up his practice to become a Minister; the junior member for St. Thomas told him that. The Premier was grieved to hear that and that was one of the things that worried him. I know the whole history of this because he came to my house and talked it, and I am sure my wife can say that is true; she believes in God. These were the things you get but now you get this machination against people and at this eleventh hour, because the Speaker does not have a hind claw, you can push him back, but even the man from obscurity can stand up when you push me back. Some in the party are loyal and have common

has been made: "A message is then sent to the Governor by the mover and seconder, to inform him that the House having chosen a Speaker is desirous to present him to His Excellency. [*Cries of "Order"*]. Mr. Clerk, I am addressing you, Sir! Mr. Clerk! I am addressing you, and it is your business to remain there in your seat. You are a paid servant of this House; you are not an individual of it. You are to respect every member of this House and not back any member of this House when you are being addressed. The former Speaker would not do that, you must treat us with the respect to which we are entitled. You are our servant. This Rule says:

"A Message is when sent to the Governor by the mover and seconder, to inform him that the House having chosen a Speaker is desirous to present him to His Excellency."

If we make choice of the Speaker now, the only correct procedure is that a Message should be sent to the Governor. He has to await our discussions and for the Speaker to present himself to him for his approval. There is no question about the Governor saying to us: "You coloured boys, you can come back tomorrow morning." A Message has to be sent to the Governor stating that we have chosen our Speaker, and the Governor must avail himself for being present.

The question that hon. junior member for St. Thomas do take the Chair as Speaker of this House, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. G. H. ADAMS, Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, MESSRS. GARNER, COX, MAPP, F. E. MILLER, HOLDER, THORNE, Mrs. BOURNE, MESSRS. SEARLES, BRYAN, T. V. MILLER, and VAUGHAN—13.

Noes: MESSRS. HUSBANDS, TALMA, WALCOTT, WILEY, DOWDING, GODDARD, TUDOR, F. G. SMITH, KER—10.

• CLERK: I now declare the hon. junior for St. Thomas the Speaker of this Hon

• SPEAKER Elect: was then conducted to Chair by his proposer and seconder and robed him.

• Mr. SPEAKER Elect (Standing on the upper of the Dias): Before I take my seat I must thank hon. members for bestowing upon me the

honour of being elected as Your Speaker. I hope that during the ensuing term I will be able to count on your loyal support in maintaining and upholding the traditions of this Hon. House. [*Cheers*].

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 9.45 o'clock.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: According to the Rules of this House, Sir, we should now repair to the Other Place. You are now the Speaker-Elect and you will become Speaker with the Governor's approval. I think that the best method would be for us to inform the Governor that we have arrived at the choice of a Speaker and the Governor should await us somewhere; after that, he can go where he wants to go. I think that that would be the proper procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER Elect: If I am not mistaken His Excellency the Governor intimated earlier today that he would adjourn these proceedings until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. That is why the motion was made for the adjournment of the House now.

Mr. TUDOR: The situation is just this: we have not completed all that had to be done today and therefore, Mr. Speaker-Elect, you have to be presented to His Excellency the Governor somewhere and he has to signify that he approves of you as Speaker of this House. When the Governor does that and we return to this Chamber, you will then have full authority to adjourn this House on a motion being made.

As it stand now, we are left as it were, halfway, and as I see it, either the Clerk adjourns or we walk out, or you ask His Excellency when you can wait upon him to present yourself to him.

Mr. SPEAKER Elect: Again, I think we can adjourn until tomorrow morning. I repeat, the Governor expressed his willingness then to adjourn the proceedings today and to come back tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

The question that the House do now stand adjourn until to-morrow morning at 9.45 o'clock was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker-Elect adjourned the House accordingly.