

THE House Of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958-59

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 January, 1958.

Pursuant to prorogation, the 1956-61 Legislative Session was re-opened by His Excellency the Governor, Brigadier Sir Robert Duncan Harris Arundell, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., in the Council Chamber, Public Buildings, at 10 o'clock a.m. today.

The following Members of the House were present in their Chamber:

His Honour Dr. H.G.H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., junior member for St. Thomas, (*Speaker*); Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Kt., C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., senior member for St. Joseph, (*Premier*); Mr. J.E.T. BRANKER, junior member for St. Lucy, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Mr. W. A. CRAWFORD, senior member for St. Philip; Hon. M.E. COX, senior member for St. Michael, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. L.E. SMITH, J.P., junior member for St. Joseph, (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. E.D. MOTTLEY, senior member for the City; Hon. R.G. MAPPE, senior member for St. Thomas, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. K.N.R. HUSBANDS, junior member for St. Peter; Mr. T.O. BRYAN, junior member for St. Michael; Mr. F.C. GODDARD, junior member for Christ Church; Hon. F.E. MILLER, junior member for St.

George, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St. A. HOLDER, senior member for St. James; His Honour Mr. V.B. VAUGHAN, junior member for St. John, (*Deputy Speaker*); Mr. C.E. TALMA, senior member for Christ Church; Mr. J.C. TUDOR, M.A., senior member for St. Lucy; Mr. C. B. SEARLES, junior member for St. James; Mr. L. St. A. THORNE, senior member for St. John; Hon. D. D. GARNER, junior member for St. Philip, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E., senior member for St. George; Mr. T.W. MILLER, junior member for the City.

HOUSE SUMMONED TO OTHER PLACE

Honourable members being in their places, the Sergeant-at-Arms entered the Chamber and informed Mr. SPEAKER that His Excellency the Governor was in the Council and was ready to receive the House.

Mr. SPEAKER preceded by the Marshal carrying the mace cradlewise and followed by other honourable members in pairs according to seniority, proceeded to the Council Chamber and waited on His Excellency the Governor.

His Excellency then addressed the two Houses of the Legislature as follows:—

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

Once more it is my privilege to welcome the Members of both The Legislature. Chambers of the Legislature on the opening of a new Session. This is the second occasion during my term of office on which the time of this ceremony had to be changed in order not to interfere with an important game of cricket.

In the 1957 Birthday Honours, the Honourable Premier was awarded a Knighthood and the Honourable Mrs. N. G. Daysh received an O.B.E.

The Honourable C. A. Burton assumed duty as Attorney General and was appointed to the Legislative Council in November, 1957.

The Constitution.

As I said in my Address to you on the occasion of the inauguration of Ministerial Government in February, 1954, Barbados has enjoyed the uninterrupted possession of a large measure of self-government so far as the Legislature is concerned ever since the Settlement of the Island in the 17th Century. On the Executive side progress has been slower but equally sure. The process of attaining self-government in internal affairs was virtually completed on the 2nd January, 1958, when the Governor-in-Executive Committee delegated his powers under Section 2 of the Executive Committee Act, 1891, to the Ministers meeting as a Cabinet under the chairmanship of the Premier.

As from the same date the Premier assumed responsibility for the internal security of the Island, the Governor retaining his responsibility for external defence.

I should mention in this context that the traditional responsibility of the Attorney General for the initiation, conduct and discontinuance of criminal proceedings, acting as he is required to do in a quasi-judicial capacity, will in no wise be affected, and the Police Force will continue to be bound by their statutory obligations relating to the enforcement of law and order.

A Bill to repeal and replace the Police Act, which will provide *inter alia* for the establishment of a Police Board, will be submitted to you in due course.

A Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act in order to allow the appointment of additional Ministers when necessary will also be presented to you. A Minister of Education will be appointed early in the session.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Her Majesty the Queen has been pleased to give instructions for the appointment of the Honourable Dr. A. S. Cato to be a member of the Executive Council and of the Honourable E. F. L. Morris to be a member of the Legislative Council. The Honourable E. F. L. Morris replaces the Honourable Dr. A. S. Cato as Legislative Council member of the Executive Committee. As Minister Without Portfolio he will have the role of Government spokesman on your Honourable Board.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly:

The Federation of the West Indies.

The Federal Government was established on the 3rd January, 1958, and the 28th February has been appointed as Nomination Day for the first Federal Elections.

We look forward to welcoming His Excellency the Governor-General and, we hope, Lady Hailes if her health permits, when they pay their first official visit to Barbados from the 10th to the 13th February, 1958.

The Colonial Development and Welfare Organisation.

On this occasion it is fitting that I should pay tribute to the Comptroller for Development and Welfare in the West Indies, Sir Stephen Luke, his predecessors and their staffs, past and present, who have lived and worked here in Barbados since 1942 and will soon be leaving our shores. My Government desires me to record their warm and lasting appreciation of the wise counsel and friendly co-operation which they have received at all times from the Comptroller and his staff.

Financial Position.

Final figures for the financial year 1956-57 show a Revenue of \$19.1 million and Current Expenditure of \$16.2 million, giving a surplus of \$2.9 million on current account. Capital Expenditure was \$4.4 million and at the beginning of the current financial year the General Revenue Balance stood at \$3.59 million, as compared with \$6.47 million on the 1st April, 1955, when the present Five-Year Development Plan began.

The Budget for the current financial year shows a Revenue of \$18.9 million and Current Expenditure of \$18.7 million. Revenue collec-

tions up to the end of December amounted to just over \$15½ million and Current Expenditure to almost \$18½ million. Capital Expenditure during the same period was approximately \$2.4 million out of a total estimate for the year of \$11.6 million. Claims through the Crown Agents amounting to \$1.8 million in respect of the Deep Water Harbour had not been brought to account locally by the end of the year.

Issues to date under the Local Loan Act, 1955, amount to \$4½ million. The Public Debt of the Island stands at \$9.65 million and sinking funds amount to \$2.25 million. Public Loans.

It will be remembered that the limitation of the rate of interest on local loans to 4½% was removed by Act 1957-1. The two issues of debentures made since that date were issued at 5% and 5½% respectively, the September issue being made at a discount of 2%.

Under the Public Loan Act, 1957, authority was given for the raising of additional loans of \$22½ million. It is contemplated that the greater part of this amount is required to finance the under construction of the Deep Water Harbour should be raised in London. X X

The measures which Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have found it necessary to take to check inflation and maintain the stability of sterling naturally restrict the supply of money and my Government have constantly under review methods of financing their capital expenditure pending the raising of a London loan. Legislative authority has already been given to draw temporarily from the Revenue Equalisation Fund, which stands at \$8 million. It is proposed that the cost of the bulk sugar installation at the Deep Water Harbour should be met from the Sugar Industry's Price Stabilization Reserve Fund. Conversations have taken place with the Crown Agents for Oversea Governments with regard to temporary advances should access to the London market not be practicable for some time. To make the way clear for my Government to borrow in London as soon as possible and to enable other essential development projects in the Island to be financed, it will be necessary to amend the Rate of Interest Act, 1754. The precise form of the amendment to be introduced is now under examination.

A new source of loan funds which will now be available in the area will be the funds of the Caribbean Currency Board, and discussions are continuing as to the amount which will be available from that source for investment in Barbados.

The finances of the three main statutory undertakings, the Housing Authority, the Natural Gas Corporation and the Transport Board continue to receive close attention and it has already been announced that in the case of the Transport Board bus fares will be increased in order that this undertaking, which is now providing a greatly improved service, may be operated on a sound basis. Statutory Boards.

In all the present circumstances great caution will be exercised in respect of Government expenditure.

Last year's crop of 204,505 tons of sugar constitutes a record of which both sides of the sugar industry should feel proud. The present crop is estimated to amount to 190,000 tons. It is not too soon for those most concerned with agriculture to consider the implications of this increase in our production in terms of land use. It may well become a matter of urgency to find alternative uses for arable land that is not required for the production of our quota of sugar. Agriculture and Fisheries.

The increased production of food crops is certainly possible from the acreage available now, but improved marketing arrangements are a first requisite. New Markets legislation will shortly be presented to you.

A pilot project to check erosion in St. Andrew's was begun in January, 1957. A Bill to provide the powers required to extend soil conservation measures throughout what is known as the Scotland District will be submitted to you. X

The mechanization of the fishing fleet has proceeded very rapidly. Over 300 powered boats are now operating of which two out of three were equipped with the assistance of Government loans. X X

Plans for the construction of an Abattoir and Cold Storage Plant are far advanced.

My Ministers are considering the best means of controlling the dynamiting of fish along our coasts and legislation for this purpose will

be presented to you in due course. It is also intended to introduce legislation to prevent the indiscriminate removal of sand from the Island's beaches.

Development Board.

The appointment of a Manager in March 1957 put the Development Board in a position to undertake the functions assigned to it. Up to the end of 1957 eight loans amounting to \$194,500 had been made to assist the development of small industries.

Pioneer Industries.

A Bill will be presented to you re-enacting and amending the Pioneer Industries (Encouragement) Act, 1951, in order to widen the scope of concessions to industries.

Tourist Industry.

Legislation will be presented to you to provide for the establishment of a Board to undertake promotional work on behalf of the Tourist industry. Consideration is being given to amending the Barbados Development Act, 1955, in order to permit the Development Board to assist small scale hotel development. Consideration is also being given to a revision of the list of concessions under the Hotel Aids Act, 1956, with a view to its amendment. A Bill to amend the Trade Act so as to permit tourists to buy certain articles duty free is under preparation.

Plans for the new terminal buildings at Seawell are complete and construction will begin in the near future.

Mineral Oil Taxation.

A Bill will be submitted to you dealing with the taxation of oil companies.

During 1957 2,200 persons left Barbados to seek employment abroad. In addition, over 900 men were recruited for temporary farm work in the United States of America. Government loans to emigrants during 1957 totalled \$311,341. Since the inception of this Scheme in September, 1954, loans totalling \$964,807 have been made of which \$475,076 have been repaid.

Provident Funds.

Provident funds for sugar workers and port workers are under discussion and consideration is being given to making suitable provision for workers who will be displaced when the new harbour comes into operation.

Deep Water Harbour.

Messrs. Richard Costain (West Indies) Ltd., the contractors, began work on the Deep Water Harbour in June, 1957. They have undertaken to complete the work in fifty months. Good progress has been made with the importation and setting up of plant and machinery, and other preliminary work. The rubble bank connecting Pelican Island with the mainland is almost complete.

Designs have been prepared for the bulk sugar installation which, it is hoped, will begin operations in May, 1960. In this connection my Government are particularly grateful to Sir Eric Millbourn for the invaluable help and cooperation he has given on a purely honorary basis ever since the Deep Water Harbour project was first discussed in London in October, 1954. Sir Eric Millbourn's visit to Barbados earlier this month, besides assisting with the settlement of several points of detail, served to confirm that work on the new harbour is proceeding in a very satisfactory manner. My Government also desire me to express their thanks to the Honourable F. C. Hutson who has given a great deal of his time in his capacity as Associate to the Consulting Engineers with respect to the bulk sugar installation.

Planning for the administration and operation of the new harbour will begin as soon as a Port Manager can be recruited. In my Government's opinion, it is essential, not only that the lay out of the area should be carefully planned in all its aspects, but that the harbour itself should be fully self-supporting.

Housing.

Since the Housing Authority was set up in April 1956, 565 new houses have been completed and 94 are now under construction. Housing estates now exist in every parish except St. Peter where suitable land is being sought. During the coming financial year it is intended to construct 300 houses. Loans made to sugar workers total \$4.3 million of which \$1 million have been repaid to date. Funds have recently been made available for lending to other classes of workers. Steps are being taken to encourage the building of wall instead of wooden houses. The authority

intends to start the re-development of certain high density areas in the City during the coming financial year.

A Town and Country Planning Bill is under consideration.

The opening of the Technical Institute last April marked an important development in education in the Island. Especially worthy of mention are the arrangements for the attendance at the Institute of boys from the technical streams at Harrison College, Combermere and the Lodge School.

Education. X

The additional dormitories for 16 men and 16 women at Erdiston will give students from Barbados the benefit of a two years' residential course.

The new Combermere School buildings will become ready for occupation during the year. They will provide accommodation for 700 boys.

Your approval will be sought in due course for further school building projects in order to provide for the expanding school age population. In particular it is proposed during next financial year to make extensions and to provide additional teaching facilities at the Alleyne School.

It is satisfactory to be able to record that several students who were assisted to obtain higher education by Government loans have returned to work in Barbados.

My Government has engaged a firm of Architects, who specialise in hospital construction, to prepare, in collaboration with the Director of Public Works, a master plan with estimates of cost of the proposed new General Hospital.

Health Services.

Preliminary discussions have been held with two parochial authorities with a view to establishing small district hospitals, each with 20 - 24 beds for medical and maternity cases and facilities for the treatment of out-patients.

My Government desire to express their gratitude to the World Health Organisation for providing the services of Major J. Cebel, Public Health Consultant, to organize the work of the Public Health Laboratory at Enmore.

Preliminary discussions have been held with two parochial authorities with a view to establishing small district hospitals, each with 20 - 24 beds for medical and maternity cases and facilities for the treatment of out-patients.

My Government desire to express their gratitude to the World Health Organisation for providing the services of Major J. Cebel, Public Health Consultant, to organize the work of the Public Health Laboratory at Enmore.

The B.C.G. campaign has been completed and the scheme to eradicate the Aedes Egypti mosquito is entering its final and most difficult phase. Both these projects were generously assisted by the World Health Organisation.

My Government intend to arrange for Local Government elections to take place during the second half of the year. Further amendments to the Local Government Act, 1954, are necessary, and it is proposed to include these in a consolidating law in respect of Local Government. Amending Bills will also be presented to you covering aspects of Public Health and Public Assistance.

Local Government.

Legislation is under preparation to provide for the licensing of commercial wireless broadcasting.

Broadcasting.

My Government have in mind the establishment of a Department of Lands and Surveys and token provision will be made in the Budget for the coming financial year.

Lands and Surveys Department.

The reorganisation of the Courts of the Island involves the implementation of two comprehensive pieces of legislation - the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1956, and the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956 - and the transfer to other courts of the duties of the Assistant Court of Appeal and the Petty Debt Court, which are to be abolished. This heavy task could not be begun until last month when the services of a second Puisne Judge became available. The Honourable the Chief Justice expects that the new system will have been brought

Judicial Reorganisation.

into operation not later than the 30th June next.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly.

I now declare the legislative session open and I pray that the blessing of Almighty God may rest upon your counsels.

HOUSE RETURNS TO CHAMBER

Mr. SPEAKER and the House preceded by the Marshal bearing the Mace returned to the Assembly Chamber and entered upon the business of the Day.

After Prayers,

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House attended His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to deliver a speech, a copy of which was handed to me by him.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Rules of the House of the last session remain the Rules of the House for this Session until amended, and I suggest that we reappoint a Select Committee today to deal with them. We have finished consideration of the amending of them.

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

The motion was put and agreed to.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph who has performed the duties of Chairman of Committees so admirably and so much to the pleasure of all be appointed Chairman of Committees for this Session.

MR. BRANCKER: Sir, I very rarely find myself in agreement on the first day with the expressions of opinion of the Hon. Premier but with respect to the motion which he has just moved I find it a pleasure to second it. *(Cheers)*

The question that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph be appointed Chairman of Committees for the Session was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

PRINTING COMMITTEE: DEBATES COMMITTEE

HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Printing Committee of the last Session be appointed the Printing Committee for this Session. It is only right however to point out to hon. members that owing to the establishment of the Government Printery, the personnel and functions of the Printing Committee will have to be changed and the Government will make suggestions and send proposals down to the House shortly. The same thing applies to the Debates Committee..

I beg to move, if the House will take both together, that the old members of the Printing Committee and those of the Debates Committee be members of the respective Committees for this Session until there is an amendment to the Act.

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

The question that the members of the Printing Committee of the last Session be the members of the Printing Committee for this Session was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The question that the members of the Debates Committee of the last Session be the members of the Debates Committee for this Session was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

VICTORIA EMIGRATION SOCIETY

HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Sir, the next Order of the Day is for the appointment of members of the Victoria Emigration Society and it is for Your Honour to select the members of that Society.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the honour to ask the members of the Victoria Emigration Society who were members during the last Session to be members for this Session.

SUGAR INDUSTRY AGRICULTURAL BANK.

HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Sir, in respect to the members of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank, I beg to move that the members of that Board for the last Session be appointed members of the same Board for this Session.

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

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

PEASANTS' LOAN BANK

HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the members of the Peasants Loan Bank who were members of that Board for the last Session be re-appointed members for this Session.

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

MR. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I would just like to say that while most of this is mere formality, I still think that some of us on this side should be appointed as members to these Boards. I wonder why only persons who are members of the Government party are at the moment on this particular Board. Surely, the institution is of sufficient importance that all shades of political opinion should be put on that Board. In saying so, I hope it may not be said that I am canvassing my membership or membership of any one of my Party. Is it not equitable and right that members of the Opposition should be represented on this particular Board?

HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there have been times when I thought it would not be a bad idea to get the Bishop as President of the Chamber of Commerce, but I did not think that I would get many people to go along with me. While it is true that the Minister of the Church of the New Creation or of the Crucifixion, whichever it is might make an excellent member of the Peasants' Loan Bank, on the other hand, why should he cavil? We have endeavoured in the past to put as many people as possible from both sides of the House on these Boards. In the case of the Peasants' Loan Bank, both the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. James are particularly and peculiarly associated with peasants. I cannot picture the hon. senior member for the City, however interested he may be in humanity, being more interested in the peasants than the two hon. members of the Board in the last session. I have only replied, because the hon. member made that statement, but I do not think his appeal is of such great importance.

MR. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, when the members on that side of the House were in opposition, I can remember them saying that the Opposition should have a voice in the administration of the Boards; they liked that then, but today, they do not like it. The Hon. Premier has been very facetious in his argument, but if this Board is to be run on the democratic principle at all, then you should put on it members of both sides of the House. I agree that I am

not as much interested in the peasants as some other Hon. Members are, but what about the Hon. Senior Member for St. George or the Hon. Senior Member for St. Lucy? Now that you have the Cabinet System of Government and you have these Boards, as the Hon. Member has been arguing, you should put members of both sides of the House on these Boards. Surely, if you are running a democratic system, just as the Premier has argued that you should not run everything around here without any member of the Opposition in it, now we say that members of the Opposition should be put on this Board. The ultimate decision rests with the Government. What would the Opposition know about the running of any Board if the present Government goes out of power? It must come, as night follows day, that somebody will take over the Government; and if you are not distributing seats on these Boards and allowing members of the Opposition to sit on them, how will they ever know or understand what is to be done on these Boards? That is why it took Hon. members over there so long to understand the working of this Board, because they were in the days when certain Hon. members had no say or right in being members of the Board.

I know that my appeal will fall on deaf ears; but surely members who are representing their constituents ought to be at least interested in the peasants. Let us take the Hon. Senior Member for St. Philip; nobody could think of any other Hon. Member being more interested in the peasants than that Hon. Member. Yes, he is in Opposition to the Government, but that is exactly what the Premier has argued, that people who are interested in the Boards should be put on them so as to get some knowledge of the working of the Boards. The present members of the Board are the Hon. Junior Member for St. Joseph and the Hon. Senior member for St. James. I am moving that the members of this Board be the Hon. Junior member for St. Joseph and the Hon. Senior Member for St. Philip.

MR. CRAWFORD: Sir, within recent times there have been two vacancies occurring in the Other Place, and on both of these occasions the vacancies were filled by people who are allegedly representing a different shade of opinion in the country from that of the Government Party. On those two occasions, Mr. K.R. Hunte and Mr. Lucie-Smith were appointed to the Other Place and it is surprising that the Government Party did not see fit to fill those vacancies with two members from the Barbados Workers' Union. If only one shade of opinion is to be represented in the Counsels of Government, then Sir, I maintain that all the vacancies in the Other Place which were filled during the tenure of office of the Government Party, should have been filled by members of the Barbados Workers' Union. You will recall, Sir, that on such an important matter as the representation of the colony at the Federal Talks, no member from this side of the House was taken; the Hon. Sir H.A. Cuke, who is supposed to be the leading representative of the Conservative element of the colony, has been attending every Federal Conference from beginning to end.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not dealing with the question before the House.

MR. CRAWFORD: I am leading up to it. If in the filling of seats on important Boards, and if on such an important matter as your Federal representation, the Conservative element in the colony should have its share of representation, why on these Boards, the appointment of which is the exclusive right of the House, should only one shade of opinion be represented? It is obvious that the policy which operates in one direction is not taken into account when any important matter arises. Therefore the contention of the Opposition—that members of both sides of the House are entitled as of right to direct participation in the administration of the activities of the Government, is completely in order.

As the hon. Senior member for the City has so rightly pointed out, strictly speaking, from the constitutional point of view, the policy is to give all shades of opinion in the elected Chamber the right to have first-hand contact and first hand knowledge of the operation of the Government at all levels in view of the fact that in due course the Opposition will become the Government (*Laughter*). In this particular Chamber, that is only a matter of months, because the days of the Government are running out and

they are closely numbered. I have the satisfaction of knowing that, on both sides of the House, that opinion is shared. (*Voices: Hear! Hear! and Laughter*) I am saying that what happens in this particular instance is that the members of the Opposition are fully capable of assuming complete control not only of the Boards, but of the Government itself, and running it efficiently without previous experience, but that might not always apply. In the present circumstances therefore, while we are not saying that we are going there to get experience, we are however contending that the principle at present is immoral, unjust and contrary to all the accepted canons of parliamentary procedure and conduct. In any properly-run Government, in any democratic Government, in any parliamentary Chamber, it is the right of the Opposition to participate to a limited extent in the Counsels of Government; this is the only Government in which that is not the case. It is no wonder therefore why the collapse of this Government is imminent.

MR. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion which has been so ably moved by the Hon. senior member for the City, I should like to say that the hon. Senior member for St. Philip has for years in the past served with distinction on the very Board and has performed very useful services. It is during his tenure of office as a member of that Board that the Peasants Loan Bank took active shape, and many of the facilities which are now granted to peasants in the development of a healthy peasantry and the development of the economy of this island, to which we cannot close our eyes, are due to him. We must have proper representatives and men of drive who will represent not only one side of the picture; the peasantry as a whole will feel more satisfied with members from both sides of the House, whether Government or Opposition, comprising the leading Boards of this island for the development of the island.

I second the nomination with great pleasure and speak as one who is not learning. I, too, have served for many years on the same Board and conducted the destiny of this Board as Minister of Agriculture in the last Government; so I happen to know that the Board needs men of greater vision and proper foresight and men who have a goal. It is for that reason that a slight change is made at this stage whereby a man of drive and vision is substituted for someone who lacks that drive and vision for the benefit of the island.

HON. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the leave of the House to speak again. Everything I have done this morning is temporary. I think it is utterly wrong with the constitutional change which we have reached that members of the Legislature should be on Boards. This is absolutely temporary until the necessary legislation comes down to abolish it. Even on the Education Board and Governing Bodies of schools, members come here with their minds made up; the same is true with the Peasants' Loan Bank. I know when I came here twenty odd years ago, you could not say anything against the General Hospital and get it carried, because nineteen members of the House were on the Hospital Board. It was wrong in the old days. Look at the absurdity of the Hon. Junior member for St. Michael choosing an Anglican Rector when he is not an Anglican! It is an instance of the old legislation that the Bishop, the Attorney General and representatives of the parish were the best people to put on Boards. It is nonsense in 1958. I do not care who goes on these Boards; it is easier to let the old members sit until the Act is changed. I suggest it is completely wrong to continue with what was done a hundred years ago, when it used to be thought that the most intelligent people got into the House of Assembly. (*A Voice: That is not true*). I know it is not true. What is true is that the most intelligent people are on the Government side. I want to make it quite clear that as far as this Government is concerned, these Boards are temporary measures and Government considers that no member of the Legislature should be on these Boards who could come to the House of Assembly with his mind already made up. People interested in loans or peasants should be on the Peasants Loan Bank Board. I should love to see a strong Peasant Association nominating members just as the Workers' Union nominate men to Government Boards now.

The Elementary Teachers Association and the Secondary Teachers Association should nominate parents to the Governing Bodies and the Education Board. When you come here already as members of the Education Board, or Lodge School Governing Body, how could you effectively help your colleagues, whether in the majority or in the minority, if you have already discussed the matter? Therefore I want to ask hon. members to let us get these things through as a mere formality until the necessary legislation is brought down to change them. For that reason I suggest to the Hon. Member, however much he may feel that the Hon. Senior member for St. Philip knows more about peasantry than the Hon. Senior member for St. James or the Hon. Senior member for St. Joseph, that it is a waste of time.

MR. BRANCKER: It is a great pity that the Speech from the Throne this morning did not foreshadow amending legislation to which the Hon. and Learned Premier has referred. It is a speech for which the Ministers can no longer disclaim responsibility; that was the speech read by the Representative of the Queen, and it was the Speech of Her Ministers in this island, and so important an omission would be amazing if one did not know and appreciate the shortcomings of Her Majesty's present "temporary" Ministers.

Mr. Speaker, what strikes me is this: I had no intention of taking part in this nomination to this Bank if the Hon. and Learned Premier had not used such phrases as "completely wrong" and "the absurdity" of having members of this Chamber on Boards, because if he will only carry his argument to its logical conclusion, there is no justification at all in proposing certain members of the Government Party or in proposing any members of this Chamber for these seats. If he believes what he says and if his mind can work logically, he should have reasoned out all he has said and let us have peasants who would not be members of the Government Party. Let any member of the Government Party propose two recognised and sensible peasants for the seats on that Board, rather than let us do anything which in the words of the Hon. and Learned Premier is completely wrong and absurd. Let us have two peasants proposed for that Board and I would invite the hon. Senior member for the City to withdraw his nomination of the Hon. Senior member for St. Philip and his support of the Hon. Junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. HUSBANDS: It is really easier always to speak after the Hon. Premier. I agree with what the Hon. Premier has said, that the time should be or is now when Hon. members of this Chamber should not be appointed to Boards. Taking that same argument, if the Premier honestly believes in that, as I do.. (Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: How do you mean "honestly"?.. I use the word "Honestly"; is it unparliamentary? I repeat if the Hon. Premier honestly believes it as I do, there is no use making a fuss in resisting the amendment made by the hon. Senior member for the City, because it is immaterial. I should say at this stage that any Government of any political complexion whatsoever would be well advised in Barbados, as long as these Boards continue to be a legal constitution, to put on as many persons of an opposite political opinion as possible.

Since I have been an independent member of this Chamber and not attached to any particular party, many people have approached me giving me information that they would not give to any Hon. member on that side; if I had remained on that side of the House, that information would not have been vouchsafed to me. The Hon. Premier knows that very often when we can tell members on that side something, they know absolutely nothing of the matter and I think it is to the advantage of the Government and not to its disadvantage that as long as these Boards remain constituted as they are, they should have representation from this side of the House as well as from that side.

The Hon. Premier has said that both members who were appointed on this Board during the last Session are interested in peasants, but what does it matter if you take only one of those and put another member from this side, one whom I know is bound to receive information which would not be vouchsafed to any member on that side. If the Hon. Premier really believes in what he says he would not attempt to resist at this stage. That is all I have to say on the matter.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, it is requisite that I should speak on this particular motion because it seems as if there is going to be a vote on this matter. I wish to explain immediately that I am agreeing with what the Hon. Senior member for the City said wholeheartedly.

I have had the pleasure of serving through other channels with the past Hon. members of that Board and I found them very much interested and grateful for the assistance which I was able to give. This whole matter revolves around a principle, the same democratic principle by which we come to know politics today and that which has evolved throughout the years, namely, that there must be an Opposition and that that Opposition must be considered. It seems to be the tendency today that you should have totalitarianism even in Party System.. It would be at this juncture unnecessary to do anything more than to accept the amendment by the Hon. Senior member for the City and give proper consideration to democracy and the principles of democracy which demand that both sides should be represented. The argument by the Hon. Premier that it is going to be changed in the future is one which I do not know anything about. Right now I agree with the suggestion which was made just now that Mr. X of a certain parish and Mr. Y of another parish who are peasant proprietors and who are very interested in peasant agriculture should be members of this Board. As far as I know, there is no law which allows us to appoint them; therefore I cannot move that these people be appointed members of that Board but that seems to be the most sensible suggestion today.

As I have said, if the law made that possible I could give you immediately names of responsible peasants who would be able to enhance the future of this Board. Unless we can be definitely told of the impossibilities of the present change being made to suit the appointment on this Board, I propose that two peasants who are interested directly with this matter should be appointed members of this Board. At this moment I shall ask Your Honour's indulgence so that I can just refer to the law to see whether this can be done.

Sir it is a great pity, with the natural evolution which have reached, that we are not fully aware as we ought to be of the large peasantry in this Island which definitely is one of the backbones of this country. We should appreciate these good men who are in the parishes which we have the honour to represent, many of whom are capable of being members of this Board. Subject to Your Honour's ruling on the matter, I understand that it is possible for me to nominate members to this Board other than members of this House and I beg to move that Mr. Sam Marshall of St. Michael and Mr. E. E. Arthur of St. George be appointed members of the Peasants Loan Bank.

MR. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding that motion. I agree with the Hon. Premier when he said that these Boards should be run by some of the peasants. I am as considerate as he is and the time has come when we must try to bring more people into public life than we have today, especially when we look around and find that we are confronted with so much difficulty when we have to make replacements. It is one of the reflections of Barbados that there are so few people in public life today, and one of the reasons is because we do not give them the opportunity of rising to the top on Boards that really rightfully belong to them.

This present Board could not be better run or should not be better run than by peasants. It is their responsibility; therefore, I think it is a good idea to start to appoint peasant proprietors to this Board.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am speaking on this motion, -

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot speak again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh yes, Sir. There are three motions before the House and I can speak on this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Thank you, Sir. I am quite willing to withdraw my motion; I am willing to do that, because I am very much convinced by the argument of the Hon. Premier. What is his argument? His argument is that he is convinced that the time has come when the peasants should be represented on this Board by people other than the members of this House and the Other Place. The law is that the House should appoint members to this Board -- not only members of this House, but people from anywhere. If we

agree with the Cabinet System of Government then the policy rests with the Government. I am prepared to withdraw my motion in favour of the one made by the hon. member and, I saw the Hon. Premier smile when the Hon. senior member for St. George mentioned Mr. Arthur's name; I think I heard the sotto voce remark that he is the Hon. member's chief canvasser in St. George. Well, let us strike out Mr. Arthur's name; what about Mr. Marshall? He is the most experienced man in this country in these matters; when Mr. Blackburne was in the Agricultural Department, he said so. As a matter of fact, he has advised the Agricultural Department in matters of this sort. What are you going to say against Mr. Arthur? Although the hon. member knows that one of the very interested and able peasant proprietors of St. Joseph has, within recent years, been unfortunate enough as to lose one of his feet, yet, we are prepared even to accept together with Mr. Marshall the nomination of Mr. Fields-Lowe; however, it does not matter that he is the chief canvasser for the Government in St. Joseph. I think that all sides of the House will agree to accept Mr. Sam Marshall as a member of this Board. I think I heard the Hon. member express surprise when Mr. Sam Marshall's name was mentioned; let us see what the Premier will do now.

I am asking leave to withdraw my motion because I am supporting the motion which has been made by the Hon. Senior member for St. George, that the peasants who have been named by him should be appointed to this Board by this House. I am willing to accept an amendment; if the Premier does not want to have a particular individual - I think that all sides would agree to the appointment of Mr. Marshall - let him suggest another peasant. If the Premier cannot let the Opposition have a voice in this matter, then let us see how sincere he is and let him not allow anybody to say that he was absolutely hypocritical in the remarks which he has made.

There being no objection, the Hon. Senior member for the City was granted leave to withdraw his motion.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I am speaking in favour of the principle of appointing peasants to this Board--a principle in which I know the Hon. Premier believes.

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of Order. May I be informed, Mr. Speaker, on what motion is the hon. member speaking? He has already spoken (Mr. HUSBANDS: Not on this motion). This is a motion which is similar to the one which the hon. Senior member for the City has withdrawn, and the one which has been made by the Hon. senior member for St. George. If Your Honour looks up the Rules, I think you will see that they are against that procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The substantive motion is for the re-appointment of the members of this Board for the last Session. That motion was made by the Premier, and the question of the principle of appointing members outside the members of the House is just incidental. That is really not the question before the House.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I am speaking on the motion made by the Hon. Senior member for St. George to which motion--

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member did not say that when he first got up.

Mr. HUSBANDS: I said that I am speaking on the principle of appointing peasants to this Board, but that did not mean that I was not speaking on the motion made by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. SPEAKER: All right.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Thank you, Sir. Like the Hon. Premier, I believe that the time has now come when this Hon. Chamber should appoint peasants to this Board. I honestly believe in that. When the Premier spoke not very long ago, most hon. members were of the opinion that, as the law existed, -- I was one of those which were of that opinion -- we could not yet appoint to this Board persons who were not members of this Hon. Chamber. Now that a check has been made on the Statute law, we find that we already have the power to do so. The law says that we are to appoint members to this Board, not necessarily members of this House, and now is the time that we can lawfully appoint peasants to serve as members of this Board. It is on that principle, that I am now addressing the House.

I am not particularly interested in the appointment of any particular peasant because I have not come here this morning with my mind made up; I have not had any discussion whatever as to who would be the best peasant or peasants to serve on this Board; but I am in favour of the principle of selecting peasants to serve on this Board.

That is why I am voting for the motion made by the Hon. Senior member or St. George and I trust that Hon. members will know that at least one member of the Government has said that members of this House should not be serving on these Boards. I believe in that principle 100%, and that is why I am voting on this occasion for the motion as made by the Hon. senior member for St. George. This would be the first occasion on which the peasants, people who are knowledgeable in agriculture, will have a voice on this Board. Therefore, I cannot reasonably expect any opposition to come from the Government Bench or to hear any opposing remarks. As a matter of fact, I said if the Premier honestly believes in what he has said, I know say this a challenge, because I am going to make it very manifest in the manner in which I am going to vote that I believe in what I say, and I hope all Hon. members will do the same.

Mr. L.E. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to say anything in this matter at all, but I can clearly see that it is operating in the minds of the Opposition that an Opposition member should be on this particular Board. (A VOICE: Oh no!) But in my opinion, knowing the Board as I do, I feel that we have too many opposition members on it already, because I can well remember before I was a member of the Board that I brought an Address, or a Question, in this House asking the Government to consider the qualification for these peasants because I knew fully well that the amount granted per acre was too small. Luckily or unluckily for me, I was not on the Board, but I was quickly appointed to the Board and had the privilege to sit and listen to the arguments and remarks of certain members when it came to the qualification for increases; it was not increased, however. I can remember one member saying that if the Government wanted to win votes by that, they would send it back to Government.

Now the Peasants Loan Bank is governed by an Act. Suppose, for instance, that Mr. Marshall, as the Hon. senior member for the City suggested, was appointed to the Board; (Mr. MOTTLEY: The Premier said that), does it mean, because he is a peasantry specialist and knows peasantry backwards, that he can go there and do something that is not in the Act? (A VOICE: He can make suggestions.) The present members make suggestions too. (A VOICE: Tell the Premier that.) The Hon. senior member for St. George had the privilege of working on that Board and I am sure if he had found any fault with the Government members he would have said it. You are talking about peasants. What would you call me? (Mr. MOTTLEY: A shopkeeper!) A plantation owner or a peasant? (Mr. MOTTLEY: A garage proprietor!) So you want to take out two peasants who are now representing the people and bring in two outsiders.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. The Hon. member does not seem to understand that the argument is not that you should have two peasants, but that you should not have two peasants from the House, in keeping with the policy enunciated by the Premier that they should be peasants from outside.

Mr. L.E. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I really thought a point of order would be something to introduce something new (Mr. CRAWFORD: That is wrong, that is sheer ignorance.) Sir, the Hon. senior member for St. Philip is saying that you must not have two members from the Government. (Mr. CRAWFORD: Not me!) But you are dealing with peasants.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of correction, I cannot let the Hon. member go on like that. It is the Premier who made that statement, but we said you should not have two members on the Board from the same Party. We argued that there should be one member from the Opposition and one from the Government, but the Premier does not agree. The Premier said that the two members should be peasants from outside; so we are not trying to remove the members of the Government Party. If according to his

argument you are not going to divide the seats between the Government and the Opposition, and you are going to take outsiders, you should show us your sincerity and we will withdraw our motion.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If the hon. member got up to a point of correction, I am going to correct him. My whole point is that no Governor, Legislative Council or House of Assembly should appoint anybody with our constitutional developments. I entirely agree that there should be educationalists on the Education Board, and parents on the Governing Bodies and so on, and I said that peasants should be on the Board and should never be appointed by this House, the Other Place or the Governor. All those old Acts should be wiped off the Statute Book, and I have approached the Attorney General about the necessary legislation.

Mr. L.E. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it is the feeling of some Hon. members that there should be two peasants, one from the Government and one from the Opposition. Take for instance you were going to appoint two outsiders; those two outsiders cannot change the Law. If they agreed to join together and when there is a meeting to consider loans to peasants they decide not to attend and cause the meeting to be abortive time and time again, these members do not have to give an account of their stewardship to the

electors. There are outsiders who can do as they like, and peasants might not get money for a year. You can imagine what inconvenience peasants would be put to if they did not care to attend two or three meetings. I am not agreeing that these members to the Board should not be members of the House. I can remember well with appointments to the Transport Board that I said members of the House should be on it. (*Cheers from the Opposition.*)

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Hon. member who has just sat down waxed so warm at the end of his speech, because I was listening with great interest to the distance which he was travelling away from the argument. It is interesting to note that in order to establish his own claims and the claim of the Hon. Senior member for St. James to remain on the Board, that he had to use an argument cut across that of the senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what is the Hon. member speaking?

Mr. TUDOR: I am speaking on the motion moved by the Hon. senior member for St. George, which is the only motion before us. If the Premier says that he very much regrets that we have not abolished the legislation which makes it possible for members of the House to be on Boards, and wished to see it is abolished as quickly as possible, we on this side agree with him so wholeheartedly that we are prepared even without much thought to take his word.

Our argument therefore, which has been summed up in the motion made by the Hon. senior member for St. George is this: if the time has come when members of the House of Assembly, even if they are peasants, should no longer sit on these Boards, then today is as good a time as any to make a fresh, clean break and a fresh start. We are willing to support the names for the Board of any two members who are peasants but as two names have already been specifically mentioned, we give them our support. If the hon. members of the opposite side vote against these two names that have been put up they would be showing two things: (a) that they do not understand the force of argument; and (b) they do not know their own Party Leader. It is very good for him to say that he is in favour of peasants being appointed to this Board and that legislation would be soon introduced to abolish the Act, yet we have not heard anything of it mentioned today in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, is this the same motion for appointments to the Peasants Loan Bank? If it is can you tell me what happened during my absence?

Mr. SPEAKER: There were two amendments to the motion. One was made by the hon. senior member for the City and there is another by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. VAUGHAN: But the Hon. senior member for St. Lucy has already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know.

Mr. TUDOR: Has the Hon. member the right to question Your Honour on that?

Mr. SPEAKER: He has every right.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, I was saying that to resist and oppose the amendment made by the hon. senior member for St. George would be to assert that the Hon. Premier's words and indeed his explanations have no sequence and are of no value to members of his own Party, and secondly, that the sincerity with which the Opposition approaches this important matter is not appreciated. All who share the opinion of the Hon. Premier that peasants should sit on these Boards as members have their opportunity here now to take him at his word; and even if any of us still retain any doubt as to whether the Hon. Premier meant what he said, that particular doubt should be put in the background so that we would have the opportunity now to do what he says we should do. I think I can take some responsibility for initiating this debate, and after listening to the arguments I do agree with the motion made by the hon. senior member for St. George and I hope that all hon. members would support it.

Mr. BRANCKER: In supporting the amendment by the hon. and gallant senior member for St. George, I think this is the point which should be borne in mind. I have just recalled to mind that under sub-section 7 of Section 3 of the Peasant Loan Bank Act of 1936, the law requires that should any member of the Bank absent himself without sufficient excuse from two successive meetings of the Bank, the Chairman shall notify the Governor or such body appointing such member and the Governor or such body may thereupon appoint some fit person to fill the vacancy thereby created.

The point was made that if you have these two peasants on the Board, they may absent themselves from meetings and therefore hold up matters with which this Board has to deal. I know that politicians also hold up meetings of this Board by absenting themselves. If it happens that these two peasants whom we wish to appoint as members are so inclined and are so careless and so indifferent in respect to their attendance at meetings of this Board, the law being so worded, you can invoke Sub-section 7 of Section 3 and the Governor or such body may thereupon appoint some fit person to fill the vacancy thereby created. (Hon. SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: What section is that?) When one reads the law to the Hon. Premier, the law seems to be Greek to him. Even if these two peasants were consistently absent although I am sure that these two peasants whose names have been mentioned are of the calibre that they will be the first to arrive at meetings, the law is there that you can appoint others in their places.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, the Hon. Premier in characteristic fashion is now trying to evade acceptance of the principle enunciated by himself that membership on these Boards should be filled by peasants on the contention not of the principle involved but on the contention of the appointment. Now, I want Hon. members to bear in mind carefully that he has not disproved his own principle. He said: "I say, appoint peasants but I am saying that the appointment must be outside of the scope of the Legislature and lie within the rights of the appropriate Minister." Now, let us assume that is right. Let us also accept the principle that in order to introduce this state of affairs you will have to make the necessary amendment to the Act for the purpose of appointing membership to this Board outside of the hands of the House and to put it in the hands of the appropriate Minister. Our contention is that we want peasants to be members of the Board and therefore, we are so to speak jumping the gun; that is to say, before we give the Minister the legal power to appoint the Board we are appointing peasants as members of that Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the Hon. member is going too far. It is either a question of adding something or an omission of some sort.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am speaking in support of the contention that two peasants should be appointed as members of that Board and then I am replying to the red herring which the Hon. Premier has thrown about who has to put them there. I have to answer that.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not included in the amendment. That is something outside of the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: But if the point enunciated by the Hon. Premier is that ----

MR. SPEAKER: I am ruling that the Hon. member speak to the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: My remarks are that we must have these two peasants on that Board and whether or not they should be appointed by the Minister concerned, let us put two peasants there.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we should first review the sequence of events as regards the motion and the amendments to it. It was moved by the Hon. Premier that the members of the last Session who were the Hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the Hon. Senior member for St. James should be appointed members of this Board. There was an amendment to that motion which was subsequently withdrawn by the Hon. Senior member for the City. The present amendment made by the hon. senior member for St. George is that Mr. Sam Marshall of St. Michael and Mr. E.E. Arthur of St. George be appointed members of this Board. I will put this amendment first.

The question that Mr. Sam Marshall and Mr. E. E. Arthur be appointed as members of this Board was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Messrs. HUSBANDS, DOWDING, MOTTLEY, GODDARD, CRAWFORD, TALMA, TUDOR and BRANCKER - 8.

NOES: Mr. L.E. SMITH, Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Hon. M.E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R.G. MAPP, Hon. F.E. MILLER, Messrs. HOLDER, THORNE, SEARLES, T.W. MILLER, VAUGHAN and BRYAN - 12.

On the Hon. F. E. Miller having been called upon to vote.

Mr. TUDOR: He cannot vote.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that the Hon. Minister was in his seat when the question was put.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister was on his feet, but he was not in his seat when the question was put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed that the Hon. Minister was in his seat.

MEMBERS: No, No, he was standing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the negative, eight hon. members voting "Aye" and twelve hon. members voting "No." I declare the "Noes" have it. The question now is that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph and the hon. senior member for St. James be re-appointed as members of this Board.

On the motion being put, the question was resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. L.E. SMITH, Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Hon. M.E. COX, Hon. D. D. GARNER, Hon. R.G. MAPP, Hon. F.E. MILLER, Messrs. HOLDER, THORNE, SEARLES, T.W. MILLER, VAUGHAN and BRYAN - 12

NOES: Messrs. HUSBANDS, DOWDING, MOTTLEY, GODDARD, CRAWFORD, TALMA, TUDOR and BRANCKER - 8.

SUGAR PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS CONTROL BOARD

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the mention of Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board on this Agenda is out of Order, because the Act has been changed, and therefore, it is unnecessary for us to appoint this Board. Therefore, the next item on the Agenda is the appointment of the members of the Sugar Production and Exports Control Board.

I beg to move that the members nominated by the House as members of this Board during the last Session be re-appointed as members of the Board for this Session.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE RE-APPOINTED

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Kt: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, I beg to move that the Select Committee appointed to consider and revise the Rules of the House be re-appointed. I am moving that that Select Committee be re-appointed with the exception of the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, who, I understand, did not find it possible to sit.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following Documents:-

(a) The Financial Report of the Accountant General for the month ended the 31st October, 1957.

(b) The Report of the Directors and Statement of Accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1957, from the Barbados Light and Power Co., Ltd.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Kt.: I am commanded to lay Message No. 1/1958 from His Excellency the Governor which reads as follows:-

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR

TO

THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to forward to the Honourable the House of Assembly the West Indies (Federation) (Commencement) Order in Council, 1957, which was made by Her Majesty in Council on the 13th December, 1957, in pursuance of subsection (2) of section 1 of the West Indies (Federation) Order in Council, 1957.

R.D.H. ARUNDELL,
GOVERNOR.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Kt.: I am also commanded to lay the following:-

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 19 Order, 1957.

Barbados Statistical Service-
Selected Monthly Indicators -
December, 1957.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement of Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders, to the 30th November, 1957.

Statement regarding the purchase of Printing Machines for the Government Printing Office.

The statement is short and it reads thus:

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS, WORKS AND HOUSING REGARDING THE PURCHASE OF PRINTING MACHINES FOR THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Under Head VII, Printing Office, Item 19, Oversize Forms, the sum of \$17,000 was provided to meet the cost of the printing of Oversize Forms by private printing firms on behalf of the Government Printing Office. The Acting Government Printer reported that the major part of this work could now be undertaken economically by the Government Printing Office if two additional machines costing \$10,300 could be provided and that this would result in reducing the amount for this item in the 1958-59 Estimates to \$6,000. The machines were available, and in view of the saving, the Acting Government Printer was authorised to use a part of the unexpended balance of \$14,998 under Item 19 to purchase the machines which could print the majority of the oversize forms needed for Government purposes.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 18 Order 1957".

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 19 Order, 1957".

Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

I would like the last mentioned Bill to be first on the Order Paper.

I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to place the sum of \$3,260 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1957-58, No. 59, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to place the sum of \$3,889 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1957-58 No. 60 which form the Schedule to the Resolution. also Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952.

Hon. R.G.MAPP: I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to place the sum of \$7,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58 Part II Capital as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-58 No. 61 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice

of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act 1891, be read a first time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. D. D. Garner seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, the Bill to amend the Fishing Industry Act, 1952 was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 28th January at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

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

THE House Of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1958-59

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 28, 1958

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

PRESENT

His Honour Dr. H.G.H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Speaker*); Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS Kt., C.M.G., Q.C., B.A., (*Premier*); Mr. J.E.T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. M.E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. L.E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. R.G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. K.N.R. HUSBANDS; Mr. F.C. GODDARD; His Honour Mr. V.B. VAUGHAN (*Deputy Speaker*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. J.C. TUDOR, M.A., Mr. C.B. SEARLES; Mr. L.St.A. THORNE, Hon. D.D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H.A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; and Mr. T.W. MILLER

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of 21st January, have been circulated and unless there is any objection the Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed

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

RESOLUTIONS OF SYMPATHY

Re

Passing of Mr. C. A. Dowding

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that we should pass a Resolution in connection with the death of the late Mr. C.A. Dowding and I now beg to move that this House place on record its sympathy with the hon. senior member for St. George and his relatives on the loss sustained at the passing of his father and that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the widow of the late Mr. C.A. Dowding and other members of his family."

If I may just add this: Mr. C.A. Dowding was not an active parliamentarian; but I think this comes with special good grace from members of the Socialist Government who have come into power because they are fighting against the Mediaevalism of what we call the old plantocracy. I think it is good to place on record that there was an exception to the harshness of some of the old planters of this country: I refer to the late Mr. C.A. Dowding. I think anybody who had anything to do with him in business or plantation work always quoted him as one

of those exceptions which makes you feel no matter how hard you may feel against plantation owners- that at least there was a planter who looked upon his fellowman as a human being.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion of the Hon. and Learned Premier. It is unfortunate that I did not have personal acquaintance with the deceased gentleman but I was at school with certain of his sons, - Mr. T.O. DOWDING who is in business and the Medical Practitioner. While at Harrison College as a contemporary of theirs, I cannot say otherwise than that I found those sons of the late Mr. C.A. Dowding to be obviously of the good stock which we learned from the Hon. and Learned Premier that their father certainly was. He was one of those good men who, I understand, has served his parish in the unostentatious capacity of Vestryman: his Vestry service, I am told, has always been conscientious and painstaking and in the interest not of his individual concern but of the parish of St. George which he represented.

But I know most of him as a gentleman who instituted the first sugar factory in Barbados which took an active interest in assisting peasants in the purchasing of their canes and paying them a more remunerative price than any other sugar factory. From the standpoint of the small man whom we on this side, as you will agree with me, exclusively represent, we bear testimony to the good work of the late Mr. C.A. Dowding for his giving peasants the opportunity of getting something more for their canes than any other factory in Barbados was prepared to pay. From my constituency of St. Lucy I have known people to send canes to his factory because despite the additional transport, Mr. Dowding was prepared to give them a square deal and share the profits of Lower Estate Sugar Factory with them; and I think that for that service his name and his instituting of that factory would always go down to posterity.

I am proud - I cannot say I have pleasure - to associate myself and my colleagues on this side with this Resolution, and in so doing offer our sincere sympathy not only to our fellow member of this House of Assembly but to his relatives, those whom we know and those whom we do not know, on the occasion of the loss of a husband and father.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the Resolution moved by the Hon. Premier and seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The late Mr. C.A. Dowding started life from the very bottom and he reminds me in many respects of my own father because there was no lower rung on which he could have begun. He rose to a height not only in the country as a planter but more recently as a businessman and he has earned for his family and firm a reputation for a square deal. As the last hon. member who spoke said, anyone who dealt with his firm or in the case of peasants dealing with his sugar factory, without any question they all realised that they were getting a square deal at the hands of his company.

3.25 p.m.

I know his sons; I went to school with them at Harrison College and one of them, Mr. Dowding, was a Barbados Scholar. He is the eldest boy - I think there are three boys alive today and one sister. The late Mr. Dowding was a good example as a planter and as a businessman who has contributed his worthwhile quota to the life of this community. For that reason I extend my sympathy to the bereaved relatives.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, hon members standing in their places for a minute at the request of His Honour The Speaker.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my mother, my brothers, my sister and myself, I would like to record my deep appreciation of the remarks of sympathy extended to me by the Hon. Premier, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. junior member for Christ Church and also of Your Honour's association with that sincere expression of sympathy.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Kt: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Barbados Statistical Service-Quarterly Digest of Statistics - No.4, December, 1957.

PETITION

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the Barbados Fire Insurance Company praying the House to pass a Bill to amend the Barbados Fire Insurance Company Act, 1881, in various particulars.

The Petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The Petition was taken as read.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$3,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part 1, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-58, No.62, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

I should like to state that this is a sum of money to provide for the visit of the Governor General of the West Indies. In as much as this matter is rather pressing, I propose to ask leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

Hon. D.D.GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$36,083 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58, Part 1, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1957-58, No.63, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957, and to validate all such appointments as members of licensing authorities under that Act as were made before the commencement of this Act.

Hon. M.E.COX: I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the money Resolution for \$36,083 of which notice has just been given. As hon. members will appreciate, the Hon. Premier has already hinted to this House in respect of this Resolution or \$3,500 that it is his desire to deal with it in all its stages today, because it is for the purpose of meeting the expenses in relation to the visit of the Governor-General of the West Indies who will be here somewhere around the 10th of next month. We will therefore be asking for leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88&89 in order to deal with this Resolution, and we hope that the House will co-operate with us in getting it through.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. M.E. Cox, seconded by Hon. D. D. Garner, the Bill to amend the Liquor Licences Act, 1957, and to validate all such appointments as members of Licensing Authorities under that Act as were made

before the commencement of this Act was read a first time.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of a Bill to amend the Barbados Fire Insurance Act, 1881, which notice I should have given earlier.

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

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Barbados Fire Insurance Act, 1881.

On the motion of Mr. Goddard, seconded by Mr. TUDOR, the Bill to amend the Barbados Fire Insurance Act, 1881, was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 & 89

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to move or the suspension of Rules 88&89.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to suspend Rules 88 and 89, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting on a matter of principle to leave being granted for the suspension of Rules 88 and 89.

This Resolution deals with money for the visit of the Governor General, and the Government was well aware that the Governor General was visiting Barbados long in advance of today's sitting. I am not going to sit silent in this House of Assembly and allow Ministers to come down here in this slipshod manner and not do their business in a proper way. This should have been before the House in its proper form last week, because there is no possible excuse that the Government did not know that the Governor General was coming to Barbados, and for that reason I am objecting to leave being granted.

The question that leave be granted for Rules 88 and 89 to be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. L.E.SMITH; Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS; Hon. M.E.COX; Hon. D.D.GARNER; Hon. R.G.MAPP; Mr. THORNE; Mr. SEARLES; Mr. VAUGHAN; Mr. BRYAN; Mr. HUSBANDS; and Mr. GODDARD - 11.

NOES: Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 3.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is not yet before the House, and the hon. member is out of order.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to this procedure, and if you are going to allow that, I want to draw it to the attention of the public that when the first motion was put to the House and a division was called for, enough time had elapsed for the Hon. Minister to have put the next motion, but he was allowed to wait until the hon. senior member for St. Andrew entered the House and took her seat in order to get enough votes to carry the motion. That procedure in doing business is below the dignity of this Chamber, and if Your Honour sits in this Chamber and allows these tactics to be used, you will see what Parliamentary procedure is going to come to. The lady member was called in and the Minister delayed in order to get twelve votes. It does not matter to me whether this passes, but I am dealing with the matter of procedure. If this is allowed, there are other tactics that can be used; if not, we will sit every day and amend Rules to put it in order for everybody.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the time has come when people who really know should answer that type of thing. I sat here next to the hon. member on my left, and he never said a word or showed any inclination of delaying anything to use tactics; and even if he did, what is wrong with that?

Mr. WALCOTT: You would agree with that!

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Over and over again in the House of Commons, members kept talking until other members got out of their beds and came to vote. Over and over again the Opposition here has done it and I do not blame them; they are quite right; there is nothing

wrong with it. A member of the Opposition would go and telephone the hon. member for Christ Church and the hon. senior member for the City at whatever hour it might be necessary to get them to come and vote. It is an absolutely legitimate tactic; because somebody chooses to be noisy, boisterous, militant and abusive, why should we sit here and be calm? The hon. member on my left has done nothing wrong; as far as I can see, it was a pure accident. I did not see any time elapse, and I repeat that if he deliberately did that, it is a perfectly lawful tactic. I have sat here too often and kept quiet when the hon. senior member for St. Peter became nasty.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not afraid of you; you cannot tell me about being nasty; I can never be as nasty as you.

Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to his talking about being nasty. You cannot allow him to use those remarks about being nasty. I could never be as nasty as he, in inviting a person to his home with the motive of getting somebody behind a screen to take down what was said. He has to go to his contemporaries with that and to people who indulge in that. I am not going to allow him to use those remarks. If you allow that, I will go on the whole day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you objecting to the remarks?

Mr. WALCOTT: I am saying that if you permit him to do that, I will have an opportunity too. I am not objecting, but I leave it to the Chair to say whether it is unparliamentary, because the same freedom should be given to everyone else.

Mr. SPEAKER: I, myself, feel that those remarks should not be used.

(Cheers from the Opposition).

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: If there is anything unparliamentary, I will withdraw unreservedly; but merely to use the words "nasty remarks" with the greatest respect, is nothing unparliamentary. I say the time has come when, instead of keeping quiet, at the militant offensiveness of the adamant member for St. Peter, the House should preserve its dignity and not remain silent. I repeat very strongly and firmly that if the hon. senior member for St. Michael did it deliberately, he was acting in the ordinary parliamentary practice. It is perfectly legitimate for Government or Opposition to muster its numbers in order that they may vote in accordance with their feelings, and if he did it deliberately, all praise to him for so doing.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to be either abusive, boisterous or noisy, but I think it would be a bad thing for this House if what has been said by the hon. member who has just sat down were to go unanswered.

Mr. SPEAKER: On what is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. TUDOR: I am speaking on the motion that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are also referring to the remarks which have been withdrawn.

Mr. TUDOR: No, Sir; I am referring to the remarks which have been made in answering the point that the hon. senior member for St. Michael did nothing wrong, and that if he did, it was good parliamentary practice. That is what I am speaking about.

3.45 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any quarrel in this House will always go much farther than it should, so long as the hon. senior member for St. Joseph intervenes. If it is true that he knew nothing about it, the best thing for him to do was to keep silent. (A VOICE: What has that to do with it?) It has a lot to do with it.

The facts are as follows:-

The hon. senior member for St. Andrew was out of the room; the hon. junior member for St. John made an attempt to leave and was restrained by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works on the ground that twelve were not present. Meanwhile, nothing was taking place on the floor of the House and it was not a proper thing after the motion was moved.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is for the Chair to decide.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in Parliament there should be no hiatus; either somebody is speaking or a question is being put; in which case when Your Honour is standing; nothing can happen; but this is a case in which members were being waited for deliberately; and it is good par-

liamentary practice merely to resort to numbers, then it is a game which two can play. As regards what the Hon. Premier said, we can deal with him on another occasion.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat said that any delay in putting or making a motion is wrong; but I am sure that the hon. member will remember that memorable sitting which we had here some time ago when he and the then hon. senior member for St. George, Mr. Barrow, kept us all night until next morning. What did they do? They sat, they slept, they read the Bible and other books and did all sort of things. As soon as one went out of the Chamber, the other one got up and spoke. They sent for coffee and they had a good time. I have in my possession a slip of paper which was written by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy to one of his colleagues asking, "What about a walk out now?" When he thought the Government would not have a quorum to pass what it was doing then.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that to do with this?

Hon. M.E. COX: I am merely pointing out the tactics used by the hon. member and other members on that occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is wrong to do that now.

Hon. M.E. COX: I want to assure hon. members, whether it is wrong or right, at any time I have anything to put to this House I am going to make sure that I have a sufficient number of hon. members on this side to pass that motion, irrespective of whether hon. members on that side accuse me of delaying tactics or not. It is the Government's duty to get its business passed which business is the people's business.

The question that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. Smith, Hon. Sir Grantley Adams, Hon. M. E. Cox, Hon. D.D. Garner, Hon. R.G. Mapp, Mrs. Bourne, Mr. Vaughan, Mr. Thorne, Mr. Searles, Mr. T.W. Miller, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Husbands, Mr. Dowding, and Mr. Goddard. - 14

NOES: Mr. Walcott, Mr. Tudor and Mr. Brancher
3

STATEMENT RE C.D & W. SCHEME FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL HOLDINGS.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay a Statement on New Colonial Development and Welfare Scheme, 3110 for Financial Assistance to small-holders for irrigation purposes.

It is as follows:-

Provision was made under C.D. & W. scheme D. 217 in 1946 for assistance to peasants with their irrigation installations provided they fulfilled certain specified conditions. The scheme expired on 31st March, 1956, with 128 small-holders having benefited from it involving a free grant of \$54,000.

In order that facilities should continue to be available to small-holders, the Secretary of State was asked to allow the stocks of equipment on hand (valued at \$51,390) to be used and to provide a capital sum to continue the scheme. The Secretary of State agreed to this and a new Scheme D.310 was made with a grant of \$48,360 with effect from 1st April, 1956.

Small-holders i.e. persons owning not more than 25 acres, or less than 1/2 acre are therefore again in a position to obtain financial assistance (free grants up to a maximum of \$720) for provision and improvement of irrigation facilities under the same conditions as the original scheme.

BILL TO AMEND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACT.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day stands under the name of the Hon. Premier:- Second reading of a Bill to amend the Executive Committee Act, 1891.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is simple. We all know that we are following English conventions and we appoint Ministers with particular portfolios in accordance with the practice that the Leader of the Majority Party who is sent for by the Governor to form a Government is entitled to nominate within reason what Ministers he thinks should be appointed. However, the Executive Committee Act says that the Executive Committee should be comprised of one member of the Other

Place and four members of this House. So long as this Act exists, we cannot, strictly speaking, (legally you cannot get around that) appoint five or six members or any greater number than four from the House of Assembly. Although by convention the Governor calls whoever is leader of the majority party and tells him to appoint Ministers just as the Queen appoints the Prime Minister but she appoints the other Ministers only on the word of the Prime Minister - similarly, over here the Governor still appoints the Premier and members of the Cabinet but appoints the Premier by convention.

3.55 p.m.

In the words of the former Governor Bushe, under the "Bushe Experiment", whoever, in his opinion, can command a majority in the House is the Leader of the Government. Although it is quite possible to appoint half a dozen ministers who could attend Cabinet meetings, they will not be, strictly speaking, members of the Executive Committee, because the Act says that there are to be four members from this House. We have already changed the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) Act to make it possible to have more than four Cabinet Ministers. It is thought advisable and it is obvious that it is advisable not to limit in an Act the number of persons who may be appointed as Ministers or who may be appointed to the Executive Committee.

A Minister without portfolio is now a member of the Cabinet by virtue of the fact that he is the nominee in the Other Place on the Executive Committee; therefore, there is no necessity to think how he gets on the Executive Committee. He is there by virtue of the fact that he is the nominee in the Other Place. As soon as we appoint another Minister - if this House passes his salary - he will be paid, but he is not strictly a legal member of the Executive Committee, because there are already our members from this House. The object of this amendment is to delete the word "four" and leave the number indefinite.

Quite recently a friend of mine whom I met in Canada last year, sent me a copy of a speech which Lord Attlee made recently, (I think, to the Oxford Conservative Association) in which he spoke very much about the duties of Prime Ministers and of the functions and difficulties of Prime Ministers in forming Cabinets and so on. He, like other Prime Ministers, has found that sometimes you have to crush somebody's corns; and he pointed out what he thought was an appropriate number of members of the Cabinet - and they were fewer than what obtains in Great Britain. He thought of sixteen members and I think Sir Winston Churchill used to think of twenty-two.

The whole point is this; there is nothing exceptional or illegal for a Government from time to time to say: "I think we need another Cabinet Minister, or we have one too many", and therefore, I am merely appealing to the House to make the position as flexible as it exists in Great Britain whose parliamentary procedure we are following. Let it be left to the Government of the day to say how many Ministers it wants. I hope that I will not hear the nonsense which I heard from two hon. members who are lawyers when we were discussing the other Bill, about the rights of the Legislature in this matter of the appointment of a Minister. No Legislature, except perhaps in some Venezuelan or some other Parliament, has the right to say how many Ministers a Government should have. Great Britain has set an example to other parts of the world; if you have a Parliamentary Government and you leave it to the good sense of the electorate to say whether the Leader of the Government is wasting the taxpayers' money or not, and to get rid of that Government. I know that the Opposition is expecting that all of the backbenchers will be Ministers, but that will only happen if by some catastrophe taking place, they come into power; nobody is so silly as to think that if you can keep the number of Ministers at five or six, it is not your duty to do so.

It is purely a question, as I have said many times in this House, of the time having come when the initial experiment, so to speak, of putting a number of things under the portfolio of the Premier has been proved to be somewhat outmoded because the Premier should not have a good deal of routine work to do and very little time for co-ordination. The position should be in the reverse; the Premier should have very little routine work to do and time off for more co-ordination.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have spoken long enough: I have not made any defence of this Bill; I have merely endeavoured to explain that as soon as you have reached the stage of having more than five Cabinet Ministers, you have got to change the Executive Committee Act so that there will not be any clash in the work of the Cabinet Ministers. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Whenever we are dealing with some constitutional change in this island, we can hear a great deal about Great Britain, the British Government and Lord Attlee; but we know that what the British people are noted for is a high sense of political propriety and integrity, not what we get in these local parliaments where the political parties do things for expediency. Now that you have this Executive Committee Act which is about to be changed, we hear that because there are more than five Ministers, therefore, the number must not be less than four. When you hear somebody today making a comparison between Great Britain and Barbados as to the number of Ministers, you would believe that there is some comparison! Would you believe that there are more Ministers in the British Parliament than there are members of this House of Assembly? That argument cannot be followed where you have a parliament of twenty four members. In 1876 you heard that the Barbados Government could be run by four members from this House of Assembly and one from the Other Place, and then the other official members made the number of the Executive Committee nine.

4.05 p.m.

Now, for the next twenty-five years or in the unforeseeable future, this Government does not know how many Ministers it will require, so that is why you find they want to put in the words "not less than four," because you are likely to need ten. They cannot make up their minds as to the number of Ministers they require. Every time we have a monumental blunder by one who claims to be Premier, this is the talk you get. He has more things added to his portfolio, and he now requires a sixth Minister.

All these years he has been reading about constitution and about Lord Attlee. What is happening with the Constitution and the half-baked lawyers and the people in the Opposition to whom we will have to teach the alphabet, who do not know that he is the Prime Minister with portfolio for Education, Finance, General Purposes, Police, and others? You did not realise until your educational system and your Finance system had broken down that you had to come "poohbahing" this issue. You have all these constitutional changes, but you are not putting any money in the workers' pockets. You are having all these Ministers, but what is the National Income? Has it risen? What has been done to show that the development of the country is something worthwhile? Let me show you the impropriety of that Government. When dealing with a similar matter for the Legislative Council, I warned this Chamber then, and it has proved true, that the amendments you were making for running this Government would suit the late Dictator Jimenez. These amendments are suitable for a place like Venezuela. The hon. member talked about Uruguay; he possesses the mentality of a dictator. For years you have been preaching the British Constitution but what do you find here? Did Lord Attlee, when he became Prime Minister of Great Britain in 1945, put in the House of Lords any person who had been politically discredited by the community? We have just passed a measure here saying that for the Other Place you are going to have a person doing the Cabinet work, and that is why I say you have to be very watchful. What has this Government done? This Government has placed a member in that position of Cabinet Minister, who was a candidate running for the House of Assembly in this same Session, and who was politically discredited by the community. When you talk about political propriety, can you call any example in the British Empire or in the world in which a candidate who had lost in the Elections became a Cabinet Minister? In the Colonial context, any time a man runs for the House of Assembly or Parliament and loses an election, it is bad policy to appoint that same candidate as a member of the Legislative Council, because by that you are trying to defeat the aims and will of the people. This is the biggest piece of political impropriety that there is. When you talk about

the British Commonwealth or the British Parliament setting a standard, there can be no comparison in political propriety between the Premier and Lord Attlee; the comparison would be like a thorough bred racehorse and a fowl-cock.

In this Session you ran a candidate for the House of Assembly; this Session started in 1956 and is supposed to end in 1961, and this same candidate who was to be a member of this Assembly was rejected, yet you find that he has been made a member of the Cabinet which is ruling this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is out of order. I think you are more or less dealing with the qualification of the person who was appointed.

Mr. WALCOTT: No, Sir; I am not dealing with that. What I am dealing with is that in introducing this Bill, the Premier said the Bill is simple and that we are following the English convention I took down the words. There is no Act of Parliament in England which states how many members should be members of the Cabinet. There is an Act in Barbados which says how many members should be on the Executive Committee—so many from the House of Assembly and so many from the Other Place—and the hon. member made reference to the measure which we passed here permitting a member from the Other Place to be a member of the Cabinet. What I am saying is that in dealing with conventions, where there is no law, there is nothing you can bring to this Chamber to say that he has broken the Law. He has to amend the law for certain things; but when you have conventions there is nothing to amend, as he says.

Today, Macmillan can make any number of people into Cabinet Ministers, because there is no law in Great Britain which says how many Cabinet Ministers there should be; but we are saying that in a country where the political institutions are so powerful and great, and where there is a high sense of political propriety, it means that you are kept in check by the people. Here the boss of the Party is a law unto himself; he does not have to consult members in the sense that they should say whether or not he should have a particular man. I draw that to show—and I am sure it has happened in your regime since you have been a member of this Chamber for the last twenty years—that they have slipped a man through this method into the Other Place, and therefore Government is trying to defeat the aims and objects of the things we have preached in this island. The Other Place has co-equal powers to the House of Assembly, but now it goes further—and this is the point I am making in connection with the appointment of the man to the Other Place, which in this context is more powerful than it was in the old days when the Secretary of State asked you not to do it, because when you do that you are not appointing an ordinary member, but you have taken a person from outside who lost in the last election within the same Session and made him a Cabinet Minister. That is the type of frustration you get in this community. All of us run in the Elections, but you have taken a man who lost; therefore you are using these conventions to do something for which you can show no record.

I would say that if you had taken one of the members who were elected to the House of Assembly or even a member from the Other Place and made him the Minister without portfolio, there would be no affront to the electorate; there would be no quarrel if you had taken one of the members here and elevated him to the Other Place and then had a bye-election to fill his seat. I can speak with force because it is very unfortunate that the same member had the unfortunate task of coming against me in the Elections. I have nothing against the person whom you have appointed, but I am dealing with it from the point of view that these are the things which we, as elected members have to fight against.

4.15 p.m.

We had to fight and say that these were things which we were going to get the Secretary of State to stop. This is putting whom you want in the Other Place. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, in serious terms, with our beginning of this institution of Cabinet Government that we should aim at having a Cabinet of elected members? If you had a Cabinet comprised of elected members, what quarrel could there be? What do you find? A member who had been defeated

at the last General Elections can be a Cabinet Member as long as that Government remains in power. Moreover, there is no question of resignation because there are very few people in this Island who being appointed a Cabinet Minister are in a position to resign on their own. The few are very limited. Only people like Your Honour can say: "I do not like this; this is not or me." This is a measure of their bread and butter. You are not going to get Cabinet Ministers resigning like Mr. Thorne Croft, because resignation in the case of the present Ministers means that they are not working any more. This means that you have so many people depending on you or their salary that they must do what you say. If we were a republic, I do not know what would happen but we are not a republic. It may be just as President Perez Jimenez of Venezuela and President Peron of Argentina had to find their way out. That is the sort of thing you get in a Republic.

Sir, I challenge any hon. member to tell me where in Great Britain during the last 25 years you found a man fighting an Election and being defeated and within the same Session being made a Cabinet Minister.

What do you mean by "not less than four?" As I see it, this means that there can be ten members being made Ministers. As I was saying just now, there is no Prime Minister in Great Britain who would ever think of making a defeated candidate at an Election a Cabinet Minister. The farthest step Parliament has gone is when the Other Place refuses to pass legislation, then you would be in a position to pack the Other Place with people who would help you. That is the right which you have and when I say that, you do know that I am not one who is fighting to preserve the Other Place; but if you have it, you should treat it well.

This constitution was started off with four members from this House to be members of the Executive Committee and now you want to amend the Act to say "not less than four." It is a good thing that over there you have a party without experience because its members ought to know that the position of Cabinet Minister is usually one which you reserve for backbenchers.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you addressing the Chair?

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes Sir. I was only looking at them to see whether there was any who would agree with me. Your Honour is an old parliamentarian and I am sure that no one would have been offended if you had been elevated to the Other Place, because you served in here; therefore, you would go to the Other Place with the full confidence of the people of Barbados. That is a far different thing from when you place high honour on somebody else who has not served. You have a constitution in which a defeated candidate can be given high honour. The constituency in which he ran was the most important constituency of this Island during the elections because the most attention was focussed on that. It seems to me as if you wanted that man to be a Cabinet Minister from all that time. Those hon. members who now hold the office of Minister must feel glad that he got defeated at the polls otherwise one of them might not be a Cabinet Minister. For that reason I think they must thank me.

Sir, what do you find? This Cabinet Minister without portfolio is going to draw the same salary as an active Minister in here. This is the system which we are building up. You find the abuse of this word "convention" and then the Hon. Premier is talking about Lord Attlee and saying that he can put as many people as he likes in the House of Lords; he means to say by that and by this amendment that the day we ever get a crazy man at the top, (more crazy than the one we have at present) he can come in here and make a House of Ministers. He can have twenty-four Ministers. All he would come in and say is that owing to the exigencies of the time, we must have a whole House of Ministers. There is no law which says what portfolio a Minister should hold; it is only a matter of discretion of the Prime Minister.

We all know that there is going to be a Minister of Education. We know that because the educational system of the Island has broken down, although the present Minister of Education says that there is nothing wrong with it. At one time he said that he was going to devote four-fifths of his time to education which means that the other fifth of his time he was going to devote on the other non-im

portant things such as finance. That is the situation. I said in the House that the Hon. Premier knows nothing of finance and he was hoping that this same gentleman whom he has elevated to Cabinet Minister in the Other Place would have been elected to this House so that he would be his Finance Minister. If that had happened at the last Elections, perhaps we might not have heard anything about wanting somebody to do the Government's Business in the Other Place. It does look as if you wanted to have a nominated member holding the portfolio of finance. Of course, you had the stupidity in Great Britain on one occasion. I think it was Lord Curzon; I am not quite sure. Before the last war they used to have these crazy doings until the Labour Party put them in their senses. The position was this: when you had an old lord and you wanted to dress him up, you put him in the House of Lords and dressed him up. Lord Halifax came into a lot of fire because it was not good for a nation to have an important position like Foreign Secretary in the hands of one who was in the House of Lords. Since that time they have never carried on with that nonsense of having a Foreign Secretary or an important Minister in the House of Lords. Even with all that, it is not so in this case. The hon. gentleman whom you have put into the Other Place was a defeated candidate at the polls, although he might have promised that if he got in he was going to be made Minister of Finance.

4.25 p.m.

That gentleman in the Other Place was promised that he would be made Minister of Finance; because he was the Auditor General, ipso facto he is the Finance Minister! That is why we are in this mess; we are in this mess, because you put a title to a person and it does not matter whether he is a suitable person or it. We realise that there is an anomaly where you are continually coming down here and talking about the Executive Committee and about the Cabinet. There was a time when an hon. member who held your position, Mr. Speaker, was also a member of the Executive Council; there was a time when the Speaker of the House was a member of the Executive Council. Conventions are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians which do not change. In the United Kingdom it was found that the Speaker of the House of Commons should not be a member of the Executive Committee where the formation of the policy of the Government had been taking place and therefore, the Speaker of the House has nothing to do with parliamentary conventions. There is nothing to prevent Your Honour from being a member of the Cabinet under this Act, but do we expect that? We know that that would not happen with Your Honour, but we never know the impecunious circumstances of future Speakers and they will either do this or not be in parliament; you either take this or get out. My colleague nearly came under the guillotine in that way; you either take this or go and if you are not willing to go, you must suffer their wrath. It is not that I am against constitutional advancement, because I feel that you should have constitutional advancement.

Mr. Speaker, I am so much in favour of constitutional advancement that I feel that we should not have any Governor. The office of Governor today is only a question of window-dressing. I am surprised that the Governor could accept a nomination like this, knowing that a person who was a candidate at the last elections was defeated and this person was appointed as Chairman of the Transport Board and a member of the Cinematographic Board and wherever you have a dollar going

MR. SPEAKER: Is that necessary in this debate?

Mr. WALCOTT: You have the situation where as soon as somebody loses out in parliament, you are looking for an alley job so as to give him a stipend. That is not how we want the conventions to work; I say, let us shut our eyes to this window-dressing if we are going to follow the British conventions. You are not going to live long enough to see one Minister resign of conduct which Parliament finds is not proper. The Premier said on one occasion that it is or him to decide whether a Minister should resign or not, which means that you have to do what the people do in Venezuela to get rid of a Minister, that is, to riot or have some sort of disturbance or revolution. That would have to be done in order to get rid of a Minister because it is for the Premier to decide

whether a Minister should resign or not. When you have a situation like that, you have to be cautious, you are putting power into the hands of people who have no intention of following the pattern which has been set by the Mother of Parliaments.

The fact that they have in this Bill the words "no less than" is not simply a matter of appointing a Minister of Education; but we have this innuendo that the Premier should be free well I do not know what kind of comparison I can make. You have six hundred members in the House of Commons in Great Britain with a big Cabinet and we have the Premier of Barbados who has picked his team and he is acting as a Captain of a team. He says that he does not know how many Ministers they will need; the Government found it very difficult to know how many Ministers they need because they do not know when they have to add to or take away from the number. We do know that if you take away the Minister of Finance and you find somebody to do the work you will be able to get something more in our industrial policy. You will hear people talk about the situation; but is there going to be any more money available to the people of Barbados by this change? If this Hon. Chamber can say that we are putting in these words "no less than" I am warning

hon. members for the future. I will not always be in this Chamber, but I will always be a Barbadian. When you see these words "no less than" in this Bill, I have my own sneaking suspicion. In Barbados no person can say from 1958 until 1980 how many Ministers we need to run this Government. The convention - I call it the high political propriety - which you get in Great Britain you do not get here, and the idea is to leave the position open for baiting. If he or she behaves himself or herself, he or she will live in hopes of getting to the Promised Land; but you have to be careful when you are going to the Promised Land because you have to go over the Dead Sea; otherwise you will not get there. (Laughter)

4.35 p.m.

I am saying quite seriously that this "not less than four" is not following what has been said about the British Constitution. You must realise that the British Constitution has grown up; but this is a colony, and therefore the Executive Committee is something written into the law. I do not subscribe to the idea that this is not written into the Constitution and therefore the Hon. Premier can get in Woodford Square in Trinidad and say we have the best Constitution in the world, though there are more barefooted people here than anywhere else I am not a believer in that.

Jamaica has eight Ministers and Trinidad has eight or nine with under-Secretaries and the like. Why is it that in Barbados we do not know whether our structure needs all these? So far as the Ministries in Barbados are concerned, I agree that there should be a Minister of Education, not on the basis that the five people cannot do the work, but on the basis that Education is not being seen after, and rather than have it broken down completely, you should let somebody have a shy at doing it.

When you look over there, Mr. Speaker, and see the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Communications and Works, the Minister of Social Services, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour and the Premier, and hear that they cannot find time enough to do their work, or the work is too much for them to do, you have to say that the other people in Barbados are mad people. Do you know that there are Directors of business in Barbados who do a lot more work than the Ministers do? Do you want to tell me that the Ministers find it difficult to do their job, or that their work is too much for them? Do you mean to tell me that the Minister of Industry and Labour cannot find enough hours to do his work, or that the Minister of Agriculture is overworked? The Minister of Agriculture is an affable gentleman, but if he was overworked he could not have spent two months in India. I could not spend two months in any part of the world at any time of the year. The Department of Agriculture which the Minister has to direct is one of the best in the whole Caribbean area. In connection with the Fishing Industry, I do not know what the late Minister of Agriculture would say, but I think he can throw out something to the Minister of Agriculture today with which he could have no quarrel. When the present Minister of Agriculture was

not a Minister but merely a Churchwarden, he found that he was kept busy; but now he has to work hard in his Ministry and still find time to attend to his private affairs, because you cannot expect a man to leave his little business to which he would have to return when the electorate gets tired of him.

When you look now at the Minister of Communications and Works, he has been growing fat with hard work. I do not mean that to be offensive and I will withdraw those words if you think they are unparliamentary. I do not want the inference to be taken the wrong way; but when you examine it - and that is the right we have - the thing I want to kill is the myth that the Premier is the hardest working person in the island. Ask how many times he is in home sleeping and you will know. It is all right to say this office requires this or that, but when you ask yourself how many files they cannot find, you will realise that this colony is bound to carry a top-heavy administration through the lack of what we can call "drive". You cannot tell me that there is too much for the five men to do if they would buckle down to the task of doing it. I am sure that five energetic men would run this colony and still find time in the afternoon to play tennis; but if you have an administration which is going to be run by people who have no intention to work hard, it is a different thing. That is why we do not know if we want somebody in addition to the Minister of Education. I hear there is some gentleman at Lodge School who is to come down. The Ministers' salary of \$720 a month is an attractive salary any part of the world; it is good money in the United States, Russia, Great Britain or anywhere else. You can attract anybody in any part of the world at \$720 a month without a proviso. The only proviso would be if you wanted a man like Dr. Fuchs or somebody to come from Antarctica. We do not grudge them getting this salary, but these are conventions which you are using not for political advancement, but for political expediency, and I will warn members that they have to be very chary, because you heard the Minister of Labour say just now that as long as he is in here, he will do anything to get something done or passed. We know that; we do not doubt him.

Hon. M.E. COX: On a point of order. I never made that statement. He knows I could never say that even by an accident.

Mr. WALCOTT: You gave me credit for knowing a lot about you. Why is it that at times I know so much and at another time I do not know what I am saying.

Hon. M.E. COX: We worked together on the Executive Committee for a number of years.

Mr. WALCOTT: We worked together on the Executive Committee and you know my views too. I agreed with him, Mr. Speaker, that he will have to do that in order to get things passed, and that is why I say there are political tactics which everyone of us should use; but when you would not say anything while waiting until your forces come, that is a different thing. I am making this solemn warning because for the public of Barbados this idea of inserting "not less than" is not that you do not know what you can put in now; in these days it is going to be unconstitutional and bad draughtsmanship to put it in, because you know that any Government in power can come down with amendments like this present Government to amend this; but if another Government came into power, as the hon. member said, all the backbenchers would be Ministers. It is true the Premier's ambition was to be where he is, and there are when you are ambitious to get somewhere, you feel that nobody else should get there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is straying.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am only replying to the remarks he used that if we got over there, all the backbenchers would be Ministers, but that is not his intention.

I would say, Sir, that the insertion of "not less than four" at this present time leaves one to come to the conclusion that you cannot now make up your mind, because you are not passing this Legislation on the basis that you are going to appoint a Minister next week.

You have already passed legislation to pay Ministers. Do you realise when this is passed that at any time during the year any number of members can be made Ministers? This is the last occasion on which we will be informed

that we are going to have another Minister. This is the death warrant you are signing now. After this, Government can make eight, nine or ten Ministers without reference to Parliament, and the only way you can make reference to it in Parliament is when it comes in the Estimates, because Clause 4 reads as follows:-

"Where by reason of the coming into operation of this Act after the opening of the session of the Legislature during which this Act was passed by both Houses of the Legislature, one member only of the Legislative Council and four members only of the House of Assembly were appointed by the Government for the purposes of section two of the principal Act, it shall be lawful for the Governor at any time during that session to appoint during pleasure to the Executive Committee such additional members of the Executive Council, as he shall think fit". 4.45 p.m.

If you pass this Bill, it means a question of your appointing any number of Ministers, and the Hon. Premier says that it is not our business whom they appoint as Ministers they should have. It is not Parliament to say whether you should have say, a Minister of Education or not, but you are copying the conventions of Great Britain and you are copying them without having the parliamentary institutions to carry out what you are copying. You have something in which you give power to people who do not have any regard for political rectitude.

I hope hon. members on this side of the Table will not be afraid to express a view. There are those of us who do not believe that on constitutional matters the Hon. Premier should speak the last word and he has no right to say these things when he speaks. What you can clearly see from all of this is this open door for political bribery.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On motion of Hon. Sir Grantley Adams, seconded by Hon. M.E. Cox, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. L.E. Smith being in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called. It read as follows:-

4. (1) Where by reason of the coming into operation of this Act after the opening of the session of the Legislature during which this Act was passed by both Houses of the Legislative Council and four members only of the House of Assembly were appointed by the Governor for the purposes of section two of the principal Act, it shall be lawful for the Governor at any time during that session to appoint during pleasure to the Executive Committee such additional members of the Legislative Council and of the House of Assembly not being already members of the Executive Council, as he shall think fit.

(2) Any person appointed under the provisions of subsection (1) of this section shall subject to his appointment being during pleasure as aforesaid and except he shall vacate his seat on the Executive Committee in accordance with the provisions of the principal Act, be a member of the Executive Committee during the session of the Legislature in which he was appointed and shall notwithstanding the prorogation or dissolution of the Legislature or the expiring of that session, continue to act in such capacity for a period ending with the commencement of the next ensuing session or for a period of three months after such prorogation or dissolution or, as the case may be, the expiring of the session in which he was appointed, whichever period shall be the shorter.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, before you put the question, I sincerely hope that no hon. member of the Government Party would think, because only the hon. senior member for St. Peter spoke on the second reading of this Bill, that the views he expressed with regard to giving the Hon. Premier carte blanche to appoint as many Ministers as he likes, has found acceptance on this side of the Table. In a small community like Barbados with a Parliament comprised of 24 elected members, we have already nearly one quarter of the members as ministers. You only need six Ministers - that is all - to give a proportion of 25% of Parliament being Ministers. If you were to take the

same proportion to the House of Commons, it would mean that you would have over 100 Ministers. As you know very well, Mr. Chairman, there are 600 odd Members of Parliament of Great Britain and you do not have 50 Ministers, much less 125; and, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, it requires no Herculean task to visualise the maximum number of Ministers which would be needed in this island of Barbados with its limited resources, its limited finance and what not. I go so far, Mr. Chairman, as to say that there is not now enough work to keep five intelligent men occupied all day long as Ministers. In the despatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in connection with the introduction of Ministerial status, the then Governor only recommended four Ministers. The Hon. Premier was not Premier then; he was leader of the majority party. For reasons already outlined by the hon. senior member for St. Peter, he asked to increase the number to five because five would give him a better opportunity to play with and with getting better support from his party.

There were loud asides.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the hon. senior member for St. Peter. You are interrupting the hon. senior member for St. Philip.

Mr. WALCOTT: Look over on that side of the table and you will see who is interrupting him.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, this is nothing short of highway robbery; this is nothing short of robbery of the Treasury to distribute the emoluments now being paid to Ministers to a greater number than four. That is all the Ministers you need in the island of Barbados. Sir, not one of the Ministers does a full day's work and their continued absence from the island, sometimes in planes, without anybody outside of the five of them doing their ministerial work in itself demonstrates that there is not enough work for them to do in their offices. Sir, when one Minister is absent, no other Minister is appointed to work for him and that happens regularly throughout the year.

It is merely a question, Mr. Chairman, of winning support for popular measures by using the bribe of funds from the Public Treasury in terms of ministerial emoluments. That is all it is. Which of the Ministers is over-worked? They come in here and make the most shabby spectacle of themselves in the presentation of Government Business. You have five of them in here doing what one man was doing before. The former Attorney General himself alone presented Government measures in this House without any assistance at all; and even if we admit that some of these duties are slightly more complex than they were some time before, they are not five times more complex or more onerous. They do not require five times the amount of intuition or attention or ability than they required ten or twelve years before.

4.55 p.m.

You have still, in addition to the Ministers, the Secretaries to prepare the work for them; each of the Ministers has a departmental Permanent Secretary, whereas the Attorney General only had the Chief Secretary in the Secretariat. Now we have the Chief Secretary in the Secretariat, and we still give the Ministers Permanent Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries. Have we increased ten times in size since they assumed the control of the country? Have the resources of this Island been made five times the amount they were? There is no other part of the world in which you will find such a brazen attempt to prostitute public funds. I, personally, will say in passing that I do not agree at all with increasing the number of Ministers. I was not here during the debate in the first instance, because I was not in the Island; and I agree less with the proposal in Section 4 of this Bill not to limit the number of Ministers at all. For the last three or four months, the only thing which has kept together dissentient opinion among certain sections of the majority party is because this vacancy of a Minister is being dangled before the eyes of people who have made it no secret about their determination to revolt if they are left out. When you appoint this Minister now and attempts are made to revolt, people will be told; "You should keep quiet, because we have the power to appoint more Ministers and later on as capacity increases I shall appoint more Ministers."

What is the Premier supposed to do in this country? He gets his emoluments as Premier and walks about and makes a few speeches with reference to his duties and every year or every six months he appoints another Minister. Are we to pay him to do that and also pay the Governor to do the same thing?

There are times, as has happened recently in a country not very far from here, when the evils of exploitation and oppression, a wilful waste of public funds, nepotism and the use of public funds for your own personal advancement and security are considered as not being in the best interest of the country -- there are times when these things can no longer be borne by a long-suffering public and they take the law in their own hands. The hon. senior member for St. Peter has at some length criticised the appointment of the particular individual in the Other Place. I agree with him on this ground, that since the gentleman in question was easily repudiated

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am nothing to do with the other gentleman in question; let us deal with what is in front of us.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Are you suggesting that I am not doing that? If you think so, Sir, I shall be glad to hear in what respect I am offending, because I think I am quite within my right to voice an opinion when we are discussing this Section. I say that in principle, while we naturally will have to agree that in the present constitutional position, the Government is entitled to have a Spokesman in the Other Place, yet still we are also entitled to express our dissatisfaction with the unsuitability, from any point of view, of the person who has been appointed to that Ministry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with the question of appointing an additional Minister in here; we are nothing to do with the Minister in the Other Place.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Section 4 (1) of this Bill says this: "Where by reason of the coming into operation of this Act after the opening of the session of the Legislature during which this Act was passed by both Houses of the Legislature, one member only of the Legislative Council and four members only of the House of Assembly were appointed by the Governor for the purposes of section two of the principal Act, it shall be lawful for the Governor at any time during that session to appoint during pleasure to the Executive Committee such additional members of the Legislative Council and of the House of Assembly not being already members of the Executive Council, as he shall think fit."

In his speech at the re-opening of the session, the Governor, in referring to these changes, mentioned that this legislation would be coming down, and this is the legislation which will give him the power to do legally what I am commenting on now.

5.05 p.m.

I say, Sir that it is an accepted principle, and there can be no question at all, that the Government Party is entitled to a spokesman in the Other Place, but it is not entitled to appoint a candidate who was rejected at the polls. When Mr. Gittens was defeated in Christ Church and was subsequently appointed to the Other Place, the Premier himself criticised the appointment and was very bitter about it, and expressed the utmost condemnation of the manner in which the oligarchy which then controlled the colony were using all the Governmental facilities for maintaining their position, and strengthening and carrying out whatever policies they wanted to put into effect, because at the time he felt that Mr. Gittens, the member in question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying. What has Mr. Gittens to do with this now? Where is Mr. Gittens?

Mr. WALCOTT: He is a man who plays an organ.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must speak of the Bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not know where Mr. Gittens is now, but he was in the Other Place. I have not been in contact with him since he departed this life; so I cannot satisfy Your Honour's curiosity. Maybe your undertaking Establishment helped to put him firmly away. I am saying Sir, that if it was unfair, immoral and unjust to have selected a repudiated candidate

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order. If you persist I will rule you out of order; you must keep to the Clause.

Mr. CRAWFORD: How am I out of order? On what grounds? We have too many Chairmen of Committees around here, and it is a case of the blind leading the blind. I think, Mr. Chairman, that you have already been made a laughing stock in this Chamber by following wrong advice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you want to keep to the Clause, you can do so, but you are straying all over. This Clause is asking for power "to appoint", and you are trying to deal with a person who has already been appointed. When you try to deal with the person who has already been appointed, you are out of order.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, we are granting power as you say, but I am opposing the granting of power because it has been abused. This power in the hands of certain people is like giving a sharp-edged tool to a little child. This power is not being sought in the best interest of the country; it is being sought to further the personal ambitions of one man. I am opposing the granting of power, and I am telling you why I am doing so. Only a Dictatorship can a dictator come and say he wants power to do something, until he is run out.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will help to run you out too. As a matter of fact, as I said earlier, certain steps have been taken under the present constitution, but you are now seeking legislative endorsement of these steps. I am saying that before you had this, there was an abuse of power, and the abuse lies in the fact that you are going to appoint more Ministers than the affairs of the colony want, and with the additional fact that in the appointment of the Ministers which this gives power to do, you are pitch-forking men into Ministerial positions - men who should not be there for the express reason that they were repudiated at the polls, and when it was done before, the person who is doing it now was the loudest critic of it. It was wrong when it was done by Keith Walcott, but it is right when it is done by the Premier; and they both did it for the same reason.

As a matter of fact, I go further and say this: before you had the extension of the franchise or before you had extended the basis on which people were elected to this Chamber, you might have had more excuse for picking up a man who was repudiated at the polls and put him in the Executive Committee, because he would not have been rejected by the whole electorate as you now have with Adult Suffrage. Every man and woman at the age of twenty-one can vote, and with Adult Suffrage they told you they did not want this man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is making a second reading speech on this Section. The hon. senior member for St. Peter took the opportunity to speak on the second reading.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And I felt like waiting until the House went into Committee to deal with this Section.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, keep to the Section.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am doing it in the most appropriate manner. There is not the idea that I am personally opposed to the appointment; I am talking about the principle of the Bill and of this Section. This is the important Section, not the three previous ones. I am not saying whether or not it is a good choice. He may be a very excellent man, I do not know; but we certainly could not have taken Mr. Kellman in St. Joseph or Mr. Lynch in Christ Church and make him a sixth Minister. If we are going to establish these principles and these conventions, let us do them in the right manner.

There is no point, Mr. Chairman, in saying that we are following Great Britain in this sort of thing, and then on every opportunity we get, something different is done. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that in view of how we have already seen that this power will be abused, there is a greater apprehension about giving additional power by accepting the proposed Section giving the Premier unlimited power to appoint as many Ministers as he likes. The circumstances in Great Britain do not necessarily apply here at all. There are different conditions and a more consciously and easily aroused public opinion there, because what the Government gets away with in Barbados,

no Government in Great Britain would get away with. A number of events has taken place in this country within recent times with impunity which would have caused the fall of Government in Great Britain, and therefore we cannot literally say that because Great Britain does so and so, we must slavishly follow it in Barbados. 5.15 p.m.

It is a dangerous thing and especially dangerous in a country which is just emerging from three hundred years of colonialism. In every other particular colony in the area, all of these conventions and constitutional changes have the force of law except in Barbados. It is alright for a country with three hundred, four hundred, or one thousand years of democratic institutions to proceed by conventions, but let us proceed in these early stages carefully; let us proceed step by step, giving every step the force of law and leaving nothing to the personal honesty or integrity of the person who may be able to bamboozle the electorate and bring a majority party in here. We have seen very many examples by doing what we have already done that we should not be foolhardily committing this kind of murder; nobody in his right senses with the best interest of the colony at heart will agree to support this section as it now stands.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I regard this Bill and this Clause in particular as being a further move to the final step in a series of steps in the establishment not only of self-government but probably dictatorship. When we think of self-Government, we know the Cabinet must move with it, and the Hon. Premier may have seen fit to introduce a Bill of this nature in order to grant him the necessary support in order to carry out his plans. While that may be so and while that may be a necessary corollary or may be a necessary step to take for the establishment of self-Government, it leads to nothing else but dictatorship. Wherever the Governor's name appears, you can think of the Premier and not the Governor who is acting. The Governor's name appears, but in reality the Premier exercises that power. I am saying that this is a further and probably a most vital step as far as dictatorship and self-Government are concerned, call it what you may, when this is all done.

The Hon. Premier not only admits the inability of certain - I would not say all - of his Ministers but he probably admits also the fact that he finds himself, owing to the calibre of one, two or three of his Ministers in the position that he does not know how many Ministers he would need. The fact remains that owing to the present circumstances he has vested himself with absolute power as a means of holding his party together. By this Bill all the backbenchers may be Ministers although I do not believe all would get to that position.

If the Hon. Premier had said "not more than six" we would all know what is the position. We all know now that there is a need for a Minister of Education. The Hon. Premier probably has the ability to be Minister of Education but he cannot do everything. This colony has always prided itself of being foremost educationally and of being the most educationally advanced colony of the Caribbean.

A VOICE: That was before he was Premier.

However, I am not quite sure that this Island is so far above the others educationally. Probably, the Federal Elections which are to take place within a few weeks would convince us how much politically inclined the island is to federation and the people are to voting, because it will be no question of party, but a question of man to man and a question of electing an individual on the basis of his priority educationally and otherwise. We of this party shall go to the polls on that basis and we shall win on that basis. This is no idle boast.

The benefits of Ministerial system are plain. Under Ministerial Government this Island has benefitted. Instead of channelling everything through the Chief Secretary, we have five Ministers and if the Hon. Premier wants another Minister I would agree, because he is only one man and if in the final analysis, he is thinking of going to the Federal Parliament -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying. you are going to the Federal Parliament. I do not see "Federal" in Clause 4.

Mr. TALMA: I am saying that the Hon. Premier knows the calibre of his Ministers and if he is thinking of going to the Federal -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. TALMA: I do not think that I am out of order, but I bow to Your Honour's ruling. However, I am saying with all due humility that it is expected that our Premier would be Prime Minister of the West Indies, and because of that he is making all the facts, he is making the necessary provision whereby that setup over on his side be able to carry on. You may win too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order! I am asking you to stick to Clause 4.

Mr. TALMA: The Hon. Premier is saying that there will be no limitation as to numbers: Therefore, it may be sixteen, fourteen, twelve or ten or it may be five or six. We do not know. In so far as the Minister of Education is concerned we are aware of the need for that Minister, but we are saying: "Let there be some limitation." Let us also think of the taxpayers too and let us try to live up to what the people sent us here hope that we would do. Let us have some limitation; let us not establish dictatorial powers in any one man whether he be Premier or any other man. Let us set up some Bill which would at least commend itself to the respect and the consciousness of all ordinary human beings. Let us do that. This is dictatorship. If the Bill had said "not more than one" or "not more than two" that would be alright but when it says not less than four, it can be four hundred. Whoever drafted this Bill or who creates policy I do not know, but this is no policy at all; this is dictatorship; this is hardly worth the paper on which it is written and, after all, we move as Labourites together and we have been in Government together. Too far East is West. This is dictatorship. Let us be careful so that we should not be relegated at some future date altogether.

5.25 p.m.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member who has just sat down and I have been such good friends that I am surprised that he has put me in such an embarrassing position, because he asked me not to appoint too many Ministers. I get so many messages from the Opposition as to whether I would put them forward as a Minister or Speaker that this position is extremely embarrassing. Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to the Premier.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am replying to the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But not in that way.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I have the greatest respect for the Chair and therefore I will stop. Let me reply in this way; public opinion will tell any Premier of any Party whether he is wasting the taxpayers' money or not. How can any Premier merely to please people, appoint ten Ministers when he cannot find work for ten Ministers. That is my complete answer but to suggest that in any parliamentary democracy the Legislature should say how many Ministers should be appointed, is nonsense. You must, in an election, know that if you select a particular party in a democracy, the Leaders of the Party will become the Ministers. In every country in the world that is so - to some extent, not in France. You know that, under the British system, if you select the Conservatives, the chief people in the Conservative Party will become the Ministers. You know that there will be a shifting around, that one or another Cabinet Minister will be appointed, or somebody will be dropped and so on, and that is all this Bill asks for. Since the Confederation Riots of 1876, we had this system of one and four. Experience has taught us in the last three years that we must have, not an official, but a party member in the Other Place and so on; that is all that is happening. But I say that the ultimate judge or arbiter in this matter is public opinion. Who is going to be so stupid as just to help his friends, even members of the Opposition, by giving any of them a Ministry?

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will forgive me if I end with one single sentence; I hope I will get no more messages from the Opposition begging for Ministries. (A MEMBER: Name them.)

Mr. TALMA: I shall not be petty. I thank the Premier for having made me a Minister three or four years ago, but to suggest or insinuate that I sent any message to him ---

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: The hon. member is not one of those from whom I have had messages; whether the messages will come in time, I do not know. (Laughter)

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman -

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Premier did not call your name.

Mr. TALMA: As far as my election is concerned, I secured a seat in here alone; therefore, I have never sent him any message. I ran alone and gained a seat alone. Let the Premier remember that. When I run with them, I am always wrong and it is on the basis of running alone that I will be found in the Federal Assembly. (Cheers).

Mr. WALCOTT: What we would expect to hear in a reply is something fundamental. What we have just heard substantiates what I said in my second reading speech; that is to say, that the purpose of this amendment is political bribery and bait-catching. What is motivating the premier's mind in political life is how many people in the Opposition are begging him for a position; he is doing something through which you can beg for a position; he has jobs to offer people in politics. Politicians ask him for ministerial positions and the more power you give him, the more he can expand it just like how you expand a concertina. That is the thing which is guiding him in political propriety. He wants not only the Opposition, but his backbenchers to feel that they can get high positions for themselves. He cannot call the name of anybody who has sent any messages to him. There is no truth in that; you challenge him and he does not call the name of any member who has sent any message to him saying that he will come over. That is the kind of bait which he uses, that somebody in the Opposition has asked him for a position. That person who has asked him for a position should be put in a coffin and buried immediately. That is the type of thing you are getting, and when we say these things, he will get up and tell people that they are not speaking the truth.

5.35 p.m.

In order to pass something through the House of Assembly, he has brought this down to give him more power, and the hon. senior member for Christ Church is talking about helping him. I will tell the House this: this is another example of using people; he used the member for Christ Church when it was suitable to use him, but when it did not suit the Premier to use him anymore, he did not use him. Throughout his political life that is what he wants power for. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture is being used now because it suits the Premier to use him and because he is another piece of bait in St. Philip. At one time he said he could not trust the same member. At one time, too, he could not trust the Hon. Minister of Social Services. This is the thing you get in process of time; so you do not go by the statements he makes. At one time he castigated the hon. senior member for the City and made people believe he was the greatest villain that ever landed; but now they are like Bud Abbott and Lou Costello in this Chamber.

The danger about our political life at this stage is that we are taking the man holding this high position seriously, when that man does not merit any of the things we give to him; he is deserving of these things. The hon. member said he is capable because he went to a University, and ipso facto he must be Minister of Education. Roy Joseph did not go to a University, but he did an excellent job in Trinidad so far as his Ministry is concerned; so it is stupid in Barbados to say ...

Mr. TALMA: On a point of explanation. Far be it from my mind that unless you possess an academic qualification you are not suited, or far be it from my mind for the hon. member to insinuate that I said that; that is entirely wrong. For the benefit of the Committee, that is the Premier's view.

Mr. WALCOTT: I did not say that the hon. member said that, but I said that what he said was tantamount to what people think. I think the Premier is the worst Minister of Education in the whole territory; there is no question about that. When you talk about education, I want to say that we boasted about education before

he was Premier; it is nothing that he brought along in Barbados. We boasted about education prior to his having anything to do with it; therefore he can make no claims. I want to say that he has done nothing to carry it to the pinnacle. If he were fortunate to become Minister of Education when it was the best in the whole Caribbean, we can no longer boast of it since he has become Premier. Look at the elementary schools today and compare the products who stand up in Commonwealth affairs with those who receive elementary education in Barbados today. Now, he has to drop it like a hot brick. If he talks about public opinion, it has condemned him. In Barbados, the newspaper is "mamby-pambying" this issue. The honours which have been placed on the Premier were conferred on him through the elected system. There is this idea that he is responsible for everything, when prior to his entry into politics people asked for democratic institutions. In 1925 and 1937 people went to prison for this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying from the Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you realise that this is something that caused a riot? Do you realise that we are passing a riot Act? Do you know how much blood went down the drain through this? Do you think we are people looking for Parliamentary jobs? We are not the people in here whom you want to bribe. We want to make you understand that we respect the institutions which we have. He talked about public opinion, but I should like to ask what public opinion has given him the authority to come here and amend this Act to put a man in the Other Place, and to select a person who was politically discredited at the last elections. What are you going to say for that? It is the height of political dishonesty. You have selected a man who was politically discredited at the last elections; and everybody looked forward to seeing what would happen to him in St. Peter and whether Walcott would go.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. member is straying from the Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is not straying; but when you come to these conventions

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What has the election in St. Peter to do with this?

Mr. WALCOTT: You have used convention to put a man who was politically discredited into the Council.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not straying.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am speaking to you for the third time.

Mr. WALCOTT: These are conventions and we are following the British conventions when you have taken a man who was politically discredited on Adult Suffrage at the last elections and through convention made him a Cabinet Minister. You, too, are looking forward some day to being called upstairs, but that is not good enough. He is just like Jimenez in Venezuela, and the only difference is that he has remained in power a little longer; but he will have to run from this country the same way.

Any dictatorship is bad. How can anyone sit here today and talk about the British Constitution and then present such a blaring case as this? You do not have a newspaper which can come up with these things because in any dictatorship the Press is muzzled. The Press is soft on these things because in a community where it looks as though the forces are against you, you have to take the line of least resistance. I do not have to take that line in this, because actions speak louder than voice.

As recent as two months ago, we passed a measure in here, and if you asked the community whether it is in favour of rejecting the candidate who has been made a Cabinet Minister, you will see what answer you would get. You talk about public opinion but no public opinion would give you authority to do this. The oligarchy which you possess now would give you that power when the Barbados Labour Party holds meetings. You have not held a meeting, however, to elect anybody to office since 1948. You held your last meeting ten years ago, and therefore the President holds that office for life. Where, in Great Britain, would you find the Conservative Party, the Labour Party, or the derelict Li-

beral Party holding one meeting? There are people who are afraid to tell them that they have not held a meeting for the last ten years.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What has that to do with the Clause?

Mr. WALCOTT: Do you understand that the Premier spoke about conventions? Are you clear in mind what convention means? the conditions in Great Britain include all these political institutions, and therefore you have a Party system which comes to the country to be elected. Thus the background to a Party system is that it should run on democratic lines. You do not have these institutions, and we on this side say that in the absence of these checks you have to safeguard the people. It is true that you are a businessman, Mr. Chairman, and have no time to read these things. They have a Party system which is elected on a mass basis; but we all go to elections after which we can come here and say that we, too, belong to a Party. We can say we belong to one Party and call ourselves the Grand National Party, but the institutions we want to grow up behind it have not taken place.

5.45 p.m.

This is an instance which I want to bring to the notice of this Committee. The same constitution you are asking us to grant you, we have seen how you have abused it; and there can be no possible excuse if the masses of the colony cannot see that it is not the best way for you to be putting a man in the Cabinet who has not been elected by them. That is the sort of convention you are telling us about. I challenge any man to point me to any instance which happened in the last twenty years in Great Britain in which a private member of Parliament became a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made that point already.

Mr. WALCOTT: I can make it ten times.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, dealing with Section 4, I observe that the bone of contention is that this amendment with which we are dealing today is one which is worded in an indefinite manner. It deals with the minimum number of people that may be on the Executive Committee. It cuts out any definite number and an indefinite number is now put in instead. That must follow as a natural consequence because sometime ago we passed an Act amending the Executive (Remuneration of Members) Act and we deliberately cut out a definite number and put in an indefinite number; therefore, this must follow as a natural consequence; therefore, we are faced with this today.

The Hon. Premier has the statutory authority right now. He is not observing any convention now; this has now become a statutory act of this Island. As soon as we pass this Bill, we are giving the Hon Premier full power to add to as many Ministers as he thinks fit. While I do not agree in principle with this Bill, we must bear in mind that when we are dealing with the Remuneration of Members Act, we cut out the exact number and made it an indefinite number. The Hon. Premier obviously must feel that we of the Opposition would entertain certain suspicions. He has told us nothing of the number which exists in his mind; he said that only the most radical and irresponsible Government Party would be thinking of appointing more Ministers than were necessary. My point is this: It would not be possible for the draftsman to include a definite number because the draftsman can only act on what he has been told. Why then is this an indefinite number which can allow an abuse? The Barbados Labour Party would not always be the Majority Party. I can easily visualise that, and if they have any good sense they can visualise that what they are committing this Government to, the same thing can happen when other parties come into power.

As far as conventions are concerned, I took some pains sometime ago to read the British Constitution. The Premier has a limited sphere in which to act. Any parliamentarian who decides to accept a Ministry should know what he is doing. He is actually taking an undertaking where one man and one man alone can tell him at any time that he may leave. It is inevitable so. The prime Minister of Great Britain is in that happy position; so too the Hon. Premier of Barbados. Therefore, any backbencher who looks for promotion must realise that

one man and one man alone in the country decides how long he is there for. That is inevitable; I say this without any personal reference to the present Premier of Barbados. It is something unavoidable in constitutions that follow the British practice and we have to accept that.

This is becoming the statutory law of the Island when it is passed and I have no doubt that it will pass. From now on it is no question of any convention; it will be law. Because of that, the Hon. Premier will be in the undoubted position of recommending as many Ministers as in his opinion he thinks necessary to recommend to the Head of the Administration for appointment. That power is vested in him and in him alone without consultation with any individual in or outside of Barbados. That is absolute; it is inevitable. It is democracy in the sense as we understand it. I do not know if many backbenchers know how much of the British constitution. My colleague said that unfortunately they are so busy that they read nothing; therefore, they have to follow lock, stock and barrel all that is put to them. I hope that at some future date they will read and understand every bit of legislation like this. I remember saying on one occasion that whenever you accept to be managed by convention, your only hope of future success is in those powers vested in a man of high principles and honour. I am not speaking in relation to any individual.

Sir, I do not agree with the bringing down of this amendment in this form. I can not agree because there must be a limit in a country which is only sixteen by fourteen with a limited economy, especially when that economy is only an agricultural one. There must be a limit to the number of Ministers whom you can appoint in Barbados. You cannot say there can be fifteen; therefore, what does not less than four mean? That means it could be a million. Do you understand the language?

I do not share the views expressed by some hon. members of the Opposition that it is not necessary to have five Ministers. It just depends on how much work they can do and can get on with and, as far as this Government is concerned, they may need seven, but when this Opposition comes into power it may only need three. Even at that; I do not think that if this Opposition comes into power it may necessarily reduce these Ministers too quickly. I do not think when the Opposition gets into power it would say: "let there be four Ministers and not seven." Human beings what they are with varying degrees of intelligence, adaptation and what not, it may be that the present Premier of Barbados may find it necessary to have seven, eight or nine Ministers. I do not know. 5.55 p.m.

He knows from what material he can draw, but I say irrespective of that, that in a country the resources of which are as limited as those of Barbados -- in a country of 166 square miles, in a country where the economy is chiefly based on agriculture, I do not see why the Premier, who is the constitutional expert in that Party, could not decide on a number of Ministers and have an amendment which was not vague and indefinite, but one which could stand the test of time, one which is practicable -- five, six, seven, or eight. This Bill is following the pattern of the amendment which we passed in relation to the Executive Committee (Remuneration of Members) Act, which count out the number and said "and other Ministers." This Bill had to follow as a corollary. What can we do about it? While I do not agree with the vagueness of this amendment in Clause 4 of this Bill -- and I will vote against it for that particular reason -- I feel that the Government should have brought down a much more precisely drafted Bill than his one which would be practicable, and I know that here must be a limitation of this number. Everybody knows that. The Premier himself has said that his Party could be silly to think that they can create Ministers in a limitless way. I am sure that we can all deal with an amendment for five, six, seven or eight Ministers.

I do not share the views of the Opposition that we should reduce the number; I act on my own independent opinion in this matter, but I will not vote for these vague amendments. There should be found in the Premier's Party an hon. member who could tell him so too. He could have said that he wants so many Ministers in

this Place and so many in the Other Place. Politics is a matter of expediency; you need these people for now. We are here not only to initiate legislation, but also to amend and improve legislation. We do not make laws like those of the Medes and Persians which altereth not; laws have some bearing on time. This law is having a bearing on these times, and we should find it practicable to say how many Ministers we need now in this day of grace. I am therefore, absolutely opposed to these vague amendments.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Kt: What has amazed me is that hon. members are talking on this Section 4 which is almost superfluous. All this Section says is that the Governor has already appointed a number in the Other Place and four members from this place and in future he may appoint more members. This Section merely follows Sections 2 and 3 which we have already passed. If I had drafted this Bill, I, personally, -- although I should not say this -- would have left out Section 4 altogether. Section 4 is only there out of an abundance of caution. It says that where by reason of the passing of this Act after the opening of the session of the Legislature during which this Act was passed by both Houses of the Legislature, one member only of the Other Place and our members only of this Place have been already appointed, nevertheless the Governor can appoint more members, which is really repeating what has already been said. I am surprised that hon. members have swallowed Sections 2 and 3 without a whisper and now they have been making a number of second reading speeches on a purely consequential section! This Section arises, because whereas you only have one member from the Other Place and four members from this Place in the Act, the Governor may appoint more members. Some lawyers are very cautious in their drafting and the Attorney General, out of an abundance of caution, has put in this Section. I do not do the work of the Attorney General's Office.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What does the Premier mean? Does he mean that he must dictate to the Opposition when we must talk and on what Section we must talk? We rise when we feel like rising, not when he tells us to rise. The Opposition does not accept the view that the present number of Ministers is insufficient for the performance of their duties. We do not agree with that; you can find Ministers at all hours of the day outside their Ministries in places which have no connection with the work of their offices. (A MEMBER: How do you know that?) Obviously, these places have no connection with the work of the offices, and therefore, we do not see at all that the present Ministers are overworked, because it is purely, as the hon. junior member for St. Peter has said, a question of political expediency. That is all. Just a few years ago, all the work was channelled through the Chief Secretary's Office; there could be no person in a better position than the Chief Secretary to express an opinion as to the maximum number of Ministers required, and he said that the Premier and three Ministers could do the work. Now we are going to have five, six, seven Ministers -- almost double the number mentioned by the Chief Secretary. If, in 1953, the Acting Governor said that he only wanted four members to do the work, how is it that now, in 1958, you want almost double that number? How is it that you now want a 75% increase in the number of members? 6.05 p.m.

All that has happened, Mr. Chairman, is this: one of the main Ministries for which the Premier is responsible, he fell down on Education. The Educational standard of the country deteriorated so far that it became a public scandal, and instead of doing more work, he decides to appoint another Minister.

One more point, Mr. Chairman. It may suit, in certain activities of life, certain people to resort to certain dodges and to use what they call strategy to draw red herrings across the trail to suit their interests. In Chicago gangland, you would not expect in a Legislative Assembly. It is no answer to any argument advanced by the Opposition today merely to state that the Opposition has been begging the Premier for a Ministerial appointment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is that statement to do with this.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is a statement made in here which had no right to be made. I am a member of the Opposition; do you imagine me begging him for an appointment?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Premier did not call your name.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He could not call my name. This statement was made to the public and when people read this statement now or fifty years from now, they would not know whom he meant. I have worked with him, and he could not even carry a message straight to the Governor for me. He distorted what I said. I would feel more comfortable working with Satan in Hell.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You remember when the Premier began to speak, I stopped him, and I am stopping you now.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am saying that all he has said now is that the work is too much. It is not too much and you can ask any of the Secretaries what work they do every day.

So far as I remember, Mr. Turner recommended that the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Industry should be one; you have divided them into two. The Premier spends more than half of his time in the air every year. What Minister of Education and Finance and all these things can spend half his time flitting from one part of the world to another every year? What are you going to appoint another Minister to do? To give out hot meals everyday? It is, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, for pure expediency. If you want to use expediency in politics you should pull your own pockets. You should take some of your money as Premier and pay somebody to do the work, but it is not fair to the public Treasury. He is the same member who got up here a few weeks ago and warned us about rising costs of Government, and threatened they would have to retrench or increase taxation. With what are you going to pay the new Minister? Are you going to pay him with sand off the beach? Then you will come for a Permanent Secretary or him, an Assistant Secretary, Office Furniture and accommodation and what not. Thus you will go on piling up Governmental costs and throwing money away, and talking about increased taxation in this two-by-four country which the Vestries could run. The time will come under the Federal Parliament when there might not be any House of Assembly at all, because the municipalities could run the place. Another Minister will cost this island \$30,000 a year. What do you want another Minister for; just to be sure of another vote in the Assembly on policy matters? There would be absolutely nothing for him to do all day long to compensate for what it would cost the country. How many Ministers are there in British Guiana, or in Trinidad which has an annual revenue of over \$100 million? Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that within another few months we will have one less Minister than Trinidad? And their revenue is over six times as much as ours, and with important mineral resources being developed, agricultural development and even marine development of natural resources. All we have is the sugar industry.

The first duty, therefore, of any new Government in this country, if it were going to impress on the public that it had the interests of the country at heart, would be to reduce the number of Ministers. The first duty of any responsible Government in this country would be to reduce the excessive number of Ministers and to appoint a number of capable men who would do a day's work and efficiently perform their duties. All we need is two Ministers and a Secretariat to run the country because the most important Ministry is run by the Permanent Secretary. As Permanent Secretary to the Premier, Mr. Pinard, was virtually Premier of Barbados.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, dealing with this Bill before us, I want to see what business Government had done. When I heard the Premier say that this could not be done a certain way, you would have thought that this was done in Norway and came to Barbados by air-mail and this is the first time he saw it. You would not believe that the Premier was bringing this heavyweight thing to change this Act; he wants to give the impres-

sion that he does not know why the Attorney General has put this in the Act, which means that it has been drafted by the Attorney General and came straight to the House of Assembly, and therefore the Premier could not tell him that he did not agree with the draft. It means, too, that the Attorney General can draft Legislation for you in whatever way he likes. Whom are you telling that to? I am no lawyer...

(A VOICE FROM THE GALLERY: Idiot, sit down.)

Mr. Chairman, you must have that gentleman put outside. (The Marshal instructed the police to remove the particular man from the Gallery.)

They are the type that are followers of the Labour Party. Now, Clause 2 of the principle Act reads as follows:-

"Immediately on the opening of each session of the Legislature, it shall be lawful for the Governor to appoint during pleasure one member of the Legislative Council and four members of the House of Assembly." In this case, the session had already passed and even if you amend the Clause in which he said "not less than four", it was already agreed to and you could not come at the re-opening after Prorogation to say you want four more.
6.15 p.m.

Well, the Session was opened sometime in 1956 and this is 1958; that the reason why Clause 4 (1) has to be written in. This was put in by the legal authority in order to make what you are going to do now legal and valid and in order to make what you are going to do now legal and valid and in order that they may not be any further constitutional row; therefore, to say that this is unnecessary and that it is superfluous shows now in this small measure what has been the trouble all along. The Hon. Premier took charge of this business all along and he should know why this subsection was put in this Bill; he should not make excuse for this section. Why should he stop the debate just to tell us that we passed the stage in which you should have spoken on Clause 2. We are speaking on Clause 4 and he is saying that you should have spoken on Clause 2. I say, we can rise whenever we feel like rising. You can clearly see the reason why the Attorney General has put in this Clause is to make it right to appoint these people after the opening of the Session.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you are going to be long I will have to be relieved.

Mr. TUDOR: In view of that, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. BRANCKER: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. TALMA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TUDOR and Mr. BRANCKER - 4.

NOES: Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Hon. M.E. COX, Hon. D.D. GARNER, Hon. R.G. MAPP, Mr. THORNE, Mr. T.W. MILLER, Mr. VAUGHAN and Mr. BRYAN - 8.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman,

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member cannot speak again. Put the substantive question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was going to speak and I asked him if he was going to be long, I would have to be relieved. He has given away so that I should be relieved; therefore, he is in order to speak.

(A VOICE IN THE GALLERY: He is in order!)

Hon. M.E. COX: Put that woman out of in here.

(The visitor left the Gallery.)

Hon. M.E. COX: I want to draw to Your Honour's attention the rule that if a motion is put and decided in the negative for the adjournment or postponement of a debate that the hon. member who makes that motion and the hon. member who seconds it lose their right to speak. They cannot speak again on the substantive motion.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The House is in Committee and the motion was

that Your Honour should report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. That motion is not an amendment to the substantive motion; therefore even if it is defeated, you still retain the right to speak. Nobody but the Hon. Minister would say that is wrong.

Hon. M.E. COX: That sort of thing happened only two or three weeks ago just before the Session came to an end.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not in Committee.

Mr. TUDOR rose to speak again.

Hon. M.E. COX: The Hon. member cannot speak again.

VOICES: Oh, no! Oh, no! Why can't he speak again?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think we are losing time.

Mr. TUDOR: If I understood Your Honour, I am given permission to proceed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing any more debate until I am relieved of my duties or this House stands adjourned.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not entertaining anything.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is not a matter of your entertaining me. It is a matter of Parliament not being broken up. There is no midway between that. A member must be speaking on a motion is being put. I am going to move a motion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the House quoted a rule and the Clerk is looking for it. I am awaiting that.
6.25 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Is it your pleasure that I should proceed, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are in order to proceed, but I will not sit here despite what the hon. Leader of the House might think. I will not be tied in this Chair as he might think.

Mr. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases.

After a pause,

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, the motion which was negatived just now, was a motion that you do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again. That was several minutes ago. If I am in order now, and I submit that I am in order, I am moving that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the Hon. Leader of the House does not do anything, I will get up and leave.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, What must I do? My hands are tied.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think it is an advantage which you are taking of me.

Hon. M.E. COX: We cannot make the motion for the adjournment of the House when you are in the Chair. (ASIDES:) The motion for reporting progress has been defeated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For the second time I say I am leaving the Chair if I am not relieved.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: May I suggest with the greatest possible respect to your ruling, that a motion for reporting progress which has been negatived is the same as if a motion for the adjournment is negatived. There is not the shadow of a doubt that that is the English practice. I suggest, with the greatest possible respect, that this debate has lasted very long and everybody has said what he has to say.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. I have not yet spoken.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: That is a point of interruption, not a point of Order. May I just remark that every member on that side has already spoken and every member on that side who wanted to say anything, has said it? None of us would want to keep Your Honour in the Chair longer than you desire to remain there. May I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you should put the question now, the question for the passing of this Section?

May I suggest, Sir, that you put the question now to Section 4?

Although the Rules speak of an amendment or an adjournment of the Debate, if you refer to May's

Mr. WALCOTT: You can refer to "June".

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: When it suits hon. "shouters" opposite they will refer to May's. We have a Rule that says in broad, general language that the Debate in Committee, unless it specifically says something different from what it says in the House, should follow the practice in the House. There are times when you specifically see in a Rule in Committee something different from what obtains in the House and every school boy knows that.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order,

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am only attempting to help the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked to be relieved of the Chair, this is the third time, and I am going to relieve myself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, at this point, left the Chair and walked out of the chamber. Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and adjourned the House through disorder for half an hour.
6.35 p.m.

On resumption.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for the City (Mr. T.W. Miller) be appointed Chairman for the remainder of this Sitting.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Adjournment, the House was in Committee of Supply. *on the Ex. Com. (Maudslayi) Bill.*

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. T.W. Miller being in the Chair.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, had it not been for the unfortunate occurrence which took place when the Committee last met, I might have been further on in my speech in this debate by now, and this debate by now might well have been concluded. I wish to say personally that it is not fitting in a debate of this nature when Constitutional changes are being considered, that we should see such a blaring example of the scant respect which is paid to the decencies of Parliamentary life, because it is true to say, Mr. Chairman, that if Parliamentary life itself is not kept up to the highest possible level, constitutional arrangements come to nothing, because almost all constitutional changes, at any rate in the British Commonwealth, not only originate in Parliament, but should have their final sanction there. To change the constitution and to maintain the same low standard of Parliamentary conduct is to argue against a change in the constitution itself.

Now, Sir, I agree entirely with all that has been said on this side of the House, not only with the very forceful and quite illuminating speech of the hon. senior member for St. Peter, but also by the speeches made by my colleagues, the hon. senior member for St. Philip and the hon. senior member for Christ Church, since the House was in Committee; but I disagree with them, perhaps, on this one point. The burden of all the speeches made so far was actually to appeal to some sense of reason or fairplay, which in the minds of the speakers, appeared to motivate the Premier. I shall not waste that time. I do not think, for instance, that in arguing with him on Constitutional or other matters you can appeal to reason or to logic, because it is clear to everybody by now that he has certain fixed motives, and any amendment to the constitution to contemplate an extension to the principle of self-government will bear fruit only to the extent if other people, even under the present circumstances, take the Constitution and work it as best as they can; but to rely on him for guidance or to hope that he will be fair in what he does is to ask too much.

7.15 p.m.

Contrary to all that we have been hearing, Clause 4 is really the operative clause of this Bill. It is true that Clauses 2 and 3 to a certain extent follow the pattern laid down under the provisions of the Act of the Legislature but it is Clause 4 which brings us to the present position. That Clause makes it lawful for the Governor after a Session of the Legislature has begun to appoint members of the House or of the Other Place as members of the Executive Committee. Now, the House of Assembly and its Committee are the bodies entirely concerned with the provision of funds to pay members of the Executive Committee and it was an unpardonable insult in the course of this debate when the Hon. Premier said that no Legislature ever had the right. Presumably he meant that no Legislature had the right to say how many members should be appointed. Certainly we have no right to appoint but we have the right to pay; and where Government funds are concerned, the popular Chamber is guardian of the public funds and any protest whose object is to limit the number of Ministers who have to be paid out of public funds is a protest which is very much in order. These constitutional changes did not just begin today; they have had a very long beginning. They go back in a piecemeal fashion to certain things already done in this Legislature and done in Barbados and which were the forerunners of this Clause which we are doing. I pointed out that the dignity of this Chamber suffers immeasurably if the House accepts that challenge. If I may digress for a moment, Mr. Chairman, when the Hon. Dr. Cato became a member of the Executive Committee, he became a member of the Executive Committee at a time when the Estimates for the then Financial Year had already been approved by this House and the Appropriation Bill had been passed by both Houses of the Legislature; yet the Hon. Dr. Cato was paid a salary. He was paid a salary for at least three months before new Estimates were introduced. How was it possible for a salary to be paid to a new member of the Executive Committee and the then House of Assembly was not asked to approve of it? Of course, it can be argued against that, that the Government always has at its disposal funds on which it can call, but there is it, you have a case which vitiates the whole argument which the Hon. Premier was putting up. Had it been exactly the rule then no person had been appointed to the Executive Committee unless provision had first been made for salary, we should not have had that. I contend that if three months before a salary was provided, a person was paid as a member of the Executive Committee, there was a case where money was wrongly applied because funds not voted by the House were used to pay a salary; and I feel that the Accountant General of the colony was quite wrong to authorise that sort of payment. It was that example which brings it more forcibly to my mind how dangerous a thing we are asked to do by giving the Governor power to appoint after the beginning of a Session any number of Ministers.

Sir, it is not worthwhile arguing the point that a Prime Minister has it in his sole discretion to make members of his party Ministers so long as he controls the Majority Party. How can you compare a constitutional convention in Great Britain which is a sovereign and independent state, not even to speak of its length of constitutional experience, with a situation obtaining in a British colony? How can you do that with a place like Barbados where you can only get full self-government when the whole area becomes independent; where failing the independence of the whole area, failing the federation of all these colonies, each island no matter how far ahead it comes along, self-government will still be attained in some aspects and some aspects of its colonial status will still be retained?

Sir, in the appointment and selection of a Cabinet, it is impertinence and the greatest effrontery for any colonial Chief Minister to compare himself with Lord Attlee in status. To compare one's self with Lord Attlee is the same as if to compare a racehorse which you have to be careful about, which you have to feed with brandy and to see that it is well watered and put in a comfortable stable and well groomed with an old cart horse which you use on the Wharf to cart about coals and wood, a d for which after its day's work you throw some ashes in its galls, put it under a "duncks" tree and throw some chaff in front of it.

If the time has come when the Hon. Premier must leave Barbados; of course, that is to say if the rest of us who have to vote permit him, let him go in peace; him leave us in no confusion! It is nothing peculiar that there is such a terrible fight to site the West Indian Capital at Chaguaramus because it is notable that the word can only be rhymed with the word "ignoramus" and in that respect, he should be the first Prime Minister of the Federation.

The next point is this: If the argument is that the Session has already begun and therefore nothing remains to be done but to give this power to the Governor, that is all the more reason why the specific number should be put down. Unless you do that, you are saying that your argument is for any time and any session, whether that session of the Legislature is long or short. It shows that you are so uncertain as to what you are doing that you find it necessary to create Ministers here and there.

Sir, it is not a question of whether five, six or seven Ministers are enough to rule Barbados; it is a question of getting a realistic assessment of things and requirements as to administering this island with its population, according to the distribution of seats in the Legislature and all of that can be ascertained before hand. It is a waste of time replying to the point of these wide powers when the particular situation as regards the party opposite makes it necessary for this uncertainty to go on; therefore, members on this side of the House must protest against the rewarding of party supporters at the expense of the public. I say that it is wrong to make constitutional arrangements of such a nature that they can benefit the Majority Party only.

7 25 p.m.

There is a lot to be said for having a Ministerial form

There is a lot to be said for having a Ministerial form of Government and there is also a lot to be said for making the representatives of the people more responsible for administering the affairs of the people; but Mr. Acting Chairman, he must be a very bad constitutionalist as not to see that there are certain things which go along with constitutional advancement. Therefore, it is only an attempt to hoodwind people - those with minds less acute than others - to argue that the situation in Barbados is so uncertain or is so hard to understand that you have to leave a wide discretion in the hands of the Prime Minister.

With respect to the appointment to the Other Place, I only wish to say unlike the hon. senior member for St. Peter, that I believe in a two-chamber form of Legislature. Therefore, I respect the Other Place not only because it is there, but because I believe it is a good thing to have it. That is not to say that I accept it in its present form, and I wish to be associated in the protest made by the hon. member against what I think to be a very dishonourable act, to be flouting the will of the electorate so early in this session.

I have reason to believe that the appointment is a good one and that the gentleman concerned will be the most efficient of the Ministers with probably one exception; because it is a good appointment, there is all the more reason why the person's chances should not be spoiled by the application of a bad principle. But here again, my general objection holds good. There is nothing to prevent this House or this Committee from being told three months from now that the pressure and volume of work in the Other Place has so increased that it is necessary to have another Minister or a "stand-in" for the Minister. If that happens, whoever is to provide the salary would not be in a position to say whether the Minister needs help or not, because the manner in which these things are done makes it difficult for any proper assessment to be made by the one body which is responsible for doing so, and I therefore, caution this Committee most strongly that it is a very dangerous thing which we are being asked to do.

I care quite a lot for the privileges of this House as a Legislature and I think that far more harm than good is done to this Legislature by persons who are undermining its authority and setting it at naught, and even by the persons who may be the occasion of the little rows and quarrels which take place from time to time. Rows and quarrels which are necessary at times are the power and prerogative of the Legislature. This constant chipping away of the authority of the Assembly by these constitu-

tional devices takes away from year to year and from time to time the power of the House to say how public funds should be spent. The Chief Justice and the Governor of this colony both have their salaries made available by Acts of the Legislature so that if at any time there was not enough money in the Treasury or only enough to pay salaries, the salaries of the Chief Justice and the Governor would have to be paid, because that is the law of the land; but all other expenditure has to be appropriated and you do not appropriate it until you know where the money is coming. A principle of great importance is involved; it is not just a question of appointing another Minister or two; it is a question as to whether or not the Committee of this House is content to give up the powers of the House which it has been enjoying ever since there was a House. I do not know of any better method of crying a halt to the taking away of the privileges of the House in saying how money is to be spent than by recording our vote against the passing of this particular Clause.

The question that Clause 4 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mrs. BOURNE, Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Hon. M.E. COX, Hon. D.D. GARNER, Hon. R.G. MAPP, Messrs. THORNE: SEARLES, VAUGHAN and BRYAN - 9.

NOES: Messrs WALCOTT, GODDARD, TALMA, CRAWFORD, TUDOR and BRANCKER - 6.

On the motion of Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M.E. COX, Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, seconded by Hon. M.E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

7.35 p.m. *Res. 6 approved. G.E.O. No. 19.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 19 Order, 1957."

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave for the Minister of Agriculture to do this in as much as it concerns his Ministry I understand that the Order was laid before the House, and this is more or less a Resolution to approve of it. I should also be glad if the Minister would deal with Order No. 3 as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is asking leave for the Minister of Agriculture to take charge of Orders Nos. 2, and 3, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. D.D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, as you will see from the Addendum, this Order is entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 18 Order, 1957, and was laid in the Legislature in the last Session. The object of this, Sir, is to create the post of Assistant Co-operative Officer to assist in the duties of the senior Co-operative Officer in that Department. For some time now this branch of the Department was established, but it was badly under-staffed; hence the work of the Co-operative Officer had to be diverted from time to time and even the senior Officer himself had to be seconded elsewhere.

We have seen, Sir, what has been the outcome of these various shifts from place to place, and we are satisfied that there is need for a Assistant Co-operative Officer, so that when the time comes for the senior Co-operative Officer to go on leave or to undergo a course of training so that we can carry co-operation in the island further than it is today, then there will be someone who is trained and accustomed to the work in the office to carry on such duties. I think that this has been long overdue, inasmuch as I feel that co-operation might be taught more profusely in the island and should be given more emphasis, especially in the agricultural field. There is a dire need for such an officer inasmuch as it depends on the success of the co-operation in this island and upon the best staff you can place in the field to teach those

who engage in this sort of work what it really means, and to teach them how to get about the job.

I do not think that any hon. member will think this is a waste of money, because in other countries they are doing a fine job of it, and there is need for such a Department. Quite recently a Conference was held in Curacao and I have had the good fortune of seeing a couple of letters returning from that august body giving praise to our Senior Officer. They spoke very well of him and I am sure he can do much more if he had somebody to work along with him and spread the gospel of co-operation among the peasants and others in this island.

I do not know how hon. members feel about it, but the Ministry and I as a Minister feel there is a burning need for the spread of the gospel. It is done elsewhere and it teaches people how to get together and provide thrift societies and so on. I might say that at the moment this organisation is a standstill, because for some time now the senior Officer has been seconded elsewhere and there was nobody under him capable of carrying on his duties; therefore, Sir, in order to get that branch in an up-to-date manner, we have to come to the Legislature and ask that this Officer be given a post. Without this Officer we are getting nowhere in the field of co-operation, and co-operative among the peasants and other people is a "must", and I hope, Sir, that not for the sake of opposition will hon. members vote against this, because there is a growing need for that particular Officer; and I may add, Sir, that unless you pay a certain amount of money as salary, you cannot get the right type of person. There is no need to be cheeseparing about it; in order to get this work done you must have somebody who understands this work and who can get among the people with their various problems and teach them.

When you think that we want to encourage the peasantry of this country to join in several bodies where they can help themselves co-operatively, I do not think that this question should take five minutes to resolve. I may mention one particular instance in passing, Sir. I suppose Your Honour is well aware that we have the Sugar Agreement in London whereby if the peasants got together and formed themselves into co-operatives and sent in a certain amount of canes, they would derive greater benefits; but with no one to guide them they are still foundering. We need such Officers to go out and organise these people and help them to keep proper books, to create a proper system and teach them the value of co-operation.

I need say no more about this except that the senior Officer has been slated for an increase. There was an anomaly some time ago and we are seeking to rectify that today. You will observe, Sir, that it is proposed to move him from the scale G.5 - G.3 (\$3,528 - 4,944) at which he now stands to G.5 - G.2 (\$3,528 x 144 - 4,392; 4,560 x 192 - 5,520. You will observe from the note that this will be placing him on par with the Fishery Officer, Irrigation Officer and the Chief Agricultural Extension Officer; I feel, Sir, that we would be lacking in our duty if we did not correct that anomaly.

The next one, Sir, as I said before is the creation of an Assistant Co-operative Officer on the scale 42,640 x 120 - 3,360. I think I have made these facts undoubtedly clear and do not think I need repeat what I have said before; but that Department cannot go forward unless we have this particular Officer attached to the Staff.

7.45 p.m.

Now, Sir, I may add that although the Chief Co-operative Officer has been seconded sometime ago to the post of Chief Agricultural Extension Officer we have now been able to get somebody to fill that post, and therefore, he has relinquished that acting appointment. We do want to go forward along co-operative lines and in order to allow this officer to be sent out for training (which is badly lacking), we must have this other officer appointed so that the work can be carried on. At present there is nobody who can carry on that work.

As regards the Office Superintendent, the staff of the department is very large and it has been put up on several occasions that that particular office should be revamped and instead of naming the holder of that post Office Superintendent, you should name him Executive Secretary. In so doing it carries greater responsibility; therefore, it must carry a larger salary. We have had

special investigation into this particular situation and I can say that everything is in a favourable manner. Personally, I feel it should be done. With the amount of work which is undertaken in that Department I feel that the officer who is in charge has the duties of an Executive Secretary.

As hon members will read further down in the Addendum, this is in keeping with the recommendation of paragraph 141 of the Salaries Commissioner's Report and is designed to relieve the Director of a great part of the burden of executive and minor administrative work so as to enable him to devote more time to the professional side of his duties and matters involving major policy.

On that particular score, I am not altogether satisfied with exactly how the operational work is carried on. Sometime we get a bottleneck between the Ministry and that Department. However, in due course the Legislature would know something more of that.

I do wish to emphasize to hon. members that these are matters which have been carefully studied and several meetings were held over these things. If the Island is to go forward, we must have these people. It is not a question of creating jobs for friends. I am not ashamed to say that our people need a considerable amount of teaching in co-operatives. Mr. Speaker, if I may digress to say this: how can the people of this colony learn anything of co-operation or co-operatives if they have no one to teach them? In marketing and things of that nature, you have to teach the people how to get around those things as well as how to organise and in order to do that you must have adequate staff. This Order seeks to do it I hope I have explained it fully. I think all hon. members are intelligent and I think all hon. members feel that there is need for these people. If there is any question any hon. member may wish to ask, and I have the answer, I will be only too pleased to give him the answer. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. R.G.MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear the comments on the lack of experts or highly efficient co-operative officers as far as agriculture is concerned. In agricultural communities like Barbados where development of small holders in agriculture is becoming continually more important, co-operatives have come to be recognised as an essential part in the development of that agriculture. However, I must warn the Hon. Minister that successful co-operatives is a highly technical job; it is one of these technical jobs where the highest technique is in the type of human being appointed to do the job. It is a human type of job; that is to say, no matter how many ideas a person may have, if you appoint a person unfamiliar with the ways of the local peasantry he will be a failure. I repeat, regardless of whom it offends, we have a tradition of appointing square pegs in round holes. Sometimes jobs are created just in order to oblige certain persons around the place. If the Hon. Minister really wants - and I presume he wants from his speech a highly trained officer in co-operatives, he should advertise for one in one of the colonies where agricultural co-operatives are highly successful - a colony like British Guiana. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture has just come from India and I think he is aware of the success and popularity of agricultural co-operatives in India. I think he is aware that an official by the name of Mr. Strickland has written of the co-operative movement in India and Africa.

Sir, I am pleasantly surprised to hear that people in this island are becoming so interested and successful in co-operatives that we need a second Co-operative Officer. I must emphasize that from popular talk, the co-operative movement so far has been a pretty poor effort and I think that one of the reasons is because the Co-operative Officer up to now has not had enough time nor experience to apply the maximum ability to his job. It is not only in marketing of canes and getting a few more dollars per ton or them that co-operatives become useful. The development of all types of co-operatives and the marketing of them is an essential part of co-operatives. Now that we are building markets all over the country - and if they are not yet built, it is planned that they are

to be built all over the country - it is essential that the co-operative movement in agriculture be led by officers who are inspired with the end product of the movement. Not anybody can be appointed as co-operative officer nor any favourite who can impress some people or who has some pull. It is time to get away from that; we have too much of that in this country and it is one of the dangers of administration in this country. If a second officer is needed - and I stress, if he is needed - that is evidence that the co-operative movement is growing. I am not competent to say whether he is needed or not, but from hearsay it is surprising that one is needed.
7.55. p.m.

With the assessment I have of the value and importance of the Co-operative Movement in Barbados, I am glad to hear that a second officer is being appointed, because it will be felt that the Co-operative Movement will develop much faster than it is now being developed. There is nothing at all against the appointment of the second officer, but he must be an officer of calibre, with the human element predominant; he must be easily approachable, and he must be acquainted not only with the agricultural side, but with the background and psychology of the peasants; otherwise, he will be a failure. The peasant is the most conservative element in society, and unless you know how to approach him, you can teach him nothing.

As regards paragraph 3 of the Addendum to this Resolution, the replacement of the post of Office Superintendent - \$3,000 - 3,816 - by a post of Executive Secretary on the scale \$3,960 - 4,392; 4,560 x 192 - 4,944. Frankly speaking, - and I will speak my mind regardless of whom it may offend - this is merely a question of creating an Office for one of the favourites. One of the greatest agricultural officers who have been in this country - perhaps he is the greatest is Dr. Saint, and nobody did more important work than he; yet he did not want any Executive Officer to relieve him so as to be able to do his technical work, as is set out in this Addendum. There is plenty staff there and I speak my mind frankly that this is just a name to give a favourite more money. I suspect that this is one of those anomalies where the nomenclature is changed so as to give a favourite more money. The Greatest Agricultural Director whom we have had in our community did not need any officer to relieve him of any duties, and I will say that we have not had his equal since then and it will be a long day before we have his equal.

I warn the Hon. Minister to have all his wits about him and not be hoodwinked or soft soaped with this mellow sweet talk from some old-time fossilised member of a family who himself should be seeking retirement in these modern days, because he thinks it a very terrible revolution that anybody like the hon. Junior member for St. Philip should be the Minister of Agriculture. He has not accepted the new order at all; in his heart of hearts he does not accept it. He still belongs to the old order psychologically. I am speaking my mind; because of what I have said, the Minister must be alert and more than alert to any suggestions like these put forward by this officer. He will be very suave to the Minister; of course, he will be suave. This person is that much psychological, but he does not belong to the new order to which the Minister belongs. Frankly, I think that this last Paragraph - (c) - is just a question, I repeat, of giving a favourite more money. The name "Executive Secretary" sounds high, but the person has no more qualifications for this job than I have for drawing the plan of a Sputnik.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I have no great quarrel with the post of Co-operative Officer, because I have no doubt that a plausible case can be made out for the creation of such a post, and it would not be wise for one to afford the opportunity of providing the need of the sixteen registered societies in this Island with a total membership of approximately 800 people. If this post has been recommended by the Ministry of Agriculture, which presumably has gone into the agricultural situation and has not been frightened, soft soaped, cajoled and intimidated, I am not disposed to interfere with that. What concerns me, Sir, is the wording of the last part of the Addendum to this Resolution which deals with the crea-

tion of the post of Executive Secretary and the replacement of the post of Office Superintendent. This paragraph speaks of relieving the Director of a great part of the burden of Executive and minor administrative work so as to enable him to devote more time to the professional side of his duties and matters involving major policy. I am wondering why the Director has been engaged in minor administrative work...

Of course, the Hon. Minister may reply that the Director has been engaged in this work, and it is because of that that it is proposed to create this post. Perhaps, Hrs Honour the Deputy Speaker has heard of some scheme that one of the aristocratic and ancient families of Barbados has been earmarked for the post; it may be that the hon. member hears more by way of the grape vine than on this side of the Table hear. What worries me in connection with this Addendum is that it is said that if you create this post, the Director will be able to devote more time to the professional side of his duties and matters involving major policy.

The duties of the Director of Science and Agriculture are fully set out in 15 sub-sections of Section 8 of the Department of Science and Agriculture Act, 1925. Those sub-sections set out his duties very fully, and now that we have Ministerial Status, I do not see how the Director should be devoting more time to matters involving major policy except in the capacity of Senior Adviser to the Hon. Minister. 8.05 p.m.

It is from the Minister and him alone that major policy is to originate and be carried through, and with Ministerial status there is no justification for the Director feeling that he, even if it were provided amongst his duties in the Act, is responsible for policy; where there is a Minister, the Director must be under him, however widely versed in his subject he might be, and it is the Minister that makes the decisions which involve major policy. I should not like the Director to think that if we create this post, he is now free to devote his time not only to the professional side of his duties but on matters involving major policy, except in so far as he understands full well that when he will be devoting more time to these matters, he is only assisting by advising the Minister, whether it be the present Minister or any future Minister, to dictate or originate or to accept matters of major policy.

Let the Minister take care and beware, because when you have a Director and he happens to be a man especially trained, with qualifications and a degree in the subject in respect of which he is a local Director, he may well through force of habit, irrespective of being what we might regard as a member of the erstwhile ruling class of this country, attempt still to be responsible and to originate matters involving major policy. That, I think, is a thing of which one must be very careful and critical, and it is at this time when we are asking to create this post to relieve the Director that he might devote more time to certain things that we should like the Director to understand, just in case he does not now fully understand, that matters involving major policy must come from the Ministry, because the Minister is responsible. If anything goes wrong, it is the Minister who according to convention - I do not know if it will be observed in this country - is to resign and the Director who carries on. It is the Minister who is responsible for whatever is wrong, and therefore, let the Director fully appreciate that policy making under the present system of Government comes from and is the exclusive prerogative of the Ministry and not the Director.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was very pleased to hear the Minister speak on this Resolution, and more so on the question of co-operative work. I was really interested in the speech of the hon. junior member for St. John who pointed out to the Minister certain things which should be borne in mind.

When you read the Addendum, it makes good reading, but the Minister did not elaborate on this. The Addendum reads:- "The expansion in the co-operative movement over the past few years has given rise to the need for the provision of an Assistant to the Co-operative Officer. There are now sixteen registered societies with total membership of approximately 800." This cannot be any vast expansion of this movement. I believe that this

Co-operative Officer had been appointed nearly six years ago, and I doubt very much whether you can call this a good record for six years. I deal with this number in a day; I am Secretary of an organisation which has 50,000 members, and we do not have a top heavy staff to deal with this number.

What I am going to say will support the hon. junior member for St. John. I am not satisfied that the time has come when you need an Assistant Co-operative Officer. The hon. member might not agree with me, but I do not believe that co-operative work as such fits into the sort of ideals and aspirations of the Co-operative Officer. The Co-operative Officer is a trained agriculturist; he was senior Agricultural Extension Officer. The danger in Barbados is that you make a post a little higher than something else and ask us to agree to it, and you are making a position now in relation to the Fishery Officer and the Irrigation Officer as well as the Chief Agricultural Extension Officer. That is obvious because this man holds a diploma from the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, and therefore he will be a man in status equal to these people; but it does not necessarily mean that he is a man who has an idea about co-operatives.

Unfortunately, both the Minister and the junior member for St. John laid emphasis on agricultural co-operatives. Now, let us be quite factual about it; the scope for agricultural co-operative work in Barbados is extremely limited. If we have to appoint a Co-operative Officer in Barbados or build co-operation within agriculture, vis-a-vis the estate and land agriculture, is of such that that is not the sort of development you will be aiming at in any undeveloped territory. It is by accident that I found among my papers an article by Professor D.G. Karve from South Africa which said "the essence of co-operation consists in having an association for meeting the economic needs of members on a non-profit-making basis. The application of this principle is not always possible within the limits of what ordinarily is called a co-operative society, i.e. a group of persons, usually small in number, forming themselves into a legal corporation for a specific purpose."

You cannot form a society because you have a few peasants in Welchman Hall and a few in some other part of the island for the purpose of getting better prices from the various factories. That is not the essence of a co-operative movement; the essence of the movement is to go into fields where there is cottage industry, and in Barbados use is not being made of people who can make baskets. You should go into that sort of thing and build up among those people something of importance.

I am one of those people who give the co-operative movement my whole-hearted support and will do anything to help them. Further in the report of the Professor says:- "A programme of small industries co-operatively organised must build within itself the provision to go on improving standards of technology, as employment offered by the industrial development of the community as a whole increases and as larger supplies of capital become available." This is a man seeing the needs in South Africa because it is a country in which the co-operative movement can work. The field is more limited in Barbados, but it can be useful.

In Nova Scotia there is a society for dealing with fishermen; this Government provides fishermen with a lot of help, but there is no attempt whatever to form a co-operative movement among fishermen. We are really in need of a positive co-operative movement among fishermen, because this is the type of men whom you can teach because you meet them by the beaches and you virtually have co-operative conditions. The Co-operative Officer cannot teach them, because he has not been given a course in this, but his brother might know more about this movement, because when he did a course in Canada, he paid a lot of attention to that.

8.15 p.m.

I agree with the hon. junior member for St. John that that would be of no use with the failure of the co-operative movement in Barbados which is so unfortunate, because you appoint a man who is predominantly an agricultural man to look after co-operatives, one whom I believe is only skilled in agricultural extension work

among peasants. That is a different thing from co-operative work. Your Agricultural Department can be of assistance to people in co-operative work and I feel that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, well meaning as he is, must see that sixteen societies are not enough to justify the need of a second officer. I have not said that because I wish to withhold support to this matter because there are only sixteen societies, but you are in this unfortunate position of paying a salary of \$220 a month rising to \$280 to this second officer. If you are thinking in terms of pushing forward the co-operative movement, surely you cannot get a man at this salary who will be interested in the job. The hon. junior member for St. John said that this is a job in which you have to teach people. If this officer has to teach people, he must be a person who has absorbed that sort of teaching and must be one who would be able to transmit it to other people. You would have to increase his salary because he could not be an officer in that low position. What has happened is that the officer who is doing this sort of work here can be attracted outside of Barbados to do agricultural work, and he is a man qualified to go outside and get a job in an Agricultural Department at a higher salary than what he is getting here. I think it was mooted at one time that he was offered a position outside. This Government is going to find out that they cannot keep a man at that salary.

I do not subscribe to the view that co-operative societies over here have been built up. I grant you that the officer who is in charge of this job is working in a hard field because the people in this country are strongly individualistic, and the average peasant considers that by hard work which he has put in he has brought himself to the position where he is now. Co-operation is the antithesis of his own background; and so to break that ground, especially in view of the fact that we have societies where reasonable credits can be granted to him, will be a hard job. At present, the Peasant Loan Bank offers a lot of facilities for peasants; therefore, the field of co-operation is not going to be a field which is easy to get peasants to join. The next point to that question is that in Barbados you have all these credit societies, and the working of co-operatives depends on cash. It is well known that where you have a small shop operating you cannot get a co-operative shop operating because it does not operate on credit. There are many features against the co-operative movement in Barbados, but with all that there is room for extension in the co-operative movement, and I think that is the task more than building it up.

I am somewhat hesitant of the need at this time of another co-operative officer but I am not going to spoil the Minister's efforts. If you are going to get the right man - I am a bit different about it - that is all well and good. I speak with a lot of reservations when I say that from the present co-operative movement in this colony it does show that the peasant is not a co-operator in the high enthusiastic sense.

In so far as the Office Superintendent is concerned, I do not think I can offer much criticism on that. I will say that I do not subscribe to the views of hon. members of the Opposition so far as the wording is concerned. I would say this: I do not know what experience these Ministers have with the present Director of Agriculture, but during the years that I was a member of the Executive I found the present Director of Agriculture to be very co-operative; I never found him to be of any obstacle. That has been my experience.

So far as the post of Executive Secretary is concerned, I should tell hon. members of the House that you have put yourself in for it already. You began in all of the small departments and put certain officers up to a particular standard and this is where you have to ace facts. If you go to non-productive departments and you put a string of executives in them, what must you do when you come to a productive department like this Department of Agriculture? Let us not fool ourselves. A first class agricultural department means a lot to this community. I would not be against having the status of Office Superintendent raised to Executive Secretary and as a matter of fact, I feel that a place like the Agricultural Department is more deserving of an Executive Secretary

at its head than many of those service Departments which you have. I feel the Director of Agriculture should not be burdened with office work so that he would be able to devote more of his time to the professional side of the job and to the implementing of the policies of the Department. It has been my experience that it wanted revamping even in the building structure. You want such a structure as to get a better flow of work and I think you ought to have a building constructed on more modern lines. As I have said, I am not opposed to raising the post of Office Superintendent to Executive Secretary and paying a better salary, because I feel in that Department there is a lot of work to be done, and I may say that it is a very efficient department and much more efficient than the Public thinks it is. The reason why the public does not think so is because you have there a lot of people who do not fall down on the work and make you believe that they have more work than they have to do. I say this: the Agricultural Department of Barbados can bear comparison with any Agricultural Department in the Caribbean. You must also bear in mind that you have to concentrate more on sugar and that department is the source from which you depend for experiments in the growth of the industry.

My only doubt, and I say this quite humbly, is about the need for Assistant Co-operative Officer but the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is calling upon us for assistance. He has told us that there are sixteen societies with eight hundred people, but that does not impress me because when you take an analysis of these societies, they are just societies around the town. Of course when it comes to Credit Unions and such things of co-operation, those are matters of educating and teaching people how to do the job. It is true, if you get more people joining these societies you will have to get someone to teach these matters. However, I am satisfied that in these things, and as the hon. junior member for St. John has said, you do not always have the right officer to do the job, and I know that it is a very difficult thing to get a Co-operative Officer because they are not people who are unemployed; they are not on the sidewalks. I agree with the hon. junior member for St. John when he said that you will have to advertise for one either in British Guiana, Trinidad or Jamaica. I do know that in Jamaica the Scheme for co-operation is first-class and there is a Field Officer in the Caribbean by the name of Mr. Bayley who knows what he is about in that respect. The scheme for co-operation in Jamaica is very much better than it is in Barbados. However, I doubt very much that you will be able to attract an officer from those parts. Surely, you cannot attract a Co-operative officer from British Guiana, Trinidad or Jamaica at a salary of \$220 rising to \$280 a month.

8.25 p.m.

As Salaries are in Barbados today, it does not make much difference between a salary of \$150 a month and a salary of \$200 a month when you are setting out an advertisement for the quality of person you require. If you are advertising for somebody to work for \$150 a month or \$200 a month, it makes no difference in the type of applicant. This salary could only attract somebody who is too old for the race, or a youngster who is just from school and who has not got the experience of carrying on the job. I would like to give the Hon. Minister this officer, but I am wondering -- I know it would not be politic for him to tell this House - how long he expects to retain this officer. There is not much future in this office for your Agricultural Officer although the salary has risen higher over the years than that of the Co-operative Officer. I am sure that this officer's salary has risen more than that of the Co-operative Officer over a period since he was appointed as Agricultural Officer. By what you are now doing, you are likely to pitch a job at a higher rate than it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I would not be dogmatic about that, because I have not made any close study of what Co-operative Officers get in other countries, but I do not think this salary weighs with me, because I do not think you have reached the stage where you need a second officer.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, in upgrading the salary of this Co-operative Officer, we are simply bringing it into line with the posts as set out such as the Fishery

Officer and those officers who are termed as junior technical officers. This is a matter of regularising what has always existed and the question of upgrading it is beside the point. This is a question of putting an officer on the same footing as other officers. In so far as whether this officer has done good work or whether he needs assistance

well, I think good work has been done within recent years and I think that that is the reason why this officer needs assistance with the uphill task which he has before him. To expect one officer to cope with the whole island is to expect too much. It is within my knowledge that the Peasant Agricultural Officers are forming groups and trying to bring about these societies. I feel pleased to see that the societies have reached as far as sixteen in number and I think that this Co-operative Officer needs assistance, because, as I have said, this is an uphill task.

In the past the Co-operative Officer has had to perform two jobs and very little of his time was concentrated on co-operative work. This Officer is not only called upon to do the job of Co-operative Officer, but also that of the Chief Agricultural Extension Officer, with the result that his time was not concentrated on the main job. To say that he does not need assistance would mean that we have reached the goal, whereas, in truth and in fact, that is not the case. It is a fact that a lot still remains to be done in the field of co-operatives and to expect one officer to perform this task is expecting too much. I would like to see the Co-operative Officer settle down on the work of co-operatives and let the Department be given all the assistance and drive which are necessary.

In so far as the Registrar of Co-operatives is concerned, the Hon. Minister should revise that question. I think that if the Registrar of Co-operatives were at liberty - it is not a question of having only one co-operative Day in the year, but it is a question of having co-operatives from day to day and from night to night. I think that another Co-operative Officer is needed very much.

As regards paragraph 3, of the Addendum to this Resolution, it is a question of upgrading this post and giving it a name. In reality, we are not doing anything new, because somebody already performs the work of Executive Secretary. It is a question of bringing to the attention of the House that this post exist and the person who is doing this job should be compensated on a higher scale. This is not anything new as it looks; I happen to know that there is one who is doing the job of Executive Secretary, so that this is only a question of regularising what is already in existence and it is a step in the right direction.

8.35 p.m.

To suggest that we do not need these officers would not be stating the true state of affairs, because they are already in existence and it is only a question of regularising them and proceeding in the way it has been done in the last few years.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down have been rather illuminating, especially since he has been a former Minister of Agriculture in the last Government. Now, whether he was making an apology or whether he was informing the House, this much of what he said interested me very much, and it is this: that the present Co-operative Officer cannot fully discharge his duties as a Co-operative Officer since he was still doing agricultural extension work.

Now, if that is so, can the House really be satisfied that there is a need for an Assistant? If the Officer has been partly performing his duties, does that Officer know from such an experience that he really needs an Assistant? That is sheer examination as a businessman would examine it. If an Officer, the substantive holder of a post, has been performing the functions of two Officers - the functions of Agricultural Extension Officer and that of Co-operative Officer, from those experiences, can he really inform Government that there is a need for an Assistant? I have very strong reasons to doubt from that.

As a matter of fact, Sir, before the hon. ex-Minister spoke, because unfortunately I did not hear the present Minister when he was addressing the House on this Resolution, I was wondering myself having heard so little

of the activities of the co-operatives in this island, if there really could be the need for an Assistant Co-operative Officer. I think that now that the Officer will be taken away from the performing the duties of the Agricultural Extension Officer, he would be able to throw his all into the business of boosting up the Co-operative movement, and of course make us hopeful for some results.

Quite recently, Sir, I was in conversation with some young man who are actively engaged in the Credit Union business - that is another side of the co-operatives - and those individuals were very despondent, cheerless and hopeless of the sort of encouragement they got from the Co-operative Officer. I agree with what other hon. members have said that the Barbadian, with his individualism, will be a very hard nut to crack, and therefore we do not expect to see co-operatives spring up everywhere over-night; but I want to know, unless a real assessment has been made by the Officer who was active and who was not handicapped by having to perform other duties, whether we have any real foundations or could be satisfied that a case has been properly made out to the Minister that there is a need now. Maybe there will be a need next year or sometime in the future, but are we satisfied in the face of what the hon. member for Christ Church has said, that a true assessment has been made and that we are really going on safe ground at this stage in creating the office of an Assistant to the Co-operative Officer.

Personally, I feel with my colleague that this particular Officer has no particular flare for co-operatives. That is my personal feeling on the matter. I am not interested at all in the salary. I am not in a position to judge what salary should be allocated to this post, so I am not going to say anything I do not know enough about. Judging the matter from what I have heard, I am confirmed in my original doubts as to the necessity at this stage for creating the post of a second Co-operative or an Assistant Co-operative Officer.

With regard to the Executive Secretary, Sir, I hope that I will be able to avail myself of an old copy of the Estimates to see whether there were Executive Secretaries before, but I take his word for it that the Agricultural Department - and I share his view entirely - is such an important one that if Executive Secretaries are to be found in Departments that might not be classified as productive Departments, I think there is a need for the creation of the post of Executive Secretary.

I was listening to hon. members who talked about policy being laid down by the Director or the danger of policy being laid down by the Director of Agriculture, but I see nothing in the Addendum to warrant remarks like that, because as I read it, it said: "This is in keeping with the recommendation at paragraph 141 of the Salaries Commissioner's Report and is designed to relieve the Director of a great part of the burden of executive and minor administrative work so as to enable him to devote more time to the professional side of his duties and matters involving major policy." I see now where the "major policy" comes in, but I think it would have been clearer if it had read: "and matters involving the implementation of major policy." The Hon. Minister must see to it that those who are responsible for these Addendums should write English clearly enough that the average hon. member of this House would not be able to find fault with these omissions. In that, Sir, I see that the Director has no power whatever and can never have power as far as creating policy is concerned.

I listened, Sir, to the remarks of the hon. junior member for St. John, and I do not think I agree with him, because unless for the purposes of ordinary electioneering, I do not think any Director or any Head of Government Department could be so stupid as to believe he would not have to listen to the Minister from whom policy proceeds.

8.45 p.m.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I rise on a point of correction. I did not say he did not listen to the Minister. That is a misinterpretation of what I said. I said that because of his psychology, he does not accept in his heart of hearts the new order at all.

Mr. HUSBANDS: Sir, I still feel - never mind how bitter a pill it may be for some people to see certain hon. members who are in the position of Ministers being

responsible for policy of the Departments under their portfolio - I do think that the type of individual who is placed as Head of a Department in this country today is so stupid as not to accept the fact that the Minister and not the Director or Head of the Department is the policy-maker; so I do not think the present Hon. Minister of Agriculture needs bother himself about that. Sir, I still have very grave doubts as to the necessity of creating the post of Assistant Co-operative Officer.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 19 ORDER, 1957

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of the following Resolution:-

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment), No. 19 Order, 1957.

Hon. D.D.GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this Order deals with establishing the post of Soil Conservation Officer. The Addendum reads as follows:-

This Order provides for the creation of a post of Soil Conservation Officer in the Scale \$4,560 x 192 - \$5,520 x 240 - \$6,240.

Soil Conservation in the Scotland district is a long term programme and it is essential as the Scheme develops that there should be a second officer who should be on the permanent establishment to assist the Senior Conservation Officer in the direction and supervision of the Planned operations and to deputise for him during his absence.

I take it that hon. members are aware of this need and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. R.G.MAPP: I beg to second that.

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

20/10/58

SITTING SUSPENDED

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative.

The sitting was suspended

9.00 p.m.

On re-assembling.

Hon. M.E.COX: With Your Honour's permission, I am moving the hon. senior member for St. John be appointed as Chairman of Committees during the absence of the Acting Chairman of Committees - the hon. Junior member for the City.

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

Mr. T.W. Miller entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. M.E.COX: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the House:- To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

Hon. M.E.COX: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, and that it be an instruction of the House when in Committee of Supply, to deal with the Resolution for \$3,500 of which notice was given earlier today.

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

The motion was put and agreed to

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went

into Committee of Supply, Mr. T.W. MILLER being in the Chair.

VISIT OF GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Kt: Mr. Acting Chairman, I propose to deal firstly, with the Resolution for \$3,500 in respect of the visit of the Governor-General of the West Indies. As hon. members will see from the Addendum to this Resolution, a Committee has been set up by the Governor-General of the West Indies. The Committee has prepared a programme and estimated that the sum of \$3,500 will be necessary to meet the financial commitments for the programme it has planned. The sums of money are as follows:-

Decorations and illuminations, \$1,200; Government entertainment, \$700; Police subsistence allowance, \$130; Display by the Police and Marines on the Ships which will be visiting at the same time; hire of extra chairs \$100; stages, \$240; posts, ropes etc., \$100; extra and overtime labour \$200; transport \$60; Community and Health Centres, \$500. That makes a total of 3,230; and contingencies are put down at \$270 making a round figure of \$3,500.

In view of the very short time before the Governor-General arrives, it is important that this Resolution should be passed quickly, and that is why we have asked the leave of the House to deal with it today. The Governor-General arrives on the 10th of February, two weeks from now, and all sorts of things are happening from 8.15 a.m. He will be met on board the ship, he goes to the Chamberlain Wharf, a salute will be fired and he and his party will land from the Police launch on the Wharf. He will be received by the Governor, and so on, he will inspect a Guard of Honour, there will be a fanfare of trumpets, he will be conducted to the saluting base, and then he will meet persons in the yard of the Public Buildings. Members of the Legislature and their wives will be presented to him and so on, and then he will visit the Technical Institute, Erdiston Training College, the Colonial Development and Welfare organisation, Trents Community Centre, the Regional Police Training School, the Gall Hill Housing Estate, the Six Cross Roads Centre, Codrington College, Sam Lord's Castle and one or two other places of that nature. He will be visiting the Belleplaine Community Centre and the Scotland District. Then there will be a display of the Royal Marines and the Barbados Police Force on the afternoon of Thursday, 13th February. That roughly is the programme.

A Committee was set up to arrange a programme for this visit; they went very carefully into the question of what should be done for the Governor-General and we have been given this estimate of the cost.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, this is normally a non-controversial matter in respect of the Governor-General of the West Indies visiting this Island. While I have no objection to the spending of this money, yet it makes me feel that in many respects, the West Indies, especially Barbados, where there has been a positive lack of enthusiasm now that Federation has actually been inaugurated - it makes me feel that with all of this money being spent in these areas, the leaders of the respective areas do not show any enthusiasm for what they have done, and this is only a question of window-dressing. Can the West Indies afford to pay this money for window-dressing? When you think of all the money which was spent for these plane fares and subsistence allowances which ran into hundreds of dollars, and then you find at the last moment that there is no enthusiasm where Federation is concerned, I say that this is the kind of money with which it would have been better to provide some school children with some benefit or to do something of a more positive nature or the benefit of Barbados than what is now being proposed. It seems to me that it would have been better for the Governor-General to pay us a routine visit without this fanfare.

I, personally, feel that the West Indies like to be 'showing off', but we do not want to do this sort of thing for the Governor-General. When the Governor-General visits Barbados, he wants to meet people, but all these other things do not mean much. I say that you are not enthusiastic about Federation and yet you are spending

all of this money. I would be a hypocrite if I did not make these remarks; I am not enthusiastic about this matter, in so far as what is taking place in the territories.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 10.00 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957-58 No. 59

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The next Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, a Resolution to place the sum of \$3,260 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1957-58 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1957-58, No. 59 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the notes to this Supplementary Resolution are very straightforward. Cleaning water and light to Government Industrial Schools: the water supply has been increased and the electricity costs more, which makes up a total of \$498.

Under Head XXIII Medical, Health Centres, the amount voted for travelling expenses is insufficient. As I said, if hon. members look at the notes, they will see that they are perfectly straightforward.

Note 4 reads as follows: "The Laboratory at the Enmore Health Centre did not commence its functions until May of this year, and on the recommendation of the World Health Organisation Consultant a special stock of forms for specifying Laboratory tests covering a wide range of investigations had to be purchased. The provision in the 1957-58 Estimates was insufficient to meet this extraordinary expenditure."

Under "Incidentals" the note reads: "In order to implement a recent decision of the Government an additional amount of \$202 will be required to provide protective clothing for certain categories of technical staff, uniform for domestic staff, and a water-proof coat for the watchman at Enmore Health Centre."

Under Note 5, part of the wall at Glendairy Prison fell down because of heavy rains, and the estimated cost of putting it back is \$1,500.

I do not believe that any of the prisoners have tried to escape yet. It may be that some of them get a better time inside than outside and do not want to escape.

Under Note 6 of Head XXXIII - Civil Aviation, Transportation, hon. members will note that the van for transporting workers to Seawell is not big enough to take them all, and some of them have to go by bus. This amount is to refund them for their bus fares.

I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$3,260 do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, Note 6 is not clear as to what it means. It reads as follows: "The transportation of Seawell Airport Staff has been supplied by the Transport Board up to 3rd December 1957, when a Station waggon was provided. As this vehicle cannot transport all of the staff, refunds are paid to those employees who travel by bus."

It is now estimated that to meet the full cost of transportation of the Airport Staff for the current financial year, a sum of \$5,196 will be required, and, as only a sum of \$4,400 has been provided in the current Estimates, a supplementary provision of \$800 is now required."

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Probably, it would save some debate if I told the hon. member that we have decided to purchase another Volkswagen, and the amount will be brought in the Estimates.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Minister very much.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, may I protest against the manner in which the Resolutions are now printed, and the inconvenience in reading them as they are now compared with how they were done before. As it is, the Estimates are printed broadwise, then you have to turn the sheet lengthwise to read the notes. As it was before, the Estimates were printed facing the notes, and you could read them without having to turn the sheet around. You might understand, but in your absence there is no member on that side who might be able to.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, under XXIII- Medical, Note 4 deals with the provision of protective clothing for the technical staff, uniform for domestic staff and a water-proof coat for the watchman at Enmore Health Centre. I should like to suggest to Government that it seems to me that they have not gone far enough with these water-proof coats, because there are other Departments of Government like the Waterworks and Highways and Transport which employ watchmen, and I should like to know why you should select the watchman at Enmore to provide him with a waterproof coat. I would suggest that similar means of protection be provided for the employees at the Waterworks and Highways and Transport.

Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: He might be a man who would not sleep through a rain, but I will bear in mind the hon member's question and make enquiries. We have voted money for protective clothing for the Waterworks employees - leggings and cloth boots - but I cannot say offhand all the categories of Government employees who have protective clothing. I will make the necessary enquiries and give the information to the hon. member.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957-58 No. 60

Hon. D.D. GARNER: Mr. Chairman, this is an omnibus Resolution in which there are a few items connected with the Department of Science and Agriculture. The amount needed under "Furniture and Equipment" is \$660, and the note reads as follows: "The staff of the Department of Science and Agriculture has recently been increased by the addition of one Senior Peasant Agricultural Instructor, one Assistant Livestock Officer, two Senior Agricultural Assistants and two Typists. More office furniture is required for the use of these additional officers and this Resolution seeks the requisite funds."

I think you will observe, Sir, from time to time that we have been making additions to staff, and therefore if you employ more people you need more furniture and things of that sort, so this seeks to rectify that position.

The next item "Reconstruction of Foreman's House at Bullens" is new and the note reads as follows: "In 1956-57 an amount of \$3,500 was provided for the reconstruction of the foreman's quarters at Bullens Agriculture Station, but the work was not completed by the end of the Financial year when a balance of \$197 lapsed. It is now proposed to complete the job (e closures etc.) and a revote of \$180 is required."

The other item - Roads - is new, and we are asking for \$1,700. The note reads as follows: "In 1956-57 an amount of \$4,000 was provided for the re-conditioning of roads at the Pine Plantation. Work progressed slowly owing to the difficulty in obtaining the necessary equipment at suitable times and at 31st March, 1957, the programme was incomplete and a balance of \$1,706 lapsed. A revote of \$1,700 is now required to complete the job."

I think it is straightforward that during the crop season and during the rainy weather we could not repair the roads, and now it is thought an appropriate time to do so. We are asking a revote of this money to continue with that particular job.

10.10 p.m.

As regards Item No. 116, (New) Furniture for Agricultural Stations, the note to it in the Addendum reads very plainly. It is as follows:-

"In October, 1956, an amount of \$5,400 was provided to meet the cost of providing basic furniture for the six Government owned houses occupied by the Peasant Agricultural Instructors at the District Agricultural Stations. Owing to the need for the purchase of furniture of termite resistant material, progress has been relatively slow and by 31st March, 1957, an unexpended balance of \$3,129 lapsed. It is proposed to continue the purchase of such furniture and a revote of \$1,129 is required for the purpose."

In other words, Sir, we are providing for these agricultural stations furniture for the occupants. It is not always possible that you can buy that heavy furniture. If we adopt the policy of going into stores and buying new furniture, it will cost Government a lot of money; there-

fore from time to time we go around to sales and buy at cheaper prices. We are also getting furniture which is termite resistant and we want the balance of this money which has lapsed from the last financial year so that we can get on with the job.

As regards the fifth item which is for the sum of \$220 for the Barbados Credit Union's Central Co-operative, this is something to do with one of the items which we have dealt with a short while ago. It is something to do with the co-operative movement. Let me say from the outset that this has my sympathy inasmuch as I feel that if we are interested in co-operation and Trade Unions as such, we should do everything in our power to get them put on a financial basis and self supporting. During the Course of the year, the Barbados Credit Unions Central Co-operative Committee sent a representative to Trinidad but they did not have the funds at their disposal to pay for his upkeep. My Ministry was approached about the matter and I looked upon it very favourably after I was informed of the conditions which prevailed. I am sure if hon. members are in favour of extending the movement of co-operatives and building up strong Credit Unions in this colony they would vote for this item so that the people who had to borrow this money to send a delegate to the first constitutional convention of the West Indian Confederation of Credit Unions which was held in Trinidad last year, would be reimbursed through the good offices of this Government. I think I have said enough. The Addendum sets out quite plainly the matter. I should apologise for having brought it at this time but hon. members are aware that I was out of the Island; therefore I could not be absent and present too. I am asking support on this measure. If there is anything upon which hon. members need clarification, I will be happy to do so. I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$3,389 do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Acting Chairman, the printing of this Resolution is different from that of the last which you had to shift around your file at right angles so as to read it. That is what I was trying to explain to hon. members on the opposite side just now.

May I offer my sympathy to the Hon. Minister who has just sat down. He referred to the fact that when he was away, things could not be done. I understand him to say that there was nobody capable. Were they not capable or was there nobody capable to carry on during the two months that he was on his tour of the Eastern Hemisphere?

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am sympathetic with these Credit Unions but I am a practical man. As I look at this Resolution and read it, it seeks to provide the sum of \$220 "as a reimbursement of the expenses incurred by the Barbados Credit Unions' Central Co-operative Committee in sending a representative to the first constitutional convention of the West Indian Confederation of Credit Unions held in Trinidad from the 13th to 15th September, 1957. These expenses have been made up as follows: Air passages, \$80, Hotel expenses \$100, Other incidental expenses \$40, making a total of \$220."

How dare the Government to provide subsistence to an organisation which is not a Government organisation? You have given them practically everything as if you were sending out a Government delegation. You are paying passage and giving them something like \$20 a day for subsistence. If the Conference started on the 13th September, and you gave the delegate the opportunity of leaving here on the 12th and coming back a day after the Conference ended, that means five days and that accounts for the hundred dollars as hotel expenses and then you are giving him \$40 as incidentals.

What is the position? I am the representative of a voluntary organisation. In 1941 the Government of Barbados gave the Barbados Workers' Union an allowance to send someone to the I.C.F.T.U. and the person who went was leader of the Government at that time but the Barbados Workers' Union only received about one-third of the money it cost to send the delegate. I do not think that the Barbados Workers' Union had any right to get any more. As a matter of fact, as long as I have anything to do with the Barbados Workers' Union. I would not go to

ask the Government for any subvention because I feel that that organisation should stand on its own feet. Why is it that these groups were not called upon to make any contribution as regards the sending of this delegate to Trinidad? The Note to the Item states that the sum of \$220 was the expenses of the Central Co-operative Committee for sending the representative to the convention. Who are these people that form the Barbados Credit Unions Central Co-operative Committee if people form themselves into any Association like that, certainly they must have been able to get something from the membership of their organisations to defray expenses of this delegate, but you are paying everything! You are paying passage, hotel expenses and other incidental expenses! The most which Government should have been prepared to do was to pay the passage. You should realise that you could not pay this committee everything. The Co-operative movement is a powerful movement and you should have told this Committee that the Government was prepared to pay the passage but the Organisation should help in the other respects.

This is a matter of principle. It is not that I am against the Co-operative Society being given some help, but I am against the principle of your giving a voluntary organisation the full amount of money it requires for expenses of this nature, and if you adopt this practice it would be something very bad. The British Empire Games are going to take place in Cardiff this year. If you have

some athlete from here desiring to take part in those games, will you be prepared to help him with all expenses? You will help with the expenses of passage but you will never get down to helping with the other expenses. Get it out of people's mind the idea that you are expected to pay all expenses for this sort of thing out of the public purse. It is not a matter of \$220, but you should have asked this voluntary organisation to go half and half with you. You did that with the Boy Scouts Association when they wanted money to send scouts to the Jamboree. This is not a matter of your encouraging the co-operative movement because it needs encouraging; you have to take this in its local context that if you are assisting somebody to go to a Conference, the assistance does not have to be as generous as this assistance which you are giving in this instance. I do hope that this would be the last time you would give assistance for everything.

10.20 p.m.

My organisation gets invitations too; we got an invitation to the Indian National Trade Union Conference. I got an invitation to go to Yugoslavia, but do you think we could ask the Legislature to pay all the expenses involved in going there? I would make a contribution to sending a delegation to this convention, but I do not think that the public should be asked to pay the whole cost of sending out the delegation. Let the people help themselves.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Of course, it will be very easy to construe any remarks which one used against this Resolution as being in Opposition to the co-operative movement itself, but most of what has been said by the previous speaker I intended saying myself. It is the height of absurdity to subsidise the Central Co-operative Committee of the Barbados Credit Unions to this extent and for this purpose. In a previous Resolution, we were told that there are sixteen co-operative societies with a total membership of about 800. If you do provide assistance to voluntary organisations for a purpose, they usually try to raise money for the particular purpose. It is quite easy for them to stage a dance and raise about \$200, but these people believe that the Government is so beholden to them that they make no effort even to raise 220 cents.

Nothing which has been said on this Resolution is to be taken as being opposed to the principle of supporting the co-operative movement or helping it to advance, but people must help themselves. The Public Treasury is not a milch cow which cannot run dry, and it is fantastic to ask the Public Treasury to be burdened with the entire expenses involved in sending people on this delegation. I cannot imagine that people with a sense of responsibility could maintain that this should be done. On what principle are they justified in sending this delegation to this Conference? If they had made an effort and had got one half of the way or even three-quarters of the way, well then; with the slightest effort they could have raised some money. However, they feel that they only

have to approach the Government and the money would be forthcoming. This is not only a question of a precedent, but it is a question of a dangerous precedent which has no justification whatever. Could these people not even pull their pockets and pay the incidental expenses? If the Government is professedly Socialist and professedly in support of this co-operative movement, it means that they will give the movement all assistance possible from a legislative point of view; but they should not pick up public money and give it to these people ad lib for the purpose of attending an international conference. This sort of thing cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination. I cannot conceive of any administration called a Government except this Government, being guilty of doing what the Resolution proposes to do. Every cent involved in participating in this Conference we are supposed to defray, because this delegation is a Government delegation going to a Conference in which the Government is interested; therefore, the entire responsibility for participating in the Conference must fall on the Government! I repeat, it is the height of absurdity.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Acting Chairman, I did not mention just now what I am going to mention now about these incidentals expenses. I travelled to Geneva last year representing the Government side of the delegation from Barbados; I was out of the Island for 30 days and the amount for incidental expenses which I had in Europe was a matter of \$30. The Government gave me \$30 for travelling! I bought a bus ticket and that alone cost me nearly £3. They could not give me any more than \$30, but it cost me more than \$30 to travel in London for a week and in Geneva for nearly a month. How can you give one person \$30 for travelling in Geneva and another \$40 for travelling in Trinidad in respect of something which is going to last for three days? I was allowed \$30 for travelling, and incidentals in this context would mean travelling -- getting from Airport to Airport. I did not travel by Government Transport; I travelled in London by paying the bus. On what basis are you giving this delegation \$40 for these incidental expenses? As the hon. member who has just sat down has said, nothing which we have said should be construed as being opposed to the co-operative system, but we are opposed to the Government paying these expenses lock, stock and barrel.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Acting Chairman, I am not opposed to money being spent in this way when we consider the money which has been frittered away in other ways. The question of the policy or principle involved is quite another matter
10.30 p.m.

What I am unalterably opposed to is the fact that this is a reimbursement. In other words, you did not give it time to find out what were the wishes of the Legislature on this matter, but you regarded it as fait accompli. You did something in September and come to us now for reimbursement and we must vote in the affirmative. It is an insult to the Committee.

Hon. D.D. GARNER: If the hon. member would give away; it is not that; it is far from that. When the note was sent to me, I made a thorough investigation and it took me some time before I arrived at decision. While I was getting the information, the Conference was going on, and the folk had to go to the Conference nevertheless, but I have documentary proof that they borrowed this money in order to get the delegate there. I am not going to take away your point, but I want you to know that it was in the Ministry for a considerable time before I gave it the O.K. and my blessing.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is attributing the blame to himself as he was wavering in his mind as to whether assistance should or should not be given. Whether this is so or not, the fact remains that it is the first time he has come here with this Resolution. It is question of reimbursing a society of a high sounding name, although the spirit of co-operation is far lacking - the Barbados Credit Unions' Central Co-operative Committee. It is very high sounding in name, but it means they cannot raise \$200. That may sound very well on paper, but this Resolution seeks to provide \$220 as reimbursement to the expenses incurred by that Society who sent a representative to the first constitutional convention of

the West Indian Confederation of Credit Unions. This is not a bad way of spending \$220 on the face of it, but it is a direct insult to the intelligence of hon. members in coming here at the end of January for expenses already committed in September of last year. How does the Audit Office function? Has the money been spent? How did you get sanction for the expenditure? If they borrowed the money, I do not see why we should vote it now. If they could raise it on a co-operative basis, let it be their dead.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would say more than that. If the Minister does not know it, Credit Unions should have money to their credit, because a Credit Union cannot function unless it has money; it is not just a name which you write. Their savings to my knowledge are in the vicinity of \$8,000, so there is no question of telling me that they have no money, because I know that they have. It may be that the rules of the Credit Union restrict them from using any of the money in the Central Committee. The Shamrock Society is one of the strongest and it is affiliated to the Catholic Church, and so Miss Selby was sent to Jamaica; she is the leading light in one of the Unions, so she was sent on a course. If the Central Committee elected somebody to send to the Conference, why must we pay all the expenses?

My view of it is that this is an organisation which can help itself, and the co-operative movement means That one helps the other and therefore any co-operative movement must learn to help itself. I feel, therefore, that the major portion of this expenditure should be borne by them. I do not see why the incidental expenses should not be paid by them and I feel this vote should be reduced. The amount of money which Government should pay to these people should be equivalent too getting the person to Trinidad and back to Barbados, that is, travelling expenses.

I do not care who the gentlemen are, but \$40 for incidental expenses is very generous for going to Trinidad after paying hotel expenses. If you are going to Trinidad on borrowed money, I do not see why you should go to the most expensive hotels, say, the Queens Park Hotel where the rate as suggested here would be \$20 a day, because the person does not have the status of the Governor General. I do not know of any incidental expenses that would amount to \$40 in such a short time. I have been travelling a lot to Conferences, and I know you have to be reasonable in these things. If I were going to a Conference on borrowed money, I would be very careful about it. As a matter of fact, after a Conference finishes in Trinidad, you can catch a plane leaving the same day.

I feel, sir, that this amount under Subsidies and Grants of \$220 should be reduced by \$140, and the amount of \$80 inserted, and I beg to make that motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am going to second the motion, Mr. Chairman, that the amount be reduced by \$140. I really cannot see how they can spend \$100 in three days on hotel expenses in Trinidad. The Queens Park Hotel is the most expensive in Trinidad. It is hardly more than \$20 a day now and three days would be \$60.

I do not know who was the representative and whether it was a gentleman or a lady, but he could not have spent \$40 in drinks in three days of taxpayers' money. Three days would be \$60; then there would be \$40 for hotel expenses and another \$40 for incidental expenses. Only the Premier of Barbados gets these allowances when he is travelling. I have never heard anything more utterly absurd. If this is not irresponsibility, Mr. Chairman, only God in heaven knows what is. I support the reduction by \$140, which in no way involves on my part any opposition to the Co-operative movement, nor does it involve any antagonism to the representative, because I do not know who he or she was, nor am I interested in finding out.
10.45 p.m.

I merely say that it is taking the Government for a ride; it is taking the taxpayers for a ride. You should not ask us to vote this money. You are paying out \$220 just for three days. Even if it were a lady, she could not spend \$220 in three days and if it were a gentleman he would have to be nightclubbing all night and entertaining a lot of ladies to spend \$80. Let them provide the hotel expenses from the finances of the Co-operative Association and not from the Public Treasury.

The question that the vote be reduced by \$140 was put and resolved in the negative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

AYES: Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. TALMA, Mr. CRAWFORD and
AYES: Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. TALMA, MR. CRAW-
FORD and Mr. BRANCKER - 4

NOES: Hon. Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Hon. M.E.
COX, Hon. D.D. GARNER, Hon. R.G. MAPP, Mr. THORNE,
Mr. SEARLES and Mr. BRYAN - 7

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of the Acting Chairman "I think the Ayes have it."

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1957-58 No. 61 REPAIRING WHARF WALLS

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$7,500 for expenditure on Wharf Walls. As the Addendum sets out:-

An amount of \$27,500 was provided in the current Capital Estimates for continuing the programme of replacing the old wooden piling around the Careenage. A part of this provision, viz: \$14,000, was used in piling the northern abutment of the Chamberlain Bridge, when it was found that a large cavity had developed under the abutment through the rotting of the old wooden piling.

As the balance of \$13,750 now remaining will not be sufficient to complete the work of piling the eastern wall of the Inner Basin, which it is hoped to commence at an early date, it is now estimated that an additional sum of \$7,500 will be required to enable this work to continue without interruption during the remaining period of the financial year.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: I wonder if the Hon. Minister would tell us when the Chamberlain Bridge would swing again. The public said that it took a Minister like the Hon. Minister of Communications to stop the Chamberlain Bridge from swinging and I am wondering if in his days as a Minister it will swing again or if under another guiding hand we would see the Chamberlain Bridge revived to its old position.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: Am I to understand that it took me to swing the Bridge?

Mr. BRANCKER: No, to stop it from swinging.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: So far as the Chamberlain Bridge is concerned, I know that certain repairs are now being carried out to certain mechanism required to swing it and soon work will be started on the Bridge in order to have it swinging, say, by the time the hon. member would like to see it swung.

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

On motion of Hon. M.E. COX, seconded by Hon. D. D. GARNER, Mr. ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee.

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

On separate motions of Hon. M.E. COX, seconded by Hon. D.D. GARNER in each case, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. M.E. COX: Sir, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 4th February, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. R.G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay this House but something has taken place since this House met on the last occasion and it has reached very wide West Indian and world proportions: I refer to the present dispute in the Bahamas. I think that everyone in this House will agree that the Bahamas is a country with a constitution similar to the one in Barbados with the exception that they do not have Ministerial power or Adult Suffrage. For sometime, Mr. Speaker, the people of the

colony of the Bahamas have been undergoing pressure both industrially and politically.

10.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, we can see that what is at present taking place in the Bahamas is similar to what took place here some years ago, and on that occasion it was the friends who we had both in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America that brought united pressure to bear and caused a Royal Commission to be sent out here to enquire into the circumstances and cause of the dispute. The Report of the Royal Commission is one of the most important documents presented in this territory, and although it was written twenty years ago, it is still an important document to which reference can be made.

Mr. Speaker, I regard it as a part of my public duty that I should move the passing of a Resolution at this stage and the whole context of the Resolution would be in support of the general feeling which exists in the West Indies, that a Royal Commission should be sent to the Bahamas for the purpose of investigating the causes and the circumstances of the present dispute. I do not know if I am in order - I may be out of order - to move the passing of a Resolution in the terms I have indicated at this stage, when we are on the adjournment, but I have not been able to give notice of the Resolution. I am not in a position to know what the Government has done in a matter such as this, but what I do know and what I can state, is that in the Trade Union we have sent a telegram to the Bahamas. However, it is the united voice of the territories, those which enjoy a better constitution and civil liberty than the Bahamas, which should register our disapproval of what is taking place in the Bahamas. I would like to tell hon. members -

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering whether the hon. member should not proceed to move the passing of a Resolution next Tuesday.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, time is really running against us, and I believe that, in these matters, the general public opinion in the area is such that if anything can be done today, it means a lot in speeding up any action which should take place. The people who are aware of the situation in the Bahamas will remember that a lady by the name of Mrs. Ogilvie was here in Barbados and a Commission including herself went to the Bahamas. I think that on this occasion the matter is of such importance that the Barbados House of Assembly would be doing what can be regarded as a good West Indian turn in allowing it to be known that we approve and support the general feeling that a Commission of Enquiry from high up should be sent to the Bahamas.

I regard that as a matter of my public duty and I would be failing in my duty if I did not draw this matter to the attention of this House. We boast of having an unbroken constitution for 300 years, and whereas, we enjoy adult suffrage, in the Bahamas a small minority control life and property, and proper Trade Union Laws would be opposed. I feel that the proposal of a Royal Commission being set up in the absence of anything else, is the best we can do to support the cause of democracy and free Trade unionism.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Even without the presence of a formal motion

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. senior member who has just sat down was really out of order, but I know he has the sympathy of the House will be in sympathy with what is taking place in Bahamas, but I do not see how we can discuss this matter any further. On the question of raising matters on the adjournment, I think I drew it to the attention of the House last Tuesday that under the heading "General Restrictions on motions for the Adjournment of the House" in May's Parliamentary Practice, we have the restriction (c) "Matters for which the Government has no administrative responsibility may not be raised." That is the restriction in this case. That is why I was suggesting to the hon. senior member for St. Peter to defer his motion until next Tuesday.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not supporting any formal motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the matter should be raised at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not even on the motion for the

adjournment? We are speaking on the motion for the adjournment which is drawing the day's proceedings to a close.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am submitting, Sir, that if that Rule were observed to the letter at all times there will be a considerable curtailment in the latitude which is allowed hon. members to raise important points on the motion for adjournment.

11.00 p.m.

Time is all important for more general West Indian support on behalf of the Bahamian Labour Leaders.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would suggest that the hon. member ask the Leader of the House to withdraw his motion or otherwise speak on the matter next Tuesday.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not want to detain the House because it is late, but as the House is aware, several West Indian leaders...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am ruling on that. I have given the hon. member some latitude. During the last Session there were certain restrictions applied to matters raised on the motion for Adjournment.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is from May's Parliamentary Procedure, but in the circumstances of the House of Commons that may apply to international secrets which may not apply here. The position of the Government of Barbados raising a simple matter that affects the destinies of another West Indian colony, in my humble submission, could not fall within the confines of that particular Rule, because I am of the opinion, Sir, that on this matter Your Honour may be wrongly advised.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not a question of being wrongly advised; it is a question of my interpretation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I, for one, regret anything taken from the House of Commons Rules to apply in Barbados which in any way prohibits the ventilation of important matters. We are not referring to any international mat-

ter or causing Government any embarrassment. All we are doing is trying to strengthen the hands of the working class in Bahamas.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled on that, but I can only help by suggesting that you ask the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw his motion. If he will not do that, then you can raise the matter next Tuesday.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If he did that, I would still have to make a motion for the Adjournment to discuss it. I feel fairly sure that both sides of the House would want to support a matter like this, and we can restrict our debate; so if the Government is willing to withdraw the motion for the Adjournment, I am willing then to draft a short Resolution and ask for the support of the House to have it passed tonight, because I do feel that the earlier we attend to this matter, the greater would be its effect.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure hon. members on the other side that we on this side are just as sympathetic towards the people of that country as they are, if not more; but I should like to say that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is a stickler for Parliamentary Procedure, and in view of the fact that we would like to speak very strongly on this subject, I am afraid I cannot withdraw at this stage, but I would suggest that the Hon. member bring a motion to the House next Tuesday and let it be fully debated, passed and sent to that country. I do not see that we can gain anything by merely speaking on it tonight on the Adjournment, when we would like something more tangible put forward in the way of a Resolution to be forwarded to the Bahamas Government.

I am afraid, therefore, Sir, that I would not be able to withdraw my motion at this stage.

The question that this House do now adjourn was put and resolved in the affirmative, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

11.10 p.m.

3/10/58