

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 11th November, 1953.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. G. H. ADAMS, B.A., C.M.G., Q.C., Mr. M. E. COX, Mr. R. G. MAPP, Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Mr. C. E. TALMA, Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. L. A. WILLIAMS, LL.B.

Prayers were read.

Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. F. C. GODDARD, Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, Mr. L. E. SMITH and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment last night, the honourable junior member for St. Thomas moved the question and the honourable senior member for St. Andrew seconded the motion. The House was giving consideration to an Address in reply to His Excellency's Message with reference to proposals for ministerial status, and has met today especially for the purpose of giving further consideration to this matter.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Speaker,—I feel that ministerial status in the island of Barbados will definitely be a good change for the Island as a whole. It will be a change in the sense that we would be having ministers for the various offices of Government and, as such, they would be responsible for the good working of the ministries which they hold. In the true sense of the word we actually have ministers now exercising some responsibility over offices of Government. It is only that they will be fully responsible for the various work of their offices when ministerial status has been implemented. The few of those who feel that we are not yet ready for ministerial status can be compared with whether we are ready to accept electricity, gas or cooking by oil stoves or some modern way of doing things. If we are ready to accept these modern utilities — and I am sure we are — then we are ready for self-government. This is an age of progress and those of us who believe in evolution must be prepared to follow on just as the other Colonies, that have evolved to self-government under the Mother Country.

In former years when former governments ran this country, we were told that the representatives

gave their services actually for nothing, but they gave service to suit the few. They did not give the service for the majority. They governed to suit themselves and a few others.

When it comes to the question of salaries there are many who feel that the salaries are extravagant. I do not feel that way, especially when it comes to the salary which is allotted to the principal minister. No one should begrudge the salary of the Principal Minister and especially when they know it is due to the indefatigable efforts of the Leader of this House that have caused us to reach this historical stage in the life of the Colony. I do not think we could measure his worth in dollars and cents.

I need not repeat what other honourable members on this side of the table have said, because they have covered the whole ground. I feel that my position in this Chamber is to defend the women of this Country and to advocate their needs. I will just say in conclusion that I see in His Excellency's message that it is proposed to follow the constitutional conventions observed in the United Kingdom so far as they can be applicable here. With that I am very much pleased. I feel that as far as women are concerned they too have made a start in assisting in the government of this country, and I do hope that in the near future around this table will be thronged with women to assist the men. We should follow the Mother Country in every respect. When the women of this country become of age in politics, they too should be appointed to ministries and hold offices. With these few remarks I beg to say that I am in hearty agreement with the proposals sent down for the granting of ministerial status in this country. (Cheers).

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT entered the House and took his seat while Mrs. BOURNE was speaking.

Mr. GODDARD: I think it is regrettable that we have only been given a week's time to deal with this White Paper. For three years we have been talking about it, yet the proposals before us have been placed in our hands for only one week and we are expected to decide on them in this time. I must also mention that this week in which honourable members have been given this White Paper to consider is one which is known in Barbados history as Races Week, and on top of that last Monday was a holiday. The majority of us who have to work for our living would have to pay attention to our business and, for that reason, I would say that none

of us has been able to consider this White Paper as adequately as we would like. The Secretary of State for the Colonies in his memorandum stated that what we say on this occasion will be the determining factor of the final decision and, for that reason, I more than regret that we have only been given this short period to deal with the proposals. I have asked that it be postponed until the Leader of this House returned to the Colony and, even at this late stage, I do not see the necessity of going on with it today. This is of so much importance that there will be much to be gained by delaying it until his return. Not a single person will get an extra job by this, nor would anyone lose his job by delaying this until the Leader of the House returned. This is another occasion as has happened in the past where legislation of great importance has been rushed through the House at late hours. This is certainly another occasion — it is not late yet—when discussion on this important matter will go on until the early hours of the morning. Probably again to-morrow night. This is a glaring example of the protests that have been made from time to time by members in this House that they have been given very short notice to decide on important questions. We have been talking about ministerial status for seven years but talking about it is not considering it. You cannot consider it until you have the facts before you. This White Paper has something like forty pages. I have not gone into all of them as carefully as I would like and I believe that there are other honourable members who have not been able to do so too, but we are supposed to study this and give a considered opinion which would be very far-reaching for the people of Barbados, and we are asked to do it in a matter of hours. It is not fair to the people and that is my greatest criticism.

We have been talking about ministerial status for a number of years. We consider that with the progress of the constitution in Barbados it will take this change to ministerial status. If I may go back, it was in 1946 when Sir Grattan Bushe instituted his experiment, when he called on the Leader of the Majority Party to send four members to the Executive Committee to formulate policy. That was the first step. It was given a trial and, to that his successor, Sir Hilary Blood, claimed that he would take the advice of the elected members with the reservation that in matters of grave consideration he would reserve that power to himself. That still remains until today.

What I claim now is that, since that time, we have had sufficient time to have put our affairs of government in this House in better order and shape. There are three criticisms which I wish to make. I have made them before and will repeat them again today. The first is that the reporting of the debates has fallen into disrepute. I do not think ever in the history of Barbados have debates of this Chamber been so late to be published in the *Official Gazette* and for reasons which are not the fault of the Debates Committee. They have made recommendations to the Government but the Government has not taken the necessary steps which the Debates Committee think would bring them up to date. The second criticism is on the matter of conducting Government business. We are called upon to come in here Tuesday after Tuesday and debate on matters which easily if there were greater efficiency in government departments they could be done to give time for recess and time for debates to be brought up-to-date. That has been ignored and neglected and the same appalling conditions which existed two years ago are happening today. These things need to be put right before the introduc-

tion of ministerial status. My next criticism is that the sittings of this House have been changed from day sittings to night sittings. Again I say, the majority of us in this House has to work for our living by day and, after doing that, we are called upon to debate Government business to very late hours at night. Very important legislation has been put through this House at late hours on more than one occasion, and it is no answer to this criticism to say that this is done in England. There is a great difference between English practice and what we adopt here. We are prone to think that anything that is good enough for the English set-up is good enough for Barbados. We, as Barbadians, who live in a tropical climate should realise that there is a great difference in conducting business of any sort in a cold climate to that of conducting it in a tropical climate.

Another very important matter that has lapsed into disuse is the matter of question time. Before we had the Bushe experiment, we had a definite period early in the day for questions to be answered by the appropriate member of the Executive and they were answered at an early date and even discussions took place on those questions afterwards. That has lapsed into disuse and that is a very important thing in parliamentary system of government. Question time should be a prerequisite to any ministerial change.

Now, the proposals as set out in this White Paper are supposed to give us a far greater measure of stability. As the honourable Leader of this House has said, we would have absolute power in our own internal affairs. I wonder how much more power he will have under this system than he is enjoying today. What is included in this White Paper is that the Governor would only send down what are the notions of the House members of the Executive Committee. I wonder if the Leader of the House, having such absolute power in local domestic affairs can override the Governor and bring down to this House any measure that has not been agreed upon by the Executive Committee. I do not think so. The Governor still has certain powers so all this power which we talk about given to the Government is still restricted. I admit that in the majority of cases, the Leader of the House would be given a free hand, but what I am contending is that the change to a ministerial set-up does not warrant what we are going to pay to foot the bill. This change to ministerial status is going to cost in the vicinity of \$100,000. It is \$84,000 on paper here, but each and every one of us knows that there is also in the background a resolution to come down to this House for members to get an increased salary. Really it has nothing to do with ministerial status, but is it delayed because we are afraid to let the public know what the entire cost of this set-up is going to be. When that Resolution comes down, it is going to put this cost up to \$100,000. I contend that the public and the Press should be given the full cost this change is going to cost the taxpayers of this Colony. Professor Beasley has warned us against incurring recurrent expenditure against our present revenue. It is well known to all of us that we are living on a one-crop industry — sugar. We have enjoyed four years of bountiful crops and have been given fair prices for them, but with this continual increased expenditure we are heading for a great pitfall. We are today expending a sum exceeding \$60,000 on our legislature and with this \$100,000 that will be needed to bring this ministerial status into effect, it will put this cost for legislature up to \$160,000. Are we going to get the full benefit of bringing efficiency in government departments from this expenditure? I would like that question to be re-considered by each and every honourable member here. In the interest of taxpayers, are they going to get the benefits from this large ex-

penditure of between \$160,000 and \$170,000 on the legislature of this Colony. I do not think so.

Three years ago, the Government came to us and said that they wanted to increase the Secretariat. We asked them for what reason, because we knew that it was run efficiently with one Colonial Secretary and a Principal Clerk for many years. Government told us that the reason for this increase was that it was getting ready for ministerial status and when that time arrived the Assistant Secretaries which were asked for would be used in the ministerial set-up. Today it is another picture. We are going to take on four more assistant secretaries, so you will see that Government has forgotten what it told us when it came to ask for more staff for the Secretariat. It was told us that the reason for taking on the Assistant Secretaries then was to train them for the day when ministerial status would be brought into force in this island. There were four Assistant Secretaries that were needed.

(A VOICE: Oh no! only one)

Sir, the proposals for this set-up to these highly paid ministers are for an additional staff of twenty more persons. We were told that the additional staff at the Secretariat would be enough when ministerial status is implemented, but as can be seen it is not so. Today what we had been told is not taken into account. It is proposed to bring in new staff for the ministries, so we cannot tell what next to expect. Today we are given a pronouncement and you may be given something different in the next few weeks. Today we are told that this additional staff is necessary. The cost of this additional staff has nothing to do with the actual cost of half-million dollars which would be required for more accommodation for these ministries. Another point which will be touched on more fully by my colleagues is why is it necessary to have five ministers. Is that fifth minister to placate some one—some one in his Party? The addition seems redundant and unnecessary. If I may sum up now. I agree and I think we all are in entire agreement that the time has come when we should be given a greater measure of responsibility to Government in all departments by the present ministers, but it seems to me that the cost does not justify the change.

Mr. BRYAN and Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking —

Mr. LEWIS: I rise at a point of order. I think the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, the honourable member does not know what I am going to address you on.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order. In view of the fact that I understand from the hon. senior member for the City that, through some misunderstanding last night, he made a motion for the adjournment of the House which was lost, I think it is only fair to say that the Government supporters would hate to think or to give the impression that, through the misunderstanding of the hon. senior member for the City, he would not be able to contribute to this debate. I am therefore moving a motion that the hon. senior member for the City be now heard.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Speaking on this motion, what was settled last night was that we would have to suspend the rule if we wanted to put the honourable senior member for the City in order to speak. The honourable member is out of order with the rules, and I do not see why the rules should be broken to put him in order. He is ruled out under the Rules, and this motion cannot put him in order. The proper thing to do would be to move a motion for the sus-

pension of the Rules. I do not see how you can entertain that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Inasmuch as I think it was the intention of the hon senior member for the City to ask permission to be allowed to be heard to-day and the Leader of the House has moved a motion that he be heard, with that as the background, I would entertain the motion.

The question is that the honourable senior member for the City be now heard. Honourable members in favour will please say "aye", and those against will say "no".

I think the "ayes" have it. The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will begin by thanking the House for the indulgence it has given me to speak on this important matter, after somewhat losing the opportunity through a misunderstanding last night. I do appreciate the opportunity. Like the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, I consider and I believe that every honourable member of this House considers likewise, that this is one of the most important discussions which have come before this Chamber within the last century. It is of very great importance to the people of this country, therefore, Sir, too much time cannot be spent in discussing it. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable junior member for Christ Church, that this White Paper in itself is comparatively voluminous and calls for a lot of study. To some people trained in the art of constitutional procedure, it might be nothing for them to study it in a couple of days, but to humble folk like myself, who never had the opportunity of a university education, we must be given more time so as to be able to do what research should be done. Personally, if I had not taken every possible moment that I had at my disposal since I received this memorandum, I would not have been able to stay on my feet to say something on it. You should be able to do what research should be done on it and to sit at the feet of people who are more conversant on the subject than you, to learn something of their views and then come in here and express your point of view. On an occasion like this one can make the speech of a demagogue or the speech of a statesman. On an occasion like this one can decide to make a speech on behalf of one's party or a non-party speech. On an occasion like this it is an easy thing, especially if you are on the opposite side, to make a speech which will win popular applause for your party, because let it be remembered there is still the axiom "first things first" and there is still the opinion of some people that this thing which we are giving attention to is not the first thing that is needed in the lives of the inhabitants of Barbados.

Going through this White Paper carefully and looking at the expenditure of approximately \$84,000 that will be necessary to carry out this programme of ministerial status, as the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, that amount will not be the end, it will be around \$100,000. I wonder if every honourable member here realises what it is going to cost. "First things first". I do not propose to make the speech of a demagogue, I propose in my humble way to keep as near to the traditional practice of a statesman on this occasion. No one, Mr. Speaker, can deny the fact that the forthcoming events cast a shadow before us, when we think of what ministerial status is going to cost. Along with what is proposed in this White Paper, the proposed increase in salaries for members of this august Chamber will carry that amount to the tremendous figure of over \$100,000 per annum. We must address to our minds what more benefit can the common man of this community derive

from this expenditure? That is the first question which we must address to our minds. The honourable leader of this House said he was not looking at this question as a party member but as a Barbadian. I would say the same thing. What I say today I would say if this party to which I belong was taking over the Government on the introduction of ministerial status. Let me say here now that I am not in opposition to ministerial status. Let me say at once any system which would give Barbados a greater measure of control in administration of this Colony I am going to support, because, politically speaking, whatever differences there may be between the views of parties of this Chamber, there are many things which we have in common. As a matter of fact, we are as close together as the fingers on one's hands. Make no mistake about that. Anything that will give Barbadians of any class or section a measure of control in the affairs of the Colony, I am prepared to support. I think that is the feeling of every person throughout the Colonial Empire. I say that with the fullest sense of my responsibility and the knowledge that I have of my colleagues on this side of the table. Despite the contrary feeling of some honourable members on that side of the table, I can say that that is the feeling of members on this side of the table. It is agreed by us that we should have a measure of control in our internal affairs. Taking the history of the Bushe experiment, whatever criticism may have been proffered against it, must be admitted today that the person operating it made a success of it.

(A VOICE: Thank you.)

I repeat I can make a speech which will suit the night before an election. There is room for making that type of speech but the occasion does not warrant it.

This White Paper, as sent to us, covers a Message from His Excellency the Governor, Sir Robert Arundell, as well as a reply from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Oliver Lyttleton, to a despatch sent by the then Acting Governor, Mr. Turner, who had been entrusted with the responsibility of getting the facts and figures and opinions from all peoples and parties of responsibility in this Colony. Ministerial status is something, as the Leader of the House has said, which the British are granting not only to the West Indies but to all colonies in the British Colonial Empire. The British want the natives of the various colonies to have a greater share in the administration of their own affairs. It has been granted already to Jamaica, Trinidad, Gold Coast, Nigeria, British Guiana and other parts of the British Empire. As I see it, we in Barbados will enjoy a constitution second to none and far in advance of the others when these proposals are put into effect. With all that, I am still of the opinion that the constitution which we now enjoy is even more advanced than all the others that have ministerial status. That is so without any further amendment to our constitution.

If I may be permitted, I will refer to a memorandum which my party had the honour to put in. I crave the right to do so because it is a memorandum by the few of us who have been elected to represent the views of those who sent us here, as against that of the majority on the other side of the table. If you do not want another British Guiana or a dictatorship Government, you must have an Opposition, you must have it in a democratic set-up. I too feel that more time should be given to honourable members to study these proposals. Our hasty discussion may create confusion and every honourable member may not be able to give of his best. Every honourable

member of this house is not like the honourable leader of this House who won the blue ribbon of Barbados educationally. Therefore, when it may only take him two hours to look over this White Paper and give his views on it, it will take other honourable members probably five, six or seven weeks to do so. However, in my humble opinion, let me say that Barbados has the most advanced and the most cultured people in the British Empire. As a result of the new amendment to the Representation of the People Act, adult suffrage was given to this Colony. The Socialists or Labour Party captured the most seats at the last Elections with adult suffrage, so it can be said that they were again given the mandate to carry out the Bushe experiment and now they will be entrusted to carry out ministerial status. The whole idea of ministerial status to me is to be able to let the people recognise or the other Governments recognise that the Government of Barbados, like the governments of other countries, is ready to be run by local people up to a certain point. If you read the Governor's Message you will see that we will only be allowed to do so up to a certain point. After the preamble and giving preliminary views, His Excellency suggested that we should have five ministers—one, the Premier or Principal Minister to take charge of finance, revenue departments, education, police and general purposes; two, the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour to take charge of trade and commerce, industry, tourism, minerals and labour; three, the Minister for Agriculture to take charge of agriculture and fisheries and lands; four, the Minister for Social Services and Local Government to take charge of medical services, old age pensions, pensions and industrial schools, probation, social welfare, library and local government and five, the Minister for Communication and Works to take charge of aviation, electricity, harbour and shipping, highways and transport, post office, public works, waterworks and housing. In following the purpose of ministerial status as constituted, this is the opinion of the Governor after having consultations with his advisers. At the outset, let me say that we of the party to which I belong were commanded, because we are part of the Opposition to the Government of this Colony, to give our views. We too put up our suggestions and I think it should be universally known because of utterances which I hear from backbenchers of Government. Let me tell them that we have never opposed the principle of ministerial status in our White Paper. We pointed out the snags but we said, and we will say it here again today later in the debate, that Barbados is ripe for a form of ministerial status. As a matter of fact if you were to take the statistics which deal with the literacy standards of the Colonies that have been granted ministerial status, you will find that our standard of literacy is higher than those other Colonies. I refer to British Guiana, Jamaica and even Trinidad. We would be lunatics, therefore, to stand by and say that we are not fit for ministerial status. In our own memorandum, we made it clear that ministerial status was a very desirable thing and, therefore, we should proceed to ministerial status, but we pointed out that we would await the recommendations to see what they would mean to us. I heard it said *sotto voce* in here when the honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to our not having sufficient time to study the proposals that we knew of them three years ago. Of course we knew of the principle of ministerial status three years ago, but we only had the proposals in our hands a week ago. Now that we have seen His Excellency's proposals, we see that it is proposed to set up five ministers. There is also the attached report

of the then Acting Governor, Mr. Turner, who sent all the relevant facts and suggestions to the Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, and a despatch by Mr. Oliver Lyttleton, Secretary of State, replying to the views of the acting Governor in every detail. The replies were exactly as to be expected. Traditionally, that is the method of governing British Colonies. The Secretary of State agrees with the man on the spot.

What do you find—this is the most important part of my speech. In agreeing with the form of ministerial status, we of the party to which I belong would be betraying our trust if we said that we agreed with the cost of it as has been sent down. To begin with, it is \$84,000. I am sorry that the honourable junior member for St. Peter is not in his place to hear this. Why did he slip in such a low gear when he was addressing us on the financial proposals is beyond me. Why did he take refuge in the fact that two members of the Executive are professional men and therefore the arguments must be that they can work for £2,000 per annum, but it would be a question whether the other two members of the Executive can work for that amount and, therefore, the arguments might be that they do not deserve that amount. Has he forgotten that nobody can tell me that such a person is worth this or is entitled to so much money? People should never entertain such low things in their minds. This Opposition has never tried to follow the example of the Government party. We always tried to look at things at a high level. I am going to say that any criticisms which we on this side of the table make in respect of the emoluments suggested for the ministers are being made in consideration of the national economy, but not at all in consideration of what Mr. A is entitled to work for. I will go further and say that a man with ambition and natural ability is entitled to work for as much money as any professional man. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will agree with me on that point. In this White Paper, we see that the Colonial Secretary who had been entrusted with the administration paid a visit to the three West Indian Colonies—Trinidad, Jamaica and British Guiana—that were at the time operating a ministerial system to find out how it worked. We find reference made to all those colonies in his attached report. Where salaries are suggested for the ministers, I must take into account the salaries paid to permanent secretaries and other officers. I am going to call a spade a spade. I do not believe that we can have a minister receiving less money than a permanent secretary. Let me say again that my speech today is the same as if this party was going to take over the ministries. Let me also remind this House that at present we have four ministries so to speak. I have been in this Chamber for almost seven years and it is recognised whenever you refer to a member of the Executive, reference is always made to the fact that the member is minister in charge of so and so. You can therefore say that the four members of the Executive operated as ministers and they covered the whole ground. What you are doing now is only to put them in offices to let them be recognised. If we want them to be recognised they must be paid salaries. That is the considered view of the Opposition, but what is also our considered opinion is that you should not start ministries to find yourself top-heavy. You should start in such a way that you can improve on it as time goes on. If you look at Mr. Turner's suggestions to the Secretary of State for the Colonies you will see that he recommended four ministers and a minister without portfolio. I am not

saying because Mr. Turner recommended something that it is right and we must say it is right; but bear in mind when I say this that what I am thinking of is our national economy. I am thinking of what Barbados can afford and what benefit is going to be derived as a result of the change. You must say that there will be some benefit to be gained in the administration of the Colony by ministerial status in so much that people will be able to get directly at ministers. There will be no beating around the bush. It is the pride and boast of the Government Party that they are going to hold those offices when they are instituted for a long time. Little do they know that this ministerial status may be a means of keeping them from power.

(A VOICE: Tell us another.)

Make no mistake about it. This ministerial system is bound to remove the Government from the people and it is going to give the Opposition the right to put direct questions to it and to demand answers, so really and truly we will know where to attach the blame. The Government cannot shelter under any Head of Department. Let us take the salaries of the ministers as have been recommended. The Premier is to get £2,000 per annum and the other four ministers £1,500. While anyone will say that, in either case, it is not too much money to pay to the ministers you are bound to say that it is going to cost a lot of money for the benefits to be derived. When you take it side by side with the national economy and the recommendations put in by Mr. Turner you are bound to express the view which some members of this House expressed when they replied to a former Governor, Sir Alfred Savage, in reference to the fact that if British Guiana and Trinidad could pay their Civil Servants so much it did not mean that Barbados could pay the same thing. Comparing the economy of this Colony with those other Colonies, Barbados is something like eleven or twelve million pounds per annum (£11,000,000—12,000,000 p.a.) as against that of Trinidad which is something like forty-five or forty-six and Jamaica something like sixty-six million (£66,000,000). As you can see, there is really no comparison with Barbados and those other colonies. Reading through Mr. Turner's report and listening to the honourable Leader of this House who said he found it impossible to carry on with four ministers as he is now carrying on; therefore the necessity for the fifth minister, I am replying by saying that the Government is now carried on by four ministers. A member of the Executive is in charge of a department and it is part-time work to each of them. It can be said that the four members of this Executive are running this Government and making a success of it.

(A VOICE: Thank you)

Do not take this as any overture. As I was saying, the four ministers have been carrying on the work of Government from 1946. I remember very well that three of them were out of the Island at the same time and the business of this Government was still carried on with an amount of efficiency. Therefore, I am saying that four ministers can run all the departments as suggested in Mr. Turner's report.

(A VOICE: But how!)

Mr. Speaker throughout the entire speech of the Leader of the House and in the memorandum there is not a suggestion to show that it is impossible for the four members of the Executive to carry on the work of ministerial status. It is not that I agree with Mr. Turner's report in its

entirety, nor because Mr. Turner has recommended four ministers, but I feel that you can use four ministers and probably get another member to hold the office of minister without portfolio. A minister without portfolio may be necessary to play his part in the Government in filling the breach of someone who may be out of the island. Sir, while we agree with a form of ministerial status, we want it run in the most economical way. Why embark on a scheme for five ministers at once with all those salaries?

(VOICES: Oh No! Oh No!)

Sir, imagine that we are starting off with an expenditure of approximately \$84,000 to set up our ministerial system. Make no mistake about it, you know as well as I do that on top of this expenditure, members of this House are expecting that their salaries will be increased also.

(A VOICE: Of course)

Sir, how can you pay ministers £1,500 and only give the Speaker £400. Mr. Speaker, you are a member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and it is you who distinguish this Chamber. Why have they not provided a bigger salary and an entertainment allowance for you also? You are called upon to entertain sometimes. Sir, do not come down here with this expenditure of \$84,000; when you come down with this \$84,000 it is only just eyewashing it. It will not be less than \$120,000 when you take everything into consideration. Sir, I am going to suggest later in this debate that if you start with this ministerial system and you must start if you have the interest of the people of this Colony at heart—do not start with five ministers. It is admitted on all sides of this House that you are doing a good job of running the Government now.

As I have seen from this memorandum and as the Leader has said, it is intended to remove from a part of the Public Buildings the offices of Public Trustee and other offices up there so as to get that space for all the ministries. If that is so and they get together and put their heads together to run things, and be advised — you have to be advised — my strongest appeal to the Government to-day is not to start for the set-up to cost \$84,000 and then in a few weeks afterwards to increase members' salaries and so on.

(A VOICE: You are suggesting we start with \$150,000?)

I do know that figures mean nothing to the Honourable Leader of this House. I have heard it said over and over again that he was a classical scholar and knows nothing of economics. He suggests a start with \$150,000 instead of \$84,000. What I do know is that the cost is going to be much more than \$84,000. Only last week we were talking about leave passages. Is any of the additional staff for these ministries entitled to leave passages? I would like to know. If any is entitled, I appeal to the Honourable Leader whose views at present are the views of this country to see this point which I make again. Do not start at \$84,000 when you know that there will be other prerequisites.

Mr. ADAMS: Look again at the breakdown. You will see that everything that is there is absolutely necessary. We must have the fifth minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I still think that Mr. Turner's breakdown with four ministers and one minister without portfolio can work efficiently. Sir, for ministerial status, I say yes, try it, but do not go at it in this way. Do not carry on with all this extraordinary expenditure. It is not necessary to

have five ministers. Speaking for myself, I am firmly of the opinion that the recommendations in this White Paper cannot so far as the progress of Barbados is concerned carry it one-sixteenth of an inch further.

(A VOICE: That's nonsense)

Mr. Speaker I maintain that these recommendations cannot carry us one-sixteenth of an inch further than the Bushe recommendations. The only thing that they can do new, as I see it, is to allow the Leader of this House, to go to the Executive Council. That is the only thing new that is going to happen from these recommendations. If you turn to the report of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, you will see that in para. 11. On that proposal, I accept the view of the learned and experienced parliamentarian. I will read the salient points of it which appear in Mr. Turner's despatch: "I consider that on the introduction of a ministerial system of the kind envisaged in this despatch the position and responsibilities of the Principal Ministers would be such that he should normally be appointed to be a member of Executive Council, it being understood that this appointment would be terminated upon his ceasing to be Principal Minister. This would increase by one the number of members of Executive Council and thus increase the number of such members on Executive Committee."

As can be seen, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, formally agreed to the suggestions that are contained in Mr. Turner's despatch. There will be only one amendment to the law which will be necessary and that is because the change-over will require the Premier to be a member of the Executive Council. All the other things will be done by conventions and traditions in keeping with the conventions in the United Kingdom.

I will read another salient point of Mr. Turner's despatch:—

"It would seem to be proper that the decisions of the Governor-in-Executive Committee should be taken with due regard to the advanced constitutional position in Barbados, and the fact that all matters which require reference to the Legislature must of necessity in the House of Assembly be the sole responsibility of the Ministers. I propose, therefore, that if a ministerial system is introduced, the Governor, in arriving at his decision in Executive Committee, should, except where it appears to him that grave or exceptional circumstances compel him to act otherwise, accept in legislative matters, the advice of the Ministers."

Is that not so? Was not that so in the Bushe recommendations? Was it not always that the Governor of this country had reserve powers? That is what I am questioning. Do you see from this that the Governor has reserve powers? Do you see how it reads? "Where it appears to him that grave or exceptional circumstances compel him to act otherwise."

(A VOICE: Nobody denies that).

Sir, according to the constitutional set-up—according to the Bushe experiment—if the Executive members of this House recommend something to the Governor in the interest of the Colony, he sends it down. The point I am going to make suits me to make now, and the public must know this. According to a speech by the honourable Leader of this House from the balcony of the Barbados Workers' Union about five years ago, he said "we are masters in our own house." The feeling by the man in the street with the introduction of ministerial status is

that we are going to be masters in our own house. The populace is going to feel that the Leader of this House—"Godpa" as he is familiarly called by them sometimes—is going to control all things, but they are mistaken. It is not so. We are not yet masters of our own house. As I see it, when ministerial status comes into operation and the Governor wants to send something down—it has been so even when the honourable junior member for St. James was controlling things—the members of the Executive from this House can tell the Governor "we are not bringing it down." The Governor will know that it will be useless for him to send it down. On the other hand, if the members of the Executive want to bring something down, taking as an instance that you wanted to bring something down to give you full control over the Police, the Governor can say "you can talk until sundown, you are not carrying it down." As it is now, even if you bring it down, you cannot make him assent to it. Of course I do know that, as far as instructions today are concerned this "grave or exceptional circumstances" is a safeguard. You must have it. However, I would like to hear a reply to this from the honourable Leader of this House. According to paragraph 22 of Mr. Turner's despatch, it says:—"The other Ministers should be 'appointed by the Governor on the recommendations 'of the Principal Minister. Any Minister should 'be liable to be dismissed by the Governor after 'consultation with the Principal Minister and, in 'addition to resignation, in the circumstances referred 'to in paragraph 21 above, the resignation of the 'Principal Minister must be deemed to include the 'resignation of all other Ministers who would automatically go out of office with the Principal Minister.'"

On that point I see that there will be no difference when ministerial status sets in to the position we are in to-day. I personally feel that is correct.

I am continuing, Sir, to give my reasons for saying that there should be Ministerial Status but on a gradual scale. There is no secret about it. When we were asked to submit a memorandum we strongly suggested that since under the present set up four Ministers advise the Governor we feel that if we have Ministerial Status the Government in power should have a mouthpiece in the Upper Chamber. If we are going to change the system do not think only of our own times but of our children and grandchildren who are to come. In proving that the system proposed is only a slight change from the present set-up and that no greater benefits will be derived, I will say that as in the present system the Governor still has the right to say that he is not sending down a measure which in his opinion is not right. If I was making a Socialist speech I would adopt the same attitude as some other West Indians. That would be all right if we had gunboats. The only gunboat I know about is the one you can buy in the store for \$12.00. In proving to this House that the expenditure contained in these proposals is unnecessary at the minute, I submit that the present system will remain the same.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member has been making a good speech more or less all the time. How can he say that the system will remain the same when the Ministers under the new system will have to sit and run the Administration which they do not do now?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: If it suits the honourable member I will say that the system will be much the same.

(Mr. ADAMS: It will be completely different.) As I was saying, we were asked to put in recommendations. Paragraph 19 of Mr. Turner's Report

says in part. "It has been represented that the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General should cease to be members of the Legislative Council and that Government business should be conducted in that Chamber by one of the members of the Government Party who will be appointed by the Governor on the advice of the Principal Minister . . ." Those are our recommendations; so we can tell the general public that the foolish petty statements made by some members of the Government that we are opposed to Ministerial Status are a joke. Mr. Turner says that it has been recommended that the Attorney General and the Colonial Secretary should cease to be members of the Council. I ask you something. In the absence of that, have you got any change?

There is a further point. If we are going to have Ministerial Status for what it is going to mean in the future the Prime Minister should recommend to the Governor a person to be nominated to the Other Place to do Government business in that Chamber. The Leader would never suggest that he nominate all the members in the Legislative Council. Some of the people whom he knows he should nominate will not meet the approval of his colleagues.

Mr. Turner further says that it has been represented that the members of Executive Council should no longer be included in Executive Committee as such but that Executive Committee should consist of the Chief Secretary, the Attorney General, the House of Assembly Members, and a member selected to be the Government spokesman in the Legislative Council. This, however, Mr. Turner says, does not represent a majority view, which is that changes on these lines should not be made as part of the present proposals. I only make that point to show that any amendment which this part of the Opposition suggests will be an effort to get something that will really work as a true constitutional change. References were made yesterday to this big constitutional change. In truth and in fact it is not the constitutional change that some people would have us to believe it is. It is far from that. I repeat, there is no bold departure from the present system. In practice we are merely carrying on the "Bushe Experiment", and I do not consider that five Ministers are necessary to do that.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn for half an hour.

Mr. VAUGHAN seconded.

The question was put and agreed to without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

RESUMPTION

On re-assembling:

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the honourable senior member for the City was addressing the House.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: When the House adjourned, Sir, I was about to make a point that while we on this side of the Opposition agree with Ministerial Status—we would go as far as to say that the Island is ripe for Ministerial Status—I am sorry that we cannot say that we regard the proposals submitted as proposals which would meet our present needs. For instance, Sir, let us take the Address which the honourable Leader of the House asked us to pass yesterday. I take it, Sir, that I am entitled to deal with that Address.

Mr. ADAMS: It is true, Sir, that I did not have the Address sufficiently well prepared yesterday to hand to honourable members when the House first sat. If Your Honour will allow it I would suggest that honourable members may refer

to it and later I will ask an honourable member from the Government side to move the passing of the cyclostyled Address as an amendment to the oral one of which I gave notice yesterday.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think that Your Honour will grant me permission to deal with the Address. While, Sir, as I have said, we agree with the principle of Ministerial Status we do not agree that the suggestions put forward meet the needs of the present time. In some cases we will be prepared to entrust further responsibility to the Ministers, and even to go further. But relative to the expenditure—we have not adopted the attitude which the honourable member for St. Peter started to object to in anticipation, nor do we say that \$800 a month or \$600 a month is too much for any particular individual — what we do say is, taking into consideration that first things should come first, and thinking in terms of our national economy and comparing salaries offered in British Guiana and Jamaica, and comparing also the revenue of those Islands with that of Barbados, we do not think that Barbados can afford these salaries at present.

At this stage, Sir, I will refer to paragraph 4 of the Address drafted by the Leader of the House which says that the House note with interest the experience of other Caribbean Colonies and is conscious of the attempt which has been made in these proposals to cut down expenditure to a minimum. We on this side of the House are apprehensive of this expenditure, and we cannot agree that an attempt has been made to cut it down to a minimum. You will agree with me, Sir, and I think the Government should agree, that while we do not want to be niggardly we want to suggest that we should start on this system in such a manner as to admit of improvement later. We cannot say that any attempt has been made to cut down the expenditure. You get Mr. Turner's recommendation for one thing and then the Government's recommendation for another thing, and you find that the recommendations of the Government are very much higher than Mr. Turner's. Therefore how can you in one breath say that you do not agree with Mr. Turner's recommendations which call for much less expenditure and say that you agree with the Government's recommendations which call for more, and in another breath say that you agree that an attempt has been made to cut down expenditure to the minimum? Remember, Sir, that we are not referring to any particular individual. We are just taking a broad view.

I will now deal with paragraph 5 of the Address. This paragraph says:—"The House notes Your Excellency's recommendation with regard to the reorganization of the Central Secretariat and the accommodation for Ministers, and share Your Excellency's eagerness to see the introduction of the scheme." As the honourable junior member for Christ Church has said, I do not think that the memory of the Leader of the House is so short that he cannot remember that when we were asked to support the idea of having additional Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries in the Colonial Secretariat we were told in no unmistakable terms that the reasons for this additional Secretarial staff were that these gentlemen would be trained with a view to having Ministerial Status established and they would work in the various Ministries. If you look at these proposals you will see that only one of these gentlemen will be taken from the Secretariat to work with Ministerial Status. What are you going to do with the other four? How in the light

of all this can we say that we agree that an attempt has been made to cut down expenditure? The Honourable Leader has said that each Minister must have an Assistant Secretary, but, I repeat, only one is coming from the Colonial Secretariat. If you go through the recommendations carefully you will see that the Ministries will be dealing with finance, revenue, education, general purposes, trade and commerce and everything that you can think of as regards the administration of the colony. Every possible Government department will come under them. When you take one Assistant Secretary from the Colonial Secretariat what are you going to do with the others in there? What are they going to do? That is why we say, Sir, that we cannot agree with paragraph 4 of the Address.

Now, Sir, it looks as if the Ministerial Status system will come into operation early next year, but I am thinking, Sir, that the House should be given more time, as the honourable junior member for Christ Church said, for making further recommendations for paring down the expenditure. As I said in the beginning, first things should come first. When you are spending roughly \$84,000 on Ministerial Status your own members, although they may not tell you, will want to know what increase they will get. Expenditure is going to be in the vicinity of \$100,000. It is interesting to note that within ten years the expenditure of the Legislature has risen from \$9,000 to \$69,000. I suppose it can be argued that the rise in expenditure compares with the rise in the Island's revenue. Be that as it may, the rise in expenditure has been tremendous. Now it is true that no one can deny that in their manifesto the Labour Party did say that if elected they would introduce a system of Ministerial Status, but that does not qualify you to say that it should cost \$100,000 in the first year.

Let me say this finally, Sir, No one denies that certain social reforms have been brought into operation within the last few years in this Colony, but while that is so, we are still very far from the goal. I was not here a few Tuesdays ago when I heard that severe criticism was offered of the Housing Board. I have been a member of that Board for some time, and I am conscious of how far we are from the goal where housing is concerned, especially when you take into account the number of applications which come before the Board for consideration. Mr. Speaker I still say first things first. Ministerial Status. Yes, bring it in. But I ask members of the Government to have a heart. Do not bring in a system that will cost \$100,000 in the first year. I will dare any member of the Labour Party to say that while they were campaigning and promising to introduce Ministerial Status they told the electorate that it would cost \$100,000 a year as compared with other needs. I heard an honourable member say that I have made a wonderful speech for the Government, but it is obvious that the Government is coming round to our way of thinking to such an extent that it would be difficult for one of us to make any other speech. I want to say this. Fun is often made at members on this side of the table, but the Secretary of State for the Colonies takes the Opposition seriously. (A Member: An impotent Opposition.) The Secretary of State for the Colonies says in paragraph 9 of his despatch:—"I should regard the salaries to be paid to Ministers as a matter primarily of domestic concern. I should similarly regard the question of payment of salary to the Leader of the Opposition, but I note that the feasibility of such

a provision would depend on whether such a person could be readily identified."

My political views have never changed one day. Possibly, if other views were expressed by the Government you would see how strong the Opposition is, but it is not the duty of an Opposition to get up and talk just for the sake of getting up and talking; therefore if we come into this Chamber and find something that we agree with what is the sense of overworking the Reporter? Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the provision contained in the paragraph of the Secretary of State's despatch which I have just quoted depends on whether such a person could be found. I remember well, Sir, that I have gone through some of the speeches made in the days when Mr. Pile and old Mr. Robinson were in this Chamber, and they were branded as Socialists. I am talking about what is history. When the Leader of the House came in here he was considered a rabid Socialist. What do you think my son will consider him later on? The honourable junior member for St. Thomas knows that what I am saying is true. Of course he was always considered very genial, although he can be strong on occasions. Let honourable members make their fun. The only reason why you do not have a strong Opposition because the Government has come around to our way of thinking. Anyone who thinks that this Opposition is impotent is making the biggest mistake of his life. All things being equal we will take on the Government Party at any time.

So, Sir, I repeat, that while we favour the principle of Ministerial Status we have to consider the cost. We are of the opinion that the cost is too high for Barbados, especially when you compare the salaries proposed with the salaries offered in Jamaica, Trinidad and other countries, taking into consideration the difference between the revenues of those countries and the revenue of Barbados. Finally, Sir, we are not in agreement with the Address proposed because we hope that in starting Ministerial Status the Government will start it along more economic lines. While we agree with the principle we must bear in mind that if the Labour Party had told the electorate that Ministerial Status would cost \$100,000 a year it would have been a different matter. In discussing this question with some of my constituents, Sir, I was moved to tears when I saw some of them actually cry. (Laughter). The Leader of the House is laughing. His heart is too hard. I must agree, of course, that among the constituents who actually cried only one was a man. (Laughter) I tell you, Sir, that when I saw them cry I myself was moved to tears. If I were to attempt to make a real demagogic speech I would move even the heart of the Honourable Leader of the House. He would immediately agree to spend half of this money on social needs and half on Ministerial Status.

The important question is, Sir, after you have spent \$84,000 what will the people of this Colony get that they have not got now. I really cannot vote for the Address along the lines in which it is drafted. Modify it. Pare down the expenditure. See to it that your expenditure is less at the start. Thinking in terms of California, I was saying to the Leader of the House yesterday, what a blessing it would be if 10,000 Barbadian workers could go to California. The people of this Colony, I told the Leader, are more pleased to hear about your going to California to see about emigration than about all the Ministerial Status proposals put together. Remember, I am not saying that you should not have a form of Ministerial Status, but it should not be

so expensive. Remember again that you have been fortunate that God in His blessings has given us rain year after year, and we have got good crops. (A Member: The Labour Party is in power.) The Labour Party is in power and God is always on the side of the strongest battalion. We have been lucky up to now, but one bad crop year with this \$100,000 and these big salaries and then another bad crop year and you will see what will happen. We on this side of the Table cannot help remembering the phrase, "Soak the rich." But what about the poor? You cannot go on always soaking the rich. If you soak the rich and the rich get richer what do the poor get?

Mr. Speaker, I am not making any wild speech saying, Down with Ministerial Status. What I am asking is that we should consider what more will the people get out of it that they have not got now when you spend \$84,000. Can you not accept the title of Ministers but pare down this expenditure in such a way that posterity will say, surely these men were not only for self aggrandisement? They were people who wanted to do something for us. I am not going to support the proposed Address. In due course this part of the Opposition will offer amendments to that Address.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker,—I must first of all compliment the honourable senior member for the City for his endurance. Others in circumstances like these would be apt to quote the poet Pope, who said, "For forms of Government let fools contend. That which is best administered is best." But that is a sentiment of the totalitarian mind, and I do not subscribe to it by any means. What we may envisage as a result of Ministerial Status—although the introductory speeches of the prospective Ministers have been distressing in their sublimity—what we may envisage should be at least a better administrative machine within the Government of the Colony. Right now I think that there is too much delay between the passing of legislation and the implementation of it. If there is one thing which the Ministers should remedy it is that. The link between the Administration and the people is too long, and the delay to which I have referred should be completely abolished.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree that because Jamaica and Trinidad and other larger units like the Gold Coast and Nigeria have recently instituted or recently had conferred upon them Ministerial Status the same political status is absolutely necessary for a small unit like Barbados. Jamaica is 26 times the size of Barbados. I disagree with the Leader of the House when he says that size does not matter in constitutional issues. Size and population must matter. Jamaica, as I have said, is 26 times the size of Barbados and has six times the population. Trinidad is ten times our size and has approximately three times our population.

On the introduction of Ministerial Status in Jamaica the Governor of that Colony had this to say. He believed that the introduction of Ministerial Status would release a surge of constructive energy. I agree with him entirely that the introduction of Ministerial Status should release a surge of constructive energy, but after all, we have had an opportunity to observe the prospective Ministers, and none of us, if we are true to our consciences, can say that we could expect from them any surge of constructive energy—not even from the Leader. The honourable Leader has said that those who were not desirous of greater self-government were slaves or were slave-minded. But, Sir, the same honourable Leader a few years ago on the United Nations Organisation condemned the idea that in these

Colonies or in any part of the British Empire there was anything like a slave status among the population. To suggest that we are slaves or slave-minded if we do not agree to the introduction of Ministerial Status in this Colony is a contradiction of his own statement and attitude at the United Nations Organisation that there is no slavery in the British Empire. (A Member: Foolishness.) The Leader said that we are as free as birds and that we almost enjoy the status of British citizenship. That was the essence of his speech at the United Nations Organisation.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of personal explanation, Mr. Speaker. At the time to which the honourable member is referring I was seeing the Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society every day. I used to attend the Committee dealing with Slavery. We discussed the sort of slavery that exists in some parts of South America where a creditor could hold a debtor and make him work off his debt. I said then that no such physical slavery existed in the British Empire. As I said last night, of course you have the mentality of a slave if you want someone to govern you and to run your affairs.

Mr. VAUGHAN: The honourable Leader has said many times how we run ourselves now. We were Governors in our own House all the time until yesterday. Barbadians are a unique people. I believe they are the strangest people in the world. They are people with their own individual psychology. I do not know if it is a sort of ingrown mentality due to the fact that we have always been homogeneous. It is only recently that we have been getting a few Indians here. We have always been homogeneous—England and Africa. That may account for our outlook.

It is good to talk about Ministerial Status. We feel that the Party system is a prerequisite of Ministerial Status. But the Party in power just now does not have the support of the people in their present administration, and the unique people of this Colony are getting disgusted with the Party system. This is what I am going to propose. If you get more self-government you will have to introduce in the place of Ministerial Status the Committee system of Government. That is a most admirable system for a small place with a small population. So in the place of what they are suggesting now I feel that instead of Ministerial Status their own Party could be divided into Committees and made responsible for the several departments of Government. This Committee system is necessary in this Colony, and one of the fundamental reasons is this. Ministerial Status calls for greater ability in the Ministers. That is an absolute essential, if it is to work really for the benefit of the populace whom they represent. You must have greater ability in the Ministerial personnel. They will get that ability if they divide themselves into Committees. They could then be sure of greater ability in the running of the departments of the Administration and in the overseeing of departments. A Minister should be a master. He should be a master in the sense of being able to command the respect and even the fear—not in the sense of being afraid but the deep respect of his Under-Secretaries and staff. If they divide themselves into Committees I think they will be assured of that additional ability. They will not be independent entirely of official opinion. But what I have said will be the practical result if the Committee system is introduced. We are talking about Federation of the West Indies. That is a possibility. With Federation all this Ministerial Status will prove superfluous. I do not agree at all with the often expressed sentiment that self-

government is better than good government. I am a realist. In Puerto Rico the present Governor Munoz Marin had an opportunity of making Puerto Rico an entity independent of the United States. There is a party in that country which agitates for that. But he was far-sighted enough to see that this is an age not so much of independent units but of united units. Governor Marin saw that independence in the sense of what the Independent Party wanted could be detrimental to the interests of Puerto Rico, and he saw that they should not make the mistake that the unfortunate Dr. Jagan made in thinking that a new constitution meant independence. This proposal means nothing of the kind despite the Honourable Leader's vehement reminders that the Governor has no Reserve Powers. This does not mean any independence as far as Barbados is concerned in controlling our own affairs. There will be no more independence than the statutory boards have. Perhaps they have more.

We have heard, I think, on at least three occasions of the resignations or coming resignations of the Leader of this House. We have heard from the roof of the local Kremlin on three occasions of the resignation of himself from office in that organisation in order to introduce Ministerial Status. In the introduction of this new system the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the authorities concerned must respect the opinion of other groups beside the Party in power, and the very suggestion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies about his accepting the title of "Principal Minister" and adding that he would not mind if the title "Premier" were used shows you of what little importance he regards a place like this. What is the idea of bearing titles which are applied in the Dominion of Canada, for instance?

Now, Sir, let us get on to the fundamental issue in this proposed set up. I am not one of those who will say that the Colony cannot afford purely from the financial angle the salaries proposed. But it must be remembered that there are still too many thousands in this Colony who have only half a loaf and some who have no loaf at all. (Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair, and Mr. Deputy Speaker takes the Chair).

As I said before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are a unique thinking people. The important point is that the introduction of any new system in the constitution must have a meaning to the people, and not merely to the Administration, and from our experience of the present Government in power I for one cannot have much confidence that it will have the meaning which it should have. It is significant that this amendment to the constitution is not a written one. Everything is changed or apparently changed, but everything remains the same. That is what it is. I do not agree that Ministerial Status as proposed is going to result in any original benefit for the reasons I have given. The Committee system would be better. We have been told, and I for one have been led to believe by the Leader of this House, that the reason why he did not bring down salaries already for members of this House was because he was waiting to bring down everything in one comprehensive Bill. (A Member: That is what is worrying you). I do not mind sneers, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What is significant is to see that the figure contained in my Address is quadrupled for the Leader and trebled for the other Ministers. I do not know who else is going to see it this way, but the proposals seem to me to want to create a

kind of class structure in the Legislature. They want to create a class structure among members who have equal political status. Every Member of this Chamber enjoys the same representative status as the Leader of the House. All of us have been elected here. He is not here by Divine appointment.

Let us compare, for instance, salaries paid in Jamaica with the salaries proposed here for Ministers. I, for one, regard it as an insult that any Minister should be receiving six and eight times the salary that any elected member receives. Our status is equal. No Honourable Member can look down on another as being inferior in status. The Chief Minister of Jamaica receives only three and a half times the amount that an ordinary member receives in salary, and the other Ministers receive only two and a third times the salary of ordinary members. If we compare the ratio between the salary of the Chief Minister of Jamaica with the salaries paid to the ordinary Members, and if the same ratio obtained here as obtains between Mr. Bustamante's salary and the salaries of the ordinary Members of his Chamber, the ordinary Members of this House would have to get a salary of \$228 a month, and if the same ratio obtained here as between the Ministers of Jamaica and the other Members of the House of Representatives, the salaries of the ordinary Members of the Barbados House of Assembly would have to be \$258 a month. Let us take the case of Trinidad. If we compare the ratio of Ministerial salaries there with the salaries of other ordinary elected Members, and if the same ratio obtained here, the elected Members of our Chamber would have to be paid \$240 a month. In those Colonies there is no such thing as the salary of the Chief Minister and those of the other Ministers being respectively eight and six times the amount of the salaries of other Members. I understand, Sir, that Barbados is taking the precedent from British Guiana. I wonder why they would not take the precedent of parading through the streets of Bridgetown with pictures of the leading Russian leaders, or follow the precedent of British Guiana in so many of the wrong practices which those unfortunate leaders have followed. Why pick out salaries alone as the point in which to follow their precedent? We can legitimately suspect that one of the principal reasons for the introduction of this system is to create a few glorified salaries for the people who are supposed to carry it on. You can suspect that from all that you know. I believe the honourable senior member for the City when he said that some people cried. It is causing great dissatisfaction. But I will go further and say this. If the system proves a success — which I have every doubt that it will — it is expected that people will forget the high salaries. But this new system must have a meaning to their lives and existence. I cannot see that the present proposals will have that meaning, because, as the honourable junior member for St. Philip said last night, he hopes that the Leader of the Party will put the best ability the Party possesses into these Ministerial positions. In order to get this "best ability" I claim that you would have to introduce the Committee system to which I have already referred. The Donoughmore Commission which went to Ceylon some years ago recommended the institution of a Committee system, and the recommendation was implemented. Ceylon had one body, a Legislative Council. I think the membership was 61, apart from three officials. They divided themselves into Committees with a Chairman of each Committee, and the Chairman of each Committee had the same access to the Governor as the proposed Ministers will have here now. Their decisions were taken in Committee.

Although subsequently Ceylon obtained Dominion status, while that Committee system of Administration obtained Ceylon enjoyed a progress which it never had before. It is true the system did not last long because Dominion Status came along, but while it lasted there was progress and prosperity, and if it suited Ceylon how much more suitable would it be for a small community like this.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the Honourable Member leaves that point I would ask him to tell the House whether Ceylon at any time had an Executive Committee system.

Mr. VAUGHAN: That does not make any difference. The honourable member is only trying to draw a red herring across the trail. The fact that you have an Executive Committee here would not prevent you from having the Committee system. As I have said, it worked well in Ceylon, and here in Barbados, where political ability is not as high as we would wish, it would be a safeguard.

Self-government would be more assured, and more efficient if you had the Committee system. Now, Sir, what is the Chief Secretary but an official Minister? A rose by any other name is just as sweet. The honourable introducer of these proposals boasted yesterday that in Barbados only as in no other part of the British Empire Ministers will have something to do with the Police. Let me read what is written here:—

"With regard to the inclusion of Police in his Portfolio it is considered that the Principal Minister should have special responsibility for those non-operational aspects of police administration, which under the Police Act, 1908, are the concern of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. In exercising this responsibility, the Principal Minister should consult with a Police Board, which, it is suggested, should be established as an advisory body of a non-political character along the lines of a County Watch Committee in the United Kingdom. The Principal Minister should himself be a member of this Police Board.

The exercise of these functions in relation to the police should, in addition to the conventions normally applicable to all Ministers, be subject to the following special arrangements:—

- (a) The responsibilities and duties of the Governor and the Commissioner (as distinct from the Governor-in-Executive Committee) as prescribed in the Police Act 1908, should continue to be exercised directly by the Governor or the Commissioner, as the case may be.
- (b) The Governor should have the right to deal directly with the Commissioner or vice versa in matters affecting defence and external or internal security.
- (c) As in the case of other Departments, the Commissioner should deal, in personal matters such as appointments, promotions, transfers and discipline, with the Colonial Secretary and not the Minister.
- (d) Police investigations, prosecutions and court matters should be matters solely for the Commissioner and members of the Force, who would deal directly with the Law Officers on such matters.
- (e) When in his opinion grave or exceptional circumstances so require, the Governor should have the right to resume direct control through the Commissioner in all matters concerning the Police for such period as he (the Governor) sees fit."

I quote that to show that the average person listening to the Leader yesterday when he said that

this is the only Colony in the Colonial Empire where a Minister would have anything to do with the Police in a controlling aspect, would have been led astray. The Chief Minister will be on the Board and when anything that concerns the Police has to go to the Governor the Chief Minister will present it in the Assembly. But as far as the Board is concerned he may as well not be on the Board at all. Do not get here and pretend that because you are on the Police Board you enjoy something that other Ministers in other new constitutions do not enjoy. It is not so.

As I said, Sir, in the last resort the success of these proposals must be decided in the light of the social upliftment of the people of the Colony. I cannot accept the proposition that we are so politically advanced that the personnel in politics at present possess the requisite ability necessary for Ministerial Status; a system which is comparable in some respects to the English Ministerial system. I do not agree that the personnel now controlling politics in this Colony is sufficiently ripe to undertake with any success, as far as the real social progress of the people goes, the proposed system introduced in this House yesterday by the very disappointing pronouncements of the proposed Ministers themselves.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,—Before the question is put I would like to make a short contribution to this debate. I regard this as being a very historic occasion in the history of this Colony, more especially from the point of view of social advancement. I remember, as the honourable Leader of this Chamber has said, and the senior member for St. Michael has also mentioned it, that in the early days of the formation of the Barbados Progressive League one of the main points in the very first Manifesto prepared by the Labour Party was the very important question of Ministerial Status and self-government. Today, after thirteen years, we have lived to see one of our aims and aspirations an actual reality. I am referring, Sir, to the Manifesto which, as the honourable Leader of the House has said, was written by Mr. Hugh Springer, the Leader and myself at the Leader's home in 1940. It was entitled "A Progressive Policy for Barbados." In that Manifesto the question of self-government and Ministerial Status for Barbados were mentioned, and Ministerial Status was one of the big points for social advancement which the Party had in mind. I must say that to-night I feel a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure in being alive and here to participate in some way in the actual success of an achievement for which the Party has always campaigned.

Ministerial Status, Sir, has come and has come to stay. We know that the "Bushe Experiment" was the introduction of semi-Ministerial Status. It was a system which served its purpose, and that purpose was to see whether or not the Island was sufficiently politically advanced that the representatives of the people could be given a greater say in the administration of government. But while the "Bushe Experiment" did permit the members of the Executive who are members of this Chamber to create policy, the creation of policy is one thing, but the implementation of it is another. It is that point which I would like to explain. Under the "Bushe Experiment" there was power without responsibility. The four members of the Executive who are members of this House created policy which, when left in the hands of heads of departments might never be implemented. In other words, the policy of the Party in power would be propounded in the Executive, and then it would be left to the heads of the various govern-

ment departments to implement that policy. This often proved to be unsuccessful, in that the wishes of the people's representatives were often flouted and not carried through. It is to prevent that that this great advancement is taking place to-day, and that we have before us the proposals which we are now being asked to implement. That is the reply to the honourable senior member for the City, who said that there would not be much difference now from what things were under the "Bushe Experiment." He did not remember that under the "Bushe Experiment" the members of the Executive had to create policy and propound it at Government House and on the floor of this Assembly, but they never had the power to implement what they wanted to do. That power of administration rested in the hands of Government departments, which often flouted the wishes of the elected representatives of the people.

We are bringing it up to the position where we can more easily answer blame, because we would be in a position, under these new proposals, not only to create policy, not only to propound it in this Chamber, but actually to execute it in practice and to administer it to the very best possible advantage. It is only then that members of the Executive, who will then become ministers, will be directly answerable to the public and to the electors who sent us here. In other words, it was a question formerly of power without responsibility but, under the present proposals as set out in a ministerial system, there will be both power and responsibility, and ministers will be directly answerable to the public if they do not carry through with their programme. In short, a party will be directly responsible to the electorate through its ministers for any of the things which its ministers held out to them during election time.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the House suggested that it was very regrettable at this stage that we should not enjoy regular cabinet system as enjoyed in the English parliamentary conventions. By that I mean that, under these new proposals, which we are advancing under this constitution, the Executive Committee will still be composed of some nominated members. In other words, there will be no definite cabinet system where all members of the Cabinet will be elected representatives of the people. The cabinet system is not actually included in these proposals. We will not in truth and fact have the Prime Minister or Premier as President or Chairman of the Cabinet with the other men hand-picked by him forming the Cabinet. We will still have the Executive Committee with the Governor as Chairman. We will still have elected and nominated members. We shall not attempt to do what a neighbouring colony attempted to do overnight or in a very limited period of time. We will not attempt to bring about over-reaching changes but we propose to move from stage to stage along constitutional lines so as to come step by step towards self-government in its entirety. We shall not attempt to make any unreasonable and drastic demands. This Party is in the position of putting proven and capable people to carry out our ministerial duties. We shall not insist at this stage that there should not be any official members on the Executive Committee or that there should not be the changes to which we agreed in the proposals. We propose to advance step by step until in the not too distant future a proper cabinet system will be introduced and the official and nominated members will be withdrawn. We hope that will be very soon because it is well known that official members usually try to obstruct a settled policy of a party.

We shall continue to advance stage by stage until we come to the stage when this Chamber in its capacity as representing the people will in a constitutional manner elect even its own Governor. To me, that is not far distant, but we must start at once with ministerial status and give our own people the power to administer its own affairs, which are quite separate from legislative functions.

I am afraid there has been a certain amount of confusion by one or two members of this Chamber on the legislative and administrative functions. They seem to me to be mixing up the two. Under this new system, a minister will be charged with not only legislative powers but administrative powers. They will have to execute the policy of the Government and see that our promises are kept and it can only be done in this way by the bringing about of ministerial status. I look to the day when I will see all of us, constituted as we will be then, doing something constructive and getting something done and seeing that our promises are carried out; as a matter of fact, showing that we are able to carry out our stewardship to our constituents. I am afraid and I express great apprehension that, unless our ministers are able and willing and competent to take the necessary interest and the necessary initiative, with a firm hand to execute as far as constituted in the manifesto of the Labour Party, nothing much will be done. They must be firm, if not, when the day comes there will be little for which they can account and it may be a pretty sorry day for us, the representatives of the Party Party. I do not care to elaborate on that any longer.

At present, we have promised the people tenantry roads, water, extension of water mains and many other little things. We have promised to make water available to every householder, but I am not satisfied that, with all the thousands of dollars that have been spent on the programme up to now, sufficient progress has been made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think it is necessary for the honourable member to elaborate on that point. When you refer to the programme for water, it is a bit off the mark and if I extend you that latitude I am afraid I would have to extend it to every honourable member.

Mr. TALMA: With all due deference to your ruling, when I said that, I only said so to prove that there should be a benefit from the introduction of ministerial status. I was trying to show that, although the Government has voted a lot of money on the water programme, it has not been spent beneficially. Water has not yet been brought to the people's doors. There are not yet small water mains running through tenantry roads. I am saying that the amount of money voted for water will be spent and our object will not be achieved. I will desist from saying anything further on this point.

Sir, unless five ministers are appointed I can see the whole system falling to pieces because it is not a question of merely a man walking around with a portfolio. It is not a question of having ministers on paper and having ministers with portfolios. It is a question of having competent people to sit in offices and to do the work of Government up to a standard. Administrative ability is essential. The four members of the Executive have adequate duties now to keep them fully employed every day without paying attention to the administrative duties of Government. When ministerial status comes into being, they will be called upon to administer and control the departments of Government along with the duties they are performing now. I can see that they will have a very busy time in getting through with all those duties.

The work will be arduous. What is more, although this Colony is small as compared with some of the other sister colonies, its importance is just as high and almost as great as any of those which enjoy ministerial system at present. When we compare this colony with any of the neighbouring colonies and we go through their various departments of Government, we will see that there are as many departments of Government in this Island as obtain in Trinidad or even Jamaica; although the volume of work may be less the number of departments is just as much. In Trinidad, there are six ministries but, in Barbados, there will only be five. I am going to say this, that unless we get off to a proper start in this new set-up of ministerial system, it is bound to fail. I say that in answer to the Opposition.

I think the honourable senior member for the City raised the point of what benefit there would be to the population as a result of ministerial status with an expenditure of \$100,000. Well, that is a good question, but let me answer the particular member in this way. The majority of you on the other side of the table are big and small business men. Is it not wise, judicious and expedient to pay directors of businesses a proper living wage, compatible with reason and commonsense and in accordance with the standard of living of the country, their status, their duties and everything combined, so as to place them on a proper footing and ensure that they should not look for favours here nor there? You should pay them in that manner so that they will feel satisfied and will not open themselves to temptation. If you regard them as Directors of the Government of Barbados, is it not better to pay them the \$84,000 to see that the Government is properly carried on? When you pay them properly you expect results from them. Is it not then proper, judicious and discreet to pay them properly? I am not saying this because I hope to be a minister. I would say it if members on the other side were taking over the Government. I am merely looking at it from a commonsense point of view. If members cannot see the wisdom of that suggestion, then I think they had better go back to school. Again, it will not always be that this Labour Party will be in power. There will come a day when the Conservative Party or a Left Wing Party or a Liberal Party, whatever it might be, will come into power. All over this City, there are Directors, lawyers with lucrative practices and sugar barons who receive a salary of over \$600 per month. To a sugar baron, \$600 per month is just a bagetelle. I know of one who started at \$1,500 per month. By this time, he must be earning £1,500 per month. A salary of \$600 per month may appear as a big salary, but to say that it is out of proportion to the economy of this Island is a theory to which I cannot subscribe. I do know that salaries of \$600 per month are paid to Second Grade Clerks of big concerns in this City. It is not so much money to-day. In any big concern, like Messrs DaCosta & Co. Ltd., you will probably find about a dozen employees receiving more than \$600 per month. You therefore cannot say that you are squandering taxpayers' money when you pay ministers of this colony \$600 per month. As I have said, the day will come when another party will come into power and, if the Conservative Party comes into power, its members, who may be appointed ministers, will regard this amount as an insult for them to receive as salary. As a matter of fact, it will not be profitable to them to devote all their time to the Government's business on that salary. It is all well and good when the honourable senior member for the City says that he agrees with the principle of ministerial system and the proposals that have

been sent down, but when he talks about it costing this Island \$100,000 that is only propaganda and an electioneering speech. He knows too well that it will cost more but he says so because he intends to use it in his electioneering campaign next time.

He knows in truth and in fact that, not only the salaries of the ministers, but that of the other officers and civil servants, are fair and very reasonable, and that they are in line. They are far below those paid to people in similar positions in the other colonies and no one should be heard making this a public issue.

I do not care to touch on salaries which are proposed for members of this Chamber. I will leave that to the discretion, good judgment, fairplay and sound commonsense of the Leader of this Chamber. All I would say now is that those salaries must be in proportion to the salaries paid in Trinidad to the ministers and the ordinary members. The same ratio of payment which obtains in Trinidad between ministers and members who are not ministers should be accorded us in this Chamber. Unless—it is not a threat—that good, commonsense and fairplay are exercised, one can well see a lot of wrangling, a lot of disturbance and a lot of dissension going on, because, human nature being what it is, all expect equality although all cannot be ministers. All cannot be generals, as the members on the otherside of the table are called. Sir, I am hoping this timely warning will assist Government in coming to a rightful conclusion on this matter. I am not trying to be an oppositionist nor am I trying to destroy anything. I have never done it in the past, I will not do it now. Let it not be said as it was said not long ago that all the money was spent in paying Heads of Departments and the supporting staff very good salaries and those in the lower ranks were not to receive anything. Let it not be said that, after having ministers, there is no more money to pay the ordinary members. Let that be no excuse. For that very good reason, I am hoping that after these proposals should have been agreed to as they will be, because the oppositionists also agree with them, Government will be coming down with a resolution for the payment of ordinary members an increased salary at the same time as that of the ministers. One resolution can incorporate everybody. I too feel that a comprehensive picture of the expenditure for ministerial status should be placed before the public at this stage. I feel that if it would cost the colony \$100,000 that we should say so at this stage. This comprehensive picture should be placed before the Colony before ministerial status.

I notice that the travelling allowance which is suggested for ministers is too small. I do not believe that \$50 a month will be enough. I do not want them to raid the Treasury but I feel that amount is too small if ministers are to do their work creditably.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not propose to speak at greater length although I can. I give this new ministerial system my blessing and feel that the Leader of this Chamber should feel himself a very happy man if he lives to see it implemented. With himself as Premier, a position which he richly deserves. I take this opportunity of wishing him the best of luck and, at the same time, offering him my fullest co-operation. I need not caution him to look at British Guiana and see what happened there. Members of this House, especially members of the Executive, are fully experienced in running this Government. They may have a more difficult task than before ministerial status, but I feel sure that they are fit and competent men to carry on the

programme. It will not only be a question of their making legislative speeches, but they will be called upon in their position of administration to be courteous, to use their commonsense and to be cultured in every sense of the word. I do believe that any matured member of this Labour Party is far from being arrogant, but we hope that, when members of this Party are entrusted to that new high role of ministers, they will not let that power go to their heads. Let it not be said that they acted as "new niggers" but let it be said that they exercised all the decency and the culture that the office demanded. Unless that is done the whole ministerial system will flop, because it will be a question of just trying to ride rough-shod over everybody. Let us not see happening over here what has been evinced in British Guiana, where one found ministers just touching a bell and saying "come in." When the person departed he turned to the other man in his office and said to him "See the big officials that are running in to me." I just say that off the record to warn of some of the dangers of ministerial status. I hope and trust proper men will be appointed ministers and that the ones appointed will carry out the duties and burdens of the offices imposed on them. I believe that they will prove successful.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that by way of amendment that this be the reply of the Governor's Message and that the following Address be now passed:—

*The House Of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

The House of Assembly has the honour to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 25/1953 forwarding for the consideration of the House certain proposals for the introduction of Ministerial Government in Barbados.

2. The House wishes to place on record its profound appreciation of the confidence and the goodwill placed in the people of Barbados, by her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom by its acceptance of the principles of extending a great measure of self-government to this Island.

3. The House appreciates and strongly approves of the principle of Ministerial Government should function in accordance with the constitutional conventions observed in the United Kingdom, and pledges its support to follow in the parliamentary government which the Mother of Parliaments under a constitutional monarch has so long maintained.

4. The House appreciates the difficulties inherent in financing a new system such as has been proposed. It notes with interest the experience of other Caribbean Colonies and is conscious of the attempt which has been made in these proposals to cut down expenditure to a minimum. Because of this the House assures Your Excellency of its willingness to agree to a money Resolution designed to provide for the carrying out of these proposals.

5. The House notes Your Excellency's recommendations with regard to the re-organisation of the Central Secretariat and the accommodation for Ministries, and share Your Excellency's eagerness to see the introduction of the scheme.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the nature of the reply to His Excellency's Message No. 25/1953. Again I take great pleasure in moving that this Address do now pass.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I desire to second the amendment to the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph as has been

moved by the honourable senior member for Christ Church for the purpose of discussion and, in doing so, I desire to make a few comments as regards to the proposals of the new change to our constitution.

Mr. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was not present in this Chamber during the whole of this debate but I certainly was present at the commencement of it. I would just like to know on a point of information what is the motion that was amended by the honourable senior member for Christ Church. The motion is now being seconded by the honourable senior member for St. John. As far as I remember, and I think I remember quite well, this House has no recollection of any previous motion put before this House. If it were done in my absence I am subject to correction. I did not hear any motion moved by anyone. I therefore would like to know what was the previous motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am aware of the fact that it is the duty of the Speaker to acquaint honourable members on any statement made by them. I think the circumstances of this motion are as follows. If I may assist the honourable member, may I tell the honourable member—and I think he should know this—that when this matter was brought before the House by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, he intimated that he intended to move an Address of the kind and he gave an outline orally of the skeleton Address which he had in his hands, which was taken by the Clerk of the House to the effect that the House agreed to the proposals contained in His Excellency's Message and to the financial arrangements for carrying out the proposals. I take it that, although it was not in actual printed form and was not read out before in full, it was a proper motion moved by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. That motion was duly seconded by the honourable junior member for St. Peter. The honourable senior member for Christ Church is now omitting in every detail the motion that comprehended the oral address given notice of by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. Does that satisfy the honourable member?

Mr. BARROW: I must thank Your Honour for your interpretation of what took place yesterday but my personal understanding is that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, who was introducing this reply, did not have the reply ready and he was giving some indication as to the nature of the reply. The amendment which has just been given by the honourable senior member for Christ Church seems to me a counter-motion. I do not think the procedure is actually correct.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the procedure is quite in order. I hope the honourable member is satisfied and will allow the debate to continue.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Sir, allow me to say one word.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking on a point of order?

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Yes, Sir. I too think that this is not the usual procedure. It is not the usual procedure that is adopted usually by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. If you have a debate mainly for the passing of an address, you simply have to ask leave to move the passing of the address and, in case it was an address embodying the reply to a Message from His Excellency, it is generally drafted beforehand and the House always proceeds to pass it. I think what the honourable senior member for St. George is saying—and I would like to support him—is that the real motion has now been put to you. It is put down on the Order Paper to-day to resume the debate on the pass-

ing of the Address to His Excellency's Message No. 25/1953, but that cannot be right because the Address has not been read. The motion which was first moved must be in accordance to what was set down on the Order Paper yesterday and that was to move the consideration of the White Paper, and the Address which has only now been moved is an address which has been the result of what has taken place during the debate. That Address could not have been moved by the honourable Leader of the House and therefore you see the difficulty. All these debates have taken place and if you allow that amendment now, I think the debate can start all over again. Obviously, that is not what is intended. The debate on the White Paper, which has been handed down here and to which we were to give consideration, is in itself a motion. If the Hon. Leader of this House wishes to reply to His Excellency's Message as soon as this debate is over, all he needs to do is to bring in this Address and move formally that it be now passed. If I may put it in this way, His Excellency's Message and the reports that follow are full things to debate on by themselves. This draft address is not only full also but, in some cases, not quite flexible to people who would wish to pass it as it is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With due deference to your political experience, I would like the honourable junior member for St. James to tell me exactly what is the White Paper in this Chamber.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: It does not matter what you call it. What has happened is that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is entitled to move that this honourable House do now debate a Message from His Excellency the Governor and for that to proceed, he has to move a motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph did move an oral Address.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: What I understood was not that. As I understand it, he gave notice that he would move an address and then, afterwards, he read out what the Address was likely to be.

Mr. ADAMS: I had been forewarned by the honourable senior member for St. Michael and that is why I was at pains to be in order. The honourable senior member for St. Michael warned me to see to it before I sat down to put a motion before the House. I turned to the Clerk and said "Please take down what I am saying as my motion." I further said to the House "That is my oral motion of what the Address is likely to be." It is going to be expanded by somebody who will move an amendment to it later. I was careful to avoid its coming in the wrong place, to start the debate all over again. There is nothing out of order. We, the members of this Government, are not all the fools we appear to be. When we see you smiling, we know what is going on behind the scenes. Let me repeat that the honourable senior member for St. Michael warned me and I was very careful to see that no undue debate would take place on this matter. Everything is perfectly in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Must the motion which has just been moved be regarded as an amendment?

Mr. ADAMS: Perhaps, Sir, before I sit down I should say I accept the amendment to my motion.

Mr. BARROW: Sir, my whole object in raising this point was to avoid what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph also wanted to avoid and that is the unnecessary prolongation of this debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member is in a position to point that out now. I cannot allow the honourable member to proceed.

Mr. BARROW: With your indulgence, Your Honour I feel the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking on another point of order?

Mr. BARROW: I am speaking now on a point of order. I originally rose on a point of order and I can rise as many times as it needs be on a point of order. I am just giving a personal explanation why I thought the original motion was not correct.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making a personal explanation? If he is, the honourable member is out of order. The honourable member may make a statement at a point of explanation.

Mr. BARROW: I intend to do that. I was going to say that I do not think, in my humble opinion, that the amendment took the proper course.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph was quite entitled to move the Address and to write out the Address after he had given an oral motion.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: Would you allow me to make a statement at a point of personal explanation? Far from my trying to hold up this debate, as you know, I merely ask Your Honour without even speaking from the floor of the House whether the honourable senior member for St. Joseph did move an Address at the commencement of the debate? If there were no motion, any member who spoke would have the right to speak again on the motion now moved. According to the explanation you have given me now, there was a motion and what the honourable senior member for Christ Church moved is an amendment to the motion. Obviously, what the honourable senior member for Christ Church moved can be an amendment.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot see on what grounds, whether it be political or moral justice, should a discussion on such an important constitutional change in this Island be stigmatised or hindered.

Mr. BARROW: I would like a ruling from the Chair on this amendment which is being debated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I may point out, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, when rising for some other purpose said that he accepted this amendment. Therefore, I take it that this amendment has become the main motion. I have no ruling for it but I think that it is the correct procedure.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should repeat—I cannot see on what grounds, whether from political or from moral justice, the discussion on such an important constitutional change of this Island should be stigmatised or hindered. I will say that most of us in this honourable Chamber should take the opportunity at this time in the history of this Island to speak on this change. I hope what is contained in these paragraphs of His Excellency's Message and the other reports will not only lead to political progress but also to social and economic progress of this Island. Tonight I am afraid that I cannot find sufficient words capable of doing justice to such an important and momentous occasion. I therefore hope that the honourable members of this Chamber will tolerate my inability in expressing the feelings which should be expressed by those of us who appreciate the advancement of the masses of this Colony. May I say, Sir, that as far as the principle of this constitutional change is concerned, we must agree with it, because it is acknowledged that we stand to benefit from the sympathetic consideration which the British Government has given

us through the Secretary of State for the Colonies coupled with the continual agitation of our foremost legislators. We are advancing from a state of physical and moral slavery; from being the stooges of serfdom and servility to a state which compels respect of all human beings endowed with morals, feelings and the desire for equality and to see that each and every one be uplifted. It is something to be appreciated, not only by ourselves, but by our former masters, because wherever there is confidence and companionship in the affairs of mankind there has been and there will always be some safety. It is safety, not only as far as the individual is concerned, but safety of interests. Therefore, I commend members of this Government for being among the prime movers of such an important adjunct to our existence. I am hoping, however, that the increased status and responsibility to those at present, who are likely to enjoy the first-fruits of the change, will not resort to what is known in the terms of ethics as licence. I do not share the expressions in various quarters of this Colony of the political and intellectual snobbishness which we have read in the past few weeks and of which we have heard today with our own ears. To share that view is to say that the masses of this Colony must continue in a state of servility even although they are in the majority, and although the burdens of political administration are carried on their shoulders. I always believe in the principle that the majority opinion must prevail and that the minority must abide and go along with the decisions and opinions of the majority. But I also believe that minority rights must be respected and preserved. I always preach that you must give every section of the community its rightful representation; resolve yourself to listen to their opinions and aspirations and to do justice to them even although the heavens might fall. I must repeat that minority rights must be respected at all times and that they must be given fair and reasonable consideration.

Sir, although my own economies are showered upon the new change that is to be brought about by ministerial status, I do not want members of the Government bench to feel that there are not legitimate apprehensions against it. It is not because one wants to be dishonest or one wants to put up a case against those who are at present in power, but the apprehensions are justified because of the past behaviour of those who could have, by their breeding, by their position of trust acted differently, to what was the state of affairs in the past. That brings us to the point of political morality. Political morality is not based on rule by the sword because you are in a position to use the sword. It is not based on consciousness of having power and the majority to force your opinions on a sincere, although feeble minority. It is based, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the moral culture, the respect for the opinions of the humblest of individuals, the respect for all opinions, however incapably expressed, and the tolerance which is expected of men in a position of responsibility. Certainly it is not based on the continued misbehaviour from those of whom a different attitude is expected. While I applaud the members of the Government bench for having been in existence to bring about this innovation, I must also remind them of their failure to give honourable members on this side of the Chamber, few though we might be, but important individuals, because we represent the views of a large percentage of the masses of this Island, our rightful due of consideration. I say that without the slightest expectation of contradiction. I do not want honourable members on that side of the table to feel that it is my intention to be unkind to

them. Little do they know that they have my greatest sympathy, but I do not and cannot tolerate arrogance in responsible quarters, nor can I disregard the necessity of giving respect in this honourable Chamber to the opinions of others regardless of the sources from which the opinions may come. With this change, I am hoping that the increase in status and the suggested means of material independence, which are contained in His Excellency's Message and which I feel are going to be implemented, will cause members of this Government to develop a sense of their responsibility, and to realise that each honourable member or minority group represents the views of a large percentage of the population of this country, else he or they could not have been here. There is no time more opportune than this to tell our real feelings about this whole affair. I hope, Sir, that this new change will remove the desire to embarrass, rather than to compromise and explain, as is now practised by members of the Government bench. I will, however, say to them "go ahead and enjoy your important status, enjoy all privileges that will be granted you by this change, but do justice, not only to the few representatives here who may express a different opinion from yours, but also to those who sent us here to put their views and aspirations before the Government."

At this stage, I come to understand that a short break is necessary, therefore, I move the adjournment of this House for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I put the motion for the adjournment of the House, I would like to say that, while I accept the amended Address which was moved, I feel the nature of the amendment introduces something new into the debate. It will therefore be a wrong thing to rob honourable members who have spoken already of giving their views on it. I therefore suggest to those honourable members who have spoken already that they can speak on this amended Address, should they so desire.

The question that this House do now adjourn for three-quarters of an hour was put and agreed to and Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.

On re-assembling.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the honourable senior member for St. John was addressing the House.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, my previous statements have been solely applied to the principle of ministerial status. I now would like to say something about the change according to how I see it in the Message. It seems to me that it has been carried to a wide mark but not as wide as I expected. It is, in my humble assessment, a change of responsibility more so than a change in status, because, seemingly, it has its limitations. Of course, I can easily sympathise with the present situation in view of the political uncertainties which prevail at present in the various colonies, and because of that I see the necessity or the desire of the authorities in London to maintain certain safeguards. As regards to the change, where members of the Government are concerned, I will conclude with the expression of the hope that the Leader of this Honourable Chamber, who has within his control the appointments of the respective ministers to the departments, will maintain that leadership which is necessary of him and will see that his ministers do not the things that are not expected of them. Not only must their activities be beyond question or suspicion, but their demeanour to the minority groups in this House must be exemplary and, however ticklish our

expressions or questions might be, the Honourable Leader should show and should insist on his ministers to show that tolerance and everything else which would, in the end, lead to co-operation. I will not dwell too much on this, but I hope that the Leader of this House is aware of what we expect of him and of the supposed ministers.

Sir, in the past, I have never been permitted to be completely satisfied with the demeanour of members of the Government, nor with their behaviour. They seem to feel that power is all and that discretion is something to be opposed. I will only say that political circumstances change overnight and, as a result, those holding office to-day might not hold them to-morrow. Therefore, discretion is needed when you are in a position of trust. I hope the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is listening to my few remarks, because I am saying on this night of the 11th of November, 1953, during the discussion on the important and momentous change in our constitution, that I am still comparatively a young man, reasonably energetic and I shall not fail when election time comes again, health permitting, to work as hard as Hades to see wrong persons are not put in right places. This is no arrogance, Mr. Speaker, I say it from the depth of my heart, because I feel that in our small Colony the failure to observe and respect the views expressed by minority groups should not be disregarded by a Government in power, although it might have to disregard such expressions. I have endeavoured during the short time I have been in this chamber to uphold the dignity of this honourable House and to encourage and assist progressive legislation, regardless from whom it emanated. I definitely disdain any attempt to change the long and admirable traditions which have been practised in this Honourable Chamber.

Sir, I have all good reasons to feel that the change which is purported to be brought about will create in the various departments of Government greater efficiency and I hope that service to the public will be the first principles in the duties of our Civil Servants, and that it will be demanded by the respective ministers, who may be head of those departments.

I cannot refrain from letting the Administration and others realise that the financial implications, in my humble opinion, are beyond the capacity of this pauperised community to sustain. If I said differently it would be against the truth. I have my personal feelings as far as the economic conditions of this community are concerned and they are based on the facts that I get around a lot, and see and hear of much suffering and that I have observed the inability of the majority of the population eking out an honest and justifiable existence. I have also observed the absence of the building up of the social services which, if they were given to the masses, for their use, would in some way tend to reduce their cost of living. I deprecate any attempt to inflict on the limited resources of this Colony any demands which will reduce the putting of more of the Colony's revenue to greater social services. I feel that these recommendations are going to be too expensive for us to bear and, with that feeling of sympathy for the progress of the Colony, a modification is definitely necessary. I do not believe that the constitutional changes should extract so much from the General Revenue of this Colony. I feel that much money should have been put to the improvement of social services and I hope this humble statement of mine will have an impression on those who are in authority and who are expected to finance the recommendations on this new constitutional change. I want it to go forth that my remarks are not based on prejudice or spite, nor the

feeling that, because I am not directly a beneficiary under the new change, I am making such utterances. I am making them for political security and out of moral respect for the Government in power.

I do not believe that comparative recommendations for the payment of salaries to ministers should be made with the Colonies of Jamaica or Trinidad, and certainly not of British Guiana. I always keep in view the natural resources of a small colony such as ours with a population that is given to thrift and which has a desire to live as human beings with all the other qualifications of good citizenship. We should not try to duplicate those financial commitments which are generally found in countries which are more advanced economically than ours. I am going to recommend and suggest a revision as far as salaries and other expenditure are concerned and I hope my revision will be given due consideration. It is my humble feeling that the Leader of the Government, whoever he might be, with a sense of responsibility not only to himself or to his party but to the Colony generally, should condescend to accept a salary of \$600 per month. The Ministers, whom I know are expected to form the Government —

Mr. SPEAKER: How has the honourable member known who will be the Ministers?

Mr. ALLDER: I do not directly know who they will be but I am presupposing that the ministers would be composed of certain members who, by their past services, are not beyond consideration. I was saying, Sir, that while we appreciate giving unlimited dignity, comparable to those obtaining in the other Colonies, to the Leader of the Government and his supposed ministers, we must go back and say that because of the Colony's limitations financially we cannot give them a sum comparable to that which is paid in other Colonies. I do not agree with those who feel that the cost is too high and refuse to say it. As I was saying, the Premier should accept \$600 per month as salary. I know from a practical point of view that it is a great task if you are to give real service. For all that it is worth it calls for great sacrifice on your part. We have come to the stage of our social and political development when those, who have the courage to come out and represent the views of the masses, should not be expected to undergo unnecessary financial embarrassment, especially those without the necessary means of financial support. If we want to raise the level of democratic representations of the masses, the few of us who have pledged to do so should be supported financially. I am saying so because, from my practical experience as a representative of the masses, I know that if we want to do justice to the masses as a representative it calls not only for time and energy and the courage to express your views, but it also calls for research. Many do not realise how many long hours at night, when they are free themselves, that representatives of theirs spend perusing literature in order to be able to garner that knowledge which is necessary for their successful representation. It is a fact that those of us who want to do justice to their representatives of the masses must spend long hours sitting and thinking on the knowledge gained from sundry sources. The masses should be told that representatives are expected to be removed from the materialistic uncertainties of this life so that they would be free to sit and do justice to the responsibility which is put on them. A representative is expected to be above board. He is expected to be as Caesar's wife. His actions must be unquestionable. Mr. Speaker, you do know that, although that is expected from a representative, you get part of the community criticising and embarrassing you because you get a paltry \$100 per month

from 201,000 people who represent the population. I hope that there will be means in the not distant future of the population knowing what they should know in this respect.

If I may go back to the financial implications, I have already suggested that the Premier should accept a salary of \$600 per month and I now suggest that the other ministers should be willing to accept salaries of \$400 per month. I too feel that the Speaker should be given an emolument of \$300 per month and also an entertainment allowance as considered necessary. I also agree that the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees should be given \$240 per month. I am not going to be so immodest as to feel that other members like myself, who are the sacrificial servants of the masses, should not receive an increase. I feel that theirs should be increased to \$200 per month and my expressions are not based on self-aggrandisement because I always desired to serve the people. I do know that sometimes my economic demands, which have to be satisfied from my commercial interests, conflict on many occasions with my responsibility to represent the masses. I hope that the hon senior member for St. Joseph has taken my statements on these salaries as seriously as I intended them to be taken.

If, Mr. Speaker, my humble suggestions do not carry weight with the Administration as far as these proposals are concerned, I can only promise them my continual opposition to their existence in power. I have no fear, nor am I willing to hide my intentions, nor am I without that hope that myself and those who I hope are preparing themselves will succeed in influencing the public that the Party in power do not deserve their continued hold on power in this Colony. That is not said in arrogance. It is based on a definite determination. I have made my suggestions as far as this constitutional change is concerned. I have expressed the hope that the increase in power will not open the door to a state of licence. I have stressed the necessity for ethics in politics. There is another point I want to stress. I cannot remember if it has been raised already, but in the Message from the Governor there is no definite statement as regards the dismissal of Ministers or who will be directly responsible for their good conduct. But having a slender knowledge of similar constitutions in other Colonies I presume that if the Chief Minister feels that a Minister does not live up to expectations he can recommend his dismissal, which will have to be sanctioned by the Head of the Administration. However that may be, it is very important to realise that the deportment of the respective Ministers should be such as to ensure the success of the new constitution.

Forgive me, Sir, if I have to go back to the financial implications. The Chief Minister is going to have \$3,000 a year entertainment allowance. (A Member: That is not true). I am speaking under correction. Even if this \$3,000 is between all the Ministers I hardly envisage a Minister attempting to entertain anyone on his own. The Chief Minister will have to come into the picture. Now that I am on this point I am thinking in terms of the total entertainment allowance which the Government will have under the new set up. The Head of the Administration at present gets £1,000 a year for entertainment allowance. When you add that to the proposed entertainment allowance to the Ministers you will get a total allowance in the vicinity of \$7,800 per annum. In my humble opinion, the taxpayers of the Colony should not be saddled with that. If the new Ministers are to have \$3,000 per annum entertainment allowance let us reduce the amount allocated to

the Head of the Administration. If a visitor comes here from overseas representing Her Majesty's Government, it would be, to use a popular phrase, "Putting more weight on King Sugar", for the Ministers to entertain him and for the Head of the Administration to entertain him too. It would be unnecessary. I know that Mr. Speaker would only entertain those who are connected with the Parliamentary Association. That would be other politicians. (A Member: Like Dr. Jagan?) Even he. That is what I feel as far as entertainment allowance is concerned, and I hope that my suggestions will be noted by the Leader of the House. I am going to appeal to the Honourable Leader of the House not to agree to any Ministerial departments costing us so much. I do not agree that an effort has been made in the present proposals to keep the expenditure as low as possible.

Now that I am on this point, Sir, I am reminded of the quotation by Pope, "For forms of Government let fools contend. That which is best administered is best." My humble rejoinder is this. The most costly is not necessarily the best. I say that because of some of the things which I have heard said by the Government side, such as, "Cheap things no good and good things no cheap." Cheap and sincere service is the best service. It is better than any other kind of service. I go further as regards the financial implications. We must envisage that we will have Federation. A Federal set up is going to be costly, and I hope really that as the honourable member for St. Michael said, I will not see it. I cannot at this present time see the necessity for introducing it within this decade, but in case the political leaders of the West Indies desire it we must not forget the financial implications which will be added to the already existing ones. I do not think that we want to see ourselves end up financially handicapped by having to keep up with such demands.

As regards the expressions which have been made by some previous speakers, I do not care to question the ability of the Ministers, because I am reminded of the fact that centuries ago the founder builders of the British Empire were unlettered men, and we are today, literally speaking, thousands of miles ahead of them. But I must repeat my former statement that there must be good behaviour and ethics in the administration of the new constitution. There must be respect for the opinion of others. There must be tolerance and the necessary training in the realms of statesmanship, and the realisation that living by the sword cannot be considered as perpetual, but a temporary sojourn in power. I hope that the Leader of this Honourable Chamber and other Honourable Members will realise that we, as descendants of slaves are tonight opening a new vista with political emancipation, which, if properly and honestly carried out, must give us that political and social status which our long-dead ancestors would not have imagined in their wildest dreams. (Cheers).

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker.—This Address proposed by the honourable senior member for Christ Church is, of course, a reply to the Governor's Message No. 25/1953 to the Legislature. The reference in paragraph 4 of the Address is, of course, a reference to the proposals contained in this very historic and important Message. It is well therefore, in considering the motion for the Address which this House should pass to the Governor to consider the proposals contained in this Message and analyse those various proposals.

I will say at the outset that the proposals meet with my general approbation. There are one or two matters with which I do not find myself in complete agreement, but as a whole the proposals are satisfactory, and they embody what I think we may all

reasonably accept and hope for at the present time. In the Message from the Governor it is pointed out that subject to the approval of the Legislature it is proposed to put into effect a Ministerial system on the lines set out in the despatches and to operate the system in accordance with the conventions stated therein. Here, I pause for a moment to deal with paragraph 3. That paragraph says,

"The Ministers, who would operate under party conventions, would become responsible for the formulation of government policy, for propounding it in Executive Committee and in the House of Assembly, and for seeing that it was carried out by the administration. Executive Committee would continue to be the policy-making body of government."

I would urge, Sir, that no one should be responsible for the conduct of Government affairs, whether in this Chamber or in the Other Chamber, unless that person is a member of the Party in power. It would be intolerable and might well cause us to be the subject of criticism if any person responsible for expounding Government policy were not a member of the Government Party and therefore entitled to be present at meetings of the Government Party and its Council so as to be *au fait* with the feelings of that Party. There is no assuming that there is any lack of ability in the Government Party so that they will not be able to get the right person for the right post.

Mention has been made in paragraphs 5 and 6 of certain safeguards. With reference to the Civil Service it is pointed out that there would be retained those essential safeguards designed to preserve the British tradition of a permanent and impartial career Civil Service. The appointment, promotion, transfer and discipline of officers in the Public Service would continue to rest with the Governor, advised by the Public Service Commission, which would be maintained as a non-political and impartial body." With reference to the Police, paragraph 6 states. "The special arrangements proposed in relation to Police would preserve the independence of the Police, who exist under the British system of Government, not to carry out the instructions of the government of the day, but to preserve the peace and enforce the law." Now, Sir, there is another safeguard which I suggest must be very important. You must also preserve the independence and integrity of the Bench. There is no question but that at the present time that is seriously threatened. It will call for a debate in the very near future in this Chamber. Nothing is more important than that the independence of the Bench should be safeguarded so that it will not have to be fearful of giving decisions based on the principles of British justice that have made the British constitution run as smoothly as it has for all these years. In view of certain present day happenings one would have liked to have seen mention made in paragraph 5 with regard to the independence of the Bench so that British justice would be administered to the full in all circumstances and that no member of the Bench would run the risk of being interdicted or suspended or put into any adverse position because of his impartial treatment of all and sundry who come before him in accordance with the high traditions of British justice.

There can be no doubt, Sir, that it is essential that safeguards should be retained in regard to the Civil Service and the Police, although I will state that, as proposed here, Barbados is the only colony where the Ministers will have anything to do with the Police. Lest that be misunderstood I will remind the House of what is stated in paragraph 6. The

Police will not be carrying out the instructions of the Government of the day, but their function would be to preserve the peace and enforce the law. Here I will refer to paragraph 10 which says that the Chief Secretary will be responsible for certain functions of Government, one of them being defence and security. That might well be misunderstood by people who read the statements in paragraph 6 and paragraph 10 without seeing clearly how these various functions are classified.

Paragraph 8 of the Governor's Message deals with the portfolios of the five proposed Ministers, and I have merely one or two suggestions to make with regard to the distribution of these Ministers. I do not know what was under consideration when the distribution was being considered, whether it was the individuals among whom they will be allocated or the departments with which they are most closely connected. I cannot help feeling that Library should be in charge of the same Minister who is responsible for Education, rather than in charge of the Minister who is responsible for Social Services and Local Government. Education, I think, is inextricably interwoven with this. As regards the Minister for Trade, Industry and Labour, I notice that here, as in Trinidad, the same Minister will be in charge of Trade and Commerce and Labour. One recalls the tremendous amount of criticism which took place throughout the length and breadth of Trinidad and Tobago over that set-up, and I do not see the point in allowing the Minister for Labour to be also in charge of what can be described as the third and fourth Chambers of the Barbados Legislature. One should be loath to attempt that in Barbados. In Trinidad that Ministry has been in the hands of a politician who is known to be an adept at walking the tight rope, and if he has not always succeeded in associating the two, one wonders how the person to whom they will give this portfolio in Barbados will be more successful than the Honourable Albert Gomes has been in the Land of the Humming Bird.

Now, Sir, one comes to paragraph 11 which deals with salaries. It is a great pity that some Honourable Members still regard that as the most important paragraph in the whole Message, and make it the whole object of their criticism. One should not be concerned with individuals who will be appointed as Ministers. Neither should one be concerned with whether any particular individual will know how to spend \$600 a month. That is beside the point. The question is, what is the office worth? I think it would be ridiculous to suggest that a Minister should receive less than the Head of the Department which the Minister is administering, and Heads of Departments have been extremely well treated as a result of what happened some time ago. I feel that a Minister must receive a higher rate of remuneration than any Head of a Department who will be subject to the Minister. There is no justification whatsoever for paying less than what is proposed here if you consider the salaries of the Heads of Departments who will be under the Ministers and who will have to do what the Ministers tell them. Imagine the Director of Education being paid more than the Minister for Education! Apart from the fact that the Minister will have other portfolios allocated to him, one could easily imagine that the Director of Education will regard himself as being superior to the Minister. Money, Mr. Speaker, as I am told by some of my friends who are better off than I, is a thing which is not without some significance in the world to-day.

There has been recognition of the office of Leader of the Opposition. There, again, the individual

matters not. It is not for this House to decide who will be the Leader of the Opposition. That is a matter for decision by the Head of the Administration. That office should have been recognised not merely now, but from the time that Members of the House who were Members of the Government received higher salaries by virtue of being Members of the Government. This is a democratic set-up, following close to the United Kingdom principle. The whole reason for taking out the Leader of the Opposition is to ensure democratic Government. He should be given all the encouragement possible, because you are thereby making it plain that a dictatorship is not acceptable, and that a Chamber of twenty-four Members all of one Party does not rule the roost in this country. To whom this salary may fall I do not know. Even if there is competition among members of a Party for it, the fact remains that the office deserves recognition as under the British constitution.

Continuing, Mr. Speaker, with this paragraph 11, subsection (5) says that there should be a Government hospitality vote of \$3,000 per annum to be controlled by the Premier (or Principal Minister) subject to reference to Executive Committee I support that proposal. I also agree with the honourable senior member for St. John that as long as you are providing this hospitality vote for entertainment by Ministers of certain important officials who come to this country, there is no justification for paying the same amount to the Head of the Administration for entertainment allowance as he now receives. You will have Ministers entertaining persons whom they did not have to entertain before, and when the other entertainment allowance comes up to be voted in due course it will receive my most critical attention.

Paragraph 14 informs us that in order to introduce the new system quickly the existing Central Secretariat organisation would be retained to serve all Ministries until the new accommodation is ready. We are also told that the Registrar and the Public Trustee would be housed in temporary offices near the Courts until permanent accommodation for them in that vicinity could be constructed. I think the words "in that vicinity" are important. The placing of the offices of Registrar and Public Trustee permanently near the Courts is long overdue. It is difficult and inconvenient for these officials located as they are now, with no offices near the Courts in Coleridge Street. Sometimes we may get a heavy rain and they cannot get from the Public Buildings to the Courts, and the work of the Courts is held up for the period of time that the rain continues.

Paragraph 15 reminds us that in the Five Year Plan a sum of \$750,000 was provided for Legislative buildings and Government offices. Mr. Speaker, may I recall the comments made around this Table by practically every member of this Chamber who was not in favour of spending this money on new Parliament buildings at this stage. While we are recalling one thing let us not overlook the views expressed by some honourable members who I have no reason to believe have changed them. Let us also remember the remarks made by the Honourable and Learned Member for St. Joseph who referred in his closing speech to the views expressed by honourable members as regards these Parliament buildings. If I do not misquote him, he said that as regards the question of priority the views expressed by honourable Members would be borne in mind.

I think, Sir, that having expressed general approval of the proposals I have also made sufficient comment on the details. The important thing is that

Barbadians and West Indians should be in a position to run their own show, and this method of Ministerial Status provides us with the best opportunity of running our own show, and for displaying our competence and ability to run our own show and to accept responsibility for anything that is done whether it receives universal approbation or whether it meets with violent public disapproval. We shall be able to put our hands on the person who has done something worthy of merit and we shall also be able to put our hands on the Minister who has done something we think merits our disapproval. That is the tremendous advantage of the system of Ministerial Status, and that is why it has become so long overdue. That is why we should no longer delay in bringing it into operation. Do not consider salaries in the light of the individuals who will be receiving them. The Ministers should be the very best paid or among the best paid people. Honourable members may refer to the Civil List and see what some heads of departments are getting. I did not quite agree with the Honourable Leader of the House when he said last night that as a result of this system there will be absolute self-Government in all our internal affairs, but in view of the importance of the role which Ministers will have to play in our internal affairs, I think they should receive remuneration adequate to that responsibility, and in proportion to the remuneration of those who will be subject to their control as far as matters of principle and policy are concerned.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—I tremble as I attempt to address this Chamber on a document of the importance of the one now being debated. I speak with some feeling on it. I think it is a great honour to be present when so important a decision is being made in this Chamber. Men govern countries and people with the switch of economies, and they do not temper it with mercy and sympathy for the other fellow. I think tonight of thousands who are in the various institutions who rely on the representatives of the people. I think of the thousands that have passed hoping and wishing for the day long coming when the Government of Barbados would be in a position to think in terms of internal self-government. This is a great occasion. But honourable members seem to radiate little or no enthusiasm or interest as they move into so important a discussion. A tremendous thing has happened, and I feel and know, Sir, it will bring much consolation in our old age when we look back and see what we have been able to assist in bringing about, and of which we will be able to feel proud. Sir I think of all the suggestions contained in the word "service". It is the greatest word in the dictionary. It is, to my way of thinking, one of the most noble things that any individual can do—to find himself having an opportunity of giving service to the people. I think, Sir, of the poor dejected mothers and the children lulled to sleep without sufficient food to keep them alive. I think of the poor fathers who produce the wealth of this country in the fields; and when we discuss this matter we should temper our deliberations by the thought of those in the wilderness.

I am happy on this occasion. I imagine how people will look back fifty years and re-read the speeches made in this Chamber on this occasion. I am happy, even if I achieve nothing else in my life, to be able to say tonight that I am in the service of the people. I feel tonight that service to the people is the best suggestion that I can pass on to members of this Assembly, especially to those who look upon politics as a mere means of existence, and who regard it merely as a means of achieving their personal ambition.

I know that this occasion is a source of great joy to the Leader of this House. It would be difficult and uncomfortable for honourable members to say, in his presence, what they would like to say. But with the passing of this Message to-day the Leader will have earned himself a monument full size and in bronze, not in clay, not like some honourable members who may deserve one of thickest and deepest clay. There are thousands on the way up, thousands never start, and thousands perish on the road. They whom the gods despise live on. We have been reading in the papers the attitude of certain people. They wonder whether or not we have got people capable of carrying on Ministerial Status. I hope that for record purposes the reporters will make sure that they will write down every single word. We came to this Island centuries ago an unwanted and rejected people. We had no power or knowledge, but to-day we are taking hold of the reins of Government. My entire being vibrates with strong emotion. Now that we are advancing to a greater measure of self-government it is refreshing to look back at the early work of the Party. I know that tonight the Leader is a worn man. No other man could stand up to what he has stood up to.

I have listened to the speeches of the Opposition. All we have heard about from them is salary. Imagine appointing a man as Minister, a member of the Cabinet, and giving him control of several departments; you must give him money to live on. You cannot have him shirking the responsibilities of his office because he has to struggle for a living for himself and his family. You should make him as financially independent as possible. The Leader of the Opposition found it difficult to get off on this debate. I expected quite a lot from him, but he said nothing positive. We were waiting for a message from the Opposition and they brought none. All we were told about is cost and salaries. They also complained of the House sitting late at night. When you are in the service of the people you work any time and at any hour. If the excuse is that you have to work in the day and cannot work at night why have you asked for the people's support? During the entire debate to-day something rested on my soul. I could feel the presence of Samuel Jackman Prescod, Sir Conrad Reeves and Dr. O'Neale. They sat up in their graves and examined this document. I am happy to know that this Government can bring freedom to the people and take the shackles from their bodies. Honourable members are laughing. In the middle of a debate like this they can laugh. Think of the untold thousands who have died without a hope, knowing nothing of this important measure which we are discussing this evening. At last we have a Government of the people which tempers economy with sympathy. Unless we have sympathy for the people we have nothing but the empty glory of being a member of the Assembly. I ask Honourable member to be aware of their responsibilities. Tonight we stand at the crossroads of destiny. I want the Ministers to take their responsibilities seriously—the Minister of Social Services, the Minister for Trade and Commerce. Think of the Five Year Plan and the industrial development of the country. Realise that we need another industrial revolution. You have got to remake this country. To the Minister of Agriculture I say, revolutionize this country. With the megasse from cane you can create a wax industry, you can make concentrated pig feed to sell for four or five cents a pound. Give the creamery scheme a rebirth. Not only will the manure from the cattle be of use agriculturally but it is essential that poor people should find themselves able to buy a

package of cream for less than three cents even though I cannot at present buy a half gill of milk. Bring the cassava factory into operation twenty-four hours a day. To-day with the British Government financing the citrus fruit scheme in St. Lucia and other Colonies you can buy rejects so that people can get them cheap. You have boundless possibilities, and I ask Government to be very careful in discharging the responsibilities which rest upon their shoulders. Do not expect any paid official who does not have to come up against the rigours of election to be as concerned about the advancement of the Colony as the elected Ministers. Use your abilities wisely and I am sure you will soon be moving in the right direction. Nothing succeeds like success.

I would like to say a word in connection with our population. I do not believe that honourable members take that problem seriously. During the Five Year Plan debate I mentioned it, and one honourable member said he did not believe that the problem would present any serious difficulty in the near future, but one authority has told us that our population will be trebled in 47 years. In the next decade the work of this Government will be completely destroyed if some attention is not paid immediately to the population problem. All the efforts of the past five years and the next five years will have been in vain. France, for example, wanted to keep her population static and to reduce it by 50%. When war came along the bulk of the male population had to be kept at home and they had to rely on foreigners to go and fight for France. They are contraceptives produced on the Continent; you swallow one and it keeps you immune for a week.

I would like to remind the House that the first six or seven men who attempted to form a Tribunal in England were banished from the country. I am asking the Government to-day to do its best. I will do my best. Let us realise that service to the people is a great honour. Let us die with our boots on. I ask members of this Chamber and those who will eventually be Ministers to be careful and sure in their planning, and they will have not only the people of the Island behind them, but all the thinking people of the world. You have seen the collapse in British Guiana. I know that Barbados will succeed where they have failed.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I want to make my contribution on what is perhaps the most important constitutional change which we in Barbados have ever experienced. I agree with the honourable junior member for St. John that Governor Marin's policy was correct for Puerto Rico. Marin had a socialistic policy when he came into power, but he had to face realities, and Puerto Rico is still part of the United States. The honourable junior member for St. John touched on the question of self-government. I think that the Secretary of State for the Colonies has said on several occasions that there are certain colonies in parts of the Colonial Empire which cannot achieve full self-government because of their size. He has said now that the British Caribbean units will achieve self-government within the framework of a Federation.

Without attempting to make a long contribution, I will speak at what I consider a national level, and not at a Party level, and I hope that what I say will be given serious consideration by my Party. Barbados has a great amount of poverty. We have always got to bear that in mind. We in Barbados have the Executive Committee Act of 1891. With the limited franchise such an Act did work well, but in line with the sociological changes which have taken place throughout the world Barbados has moved on and

we saw the birth of political Parties. Now we all know self-government will come because Great Britain realises the danger of being outvoted on the Security Council. The Colonies are all asking for more self-government and because of world factors the Secretary of State for the Colonies has to put up some form of self-government to us. But the question we must always ask ourselves, and which must always be of concern to us, is the question of cost. I think that most of the views expressed this afternoon have been on the question of cost, and I shall endeavour to deal with that at a later stage.

We all know that there were a certain amount of disadvantages in the "Bushe Experiment." For the last two years I have been happy to be a member of this Chamber, but whenever a member was prone to criticise the Administration we were told that we could not attack Civil Servants. At the same time we could not attack Executive Committee members. The constitutional change that we are making now will make us able to put someone on the spot, and there will be someone of whom we can ask questions. That will be a great difference from the former set-up, and I cannot agree with the honourable senior member for the City who said that there would not be much difference. In the proposed set-up the members who are now members of Executive Committee will be on the spot. They will have a full time job. They will have to devote all their time to that work. At the same time the system must be worked within the four corners of the law. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has expressly said that there should be no departure in working the present system from within the framework of the British Parliamentary system. I would say, like the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, that I think the success of the "Bushe Experiment" was largely due to two factors. One was, probably, the inherent ability of the Leader for compromise, because quite a number of people have said that he is good at compromise. As the lawyers say, a good compromise is better than a bad lose.

I think it will have been noticed that during the Socialist regime in Britain they tried to send down Governors here who were more actively connected with the development going on in the Colonial Office. We have also noticed by some recent appointments that the Colonial Office is apparently appointing older men as Governors of Colonies where Ministerial Status is granted, so that you will have the brake or check which is necessary. Now, I think that there is an important question which we must ask ourselves. As I have said, the Secretary of State for the Colonies has been prone to give the Colonies a greater measure of self-government. The question is, can we in Barbados afford to lag behind the other Colonies? I think the answer must be plainly in the negative. As soon as the other Colonies get Ministerial Status we should also do so.

Everyone knows my views on salaries and my views have not changed. As I have said, we should accept Ministerial Status, but we should accept it in keeping with our financial condition and in keeping with what our revenue is able to pay. Dealing with the proposals contained in this Message I think it is a good thing to see that, as far as the Police are concerned, the Force will maintain its independence and will be kept apart from politics. I am also glad to see that the traditions of the British Constitution which safeguards the Civil Service will be followed. I am likewise glad to see the proposed recognition of the Leader of the Opposition. Unless you want to have a totalitarian form of Government there must be an Opposition. If a country is going to evolve along democratic lines an Opposition is of vital neces-

sity. Democracy is bound to be endangered as long as there is one half living well and the other half living in slums. I say that, although it is true that in the framework of any country you get certain sociological inconsistencies. Now as regards the distribution of the various Ministries, I do not agree with the honourable member who said we should not have the same Minister for Trade and Commerce as for Labour. I do not share the views of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy on that point.

I would like to say that I do not share the views of my colleague on the paying of the ministers. I would like to see a different arrangement in the offices of the ministers as I feel that industry, tourism and minerals are all offices which a Minister of Labour could perform. I feel somewhere along the line that you should have a minister for Trade and Commerce. Even if anticipating a reply that a Minister for Labour in a labour capacity is actually operating and you also have a Trade Union functioning, there is the possibility that you will get some jar where that is concerned.

As regards the remuneration paid to members, I take it that this is a matter which should be related to what our finance can afford. There is no point in our harping back to the fact that we are extremely fortunate that we are getting some fairly good prices for our sugar. It is a fact that our finances are already hard pressed by high salaries of our Civil Servants and our social services still are far behind the time. Soon, there will be an extension of the General Hospital. There will be the possibility of our having to meet the cost of Federation; and the possibility of giving the Civil Servants better salaries; as well as the possibility of finding money to make provision for a Deep Water Harbour. All of these things we will have to bear in mind. I am no financial secretary but it is my feeling, with all these things in hand and to be done, that we will have to do something, not only in Barbados, but generally throughout the West Indies, to prime the economic pump so as to get more favourable conditions for the masses. I hope the future ministers will realise this. On this statement, I just have to remind you and draw to your attention the words of Mr. John Carter of British Guiana, while he was in England a few days ago, when speaking on the British Guiana situation. I think you all are well aware of what he told the British Government it would have to do if it did not want more people like the Jagans in British Guiana. I am saying that because the tendency of almost all West Indian leaders in recent times is to create a sort of impression and that is all. I say this in all sincerity to the Honourable Leader of this House, but it is the general feeling that West Indian Leaders do not much more than make trips to Colonial Office.

Another point I would like to deal with is that I do not think that in any ministerial form of government, it is good enough to have somebody of a different form of complexion in politics doing Government business. It is unknown in any form of constitutional set-up. I think that practice should cease. That is my own personal opinion.

As I have said, ministerial status has my approbation but I will throw out one suggestion. I am in general agreement with the draft Address in reply to His Excellency's Message but I am not all satisfied that we have borne in mind the cost of it. I am not speaking with regard to the cost of remuneration for the Ministers, because I feel that we will have to take on Ministers at a salary in keeping with the status and the duties which they are called upon to perform. However, I do suggest that there is not the necessity for all that office staff and all those salaries. I must

object to the salaries paid to these officers on the B.G. scale, because I was not at all satisfied when Civil Servants were recently increased in accordance with the B.G. scale. I then objected. However, it does appear that if we pay the higher Civil Servants according to that scale, it would be a foregone conclusion that the salaries of these officers for the ministerial set-up would be based on the same scale. It does not follow, however, that because a mistake was made on the last occasion, it should be repeated again. According to the Appendix, we need thirty-two (32) people to set up the Ministries. We have twelve people already and we would need to bring down a supplementary resolution to provide for twenty more people. In Appendix II, we have been given a structure of the staff allotted to one ministry — the Ministry of Communication and Works — in Trinidad, Jamaica and British Guiana. The comparative statement shows that they are full-term Civil Servants. It appears to me that the one Ministry in Jamaica is taking nineteen (19) people; Trinidad is taking nine (9) and British Guiana seven (7). That would mean that with the five ministries in British Guiana there would be thirty-five people, forty-five in Trinidad and ninety-five in Jamaica. We are told that our set-up would need thirty-two. I certainly think something can be done to pare that number down. We must also bear in mind that this personnel, in the course of time, will be eligible for pensions and that will mean an added 20% to the cost. I also hope that the other suggestions which have been drawn to the attention of this House by other honourable members as regards the question of cost will be borne in mind. We cannot say that things are in a happy way in this Colony. It is true that our finances are buoyant but it would be imprudent to attempt to say too much or too little on that statement.

Before I sit down, I wish to assure the honourable Leader of this House that I wish him extremely well and in all sincerity, and with all the goodness and depth of my heart, I hope that he may succeed. However, I would like to let the Leader of this House know that he works with people who are men and men all over the world have different personalities, different characteristics, different ideas and different feelings, and because of that, he cannot expect that all his desires will appeal to all alike. I am not going to put it any stronger than that and I hope he will take this bit of useful advice in all sincerity. Why I say so is because we are entering on a new experiment and it will need a good amount of common sense, decencies and human understanding on our part. You, Mr. Speaker, have made several visits to the United Kingdom; you have seen the standard of debate in the House of Commons recently on the British Guiana situation, and if you had read it you would have seen the amount of freedom that was allowed M.P.'s on both sides of the House of Commons and the tolerance that is given to members of parliamentary institutions. With these few remarks, I make one last appeal. As I have said I would like the Leader of the House to take note of human personalities, mannerisms and the various other things that are inherent in man, because we are embarking on a serious experiment. As I have said in all sincerity, I wish him well. (Cheers).

Mr. BARROW: We have heard a long recital of moral exhortations to the prospective members who will be put in the Ministries of the Government. We have heard lectures on political morality and the consensus of opinion of honourable members who spoke before me is that ministerial status is a good thing for this Island; that it is a step forward and the only fears which have been expressed are those

fears over the financing of the project and the manner in which the particular offices are to be carried out or occupied. However, anyone scrutinising the despatches from the Secretary of State for the Colonies and with a background knowledge of the Colonial Office and the British people's view in regard to general constitutional development, should not look at it as an exceedingly far step so far as this Island is concerned. I should like to disabuse from the minds of honourable members generally and the general public, especially members of the Houses of Parliament in the United Kingdom, that the British Government is conferring any new honour on this Island. I do not think we should be carried away at any time by platitudes on matters of this nature, because if we go back to 1891 we will see in the Executive Committee Act, which was the brain-child of the late Sir Conrad Reeves, that the Government of Barbados was placed firmly in the hands of the Executive Committee, the Executive Council of Barbados and four members of the House of Assembly appointed by the Governor of this Colony. It is surprising that members of Colonial Parliaments of Trinidad, British Guiana and Jamaica and the surrounding Caribbean territories are not aware of the fact that the Island of Barbados, in common with the Islands of Bermuda and the Bahamas, has had a large measure of non-interference by Colonial Office for the past 250 years of our parliamentary history. Therefore, the Executive Committee Act of 1891 really gave us something which was a form of ministerial government, but, at that time, there was no developed party system. The one deplorable fact of the Executive Committee Act was that members of the Executive Committee, who were appointed to the Government of this Colony, were not directly or indirectly elected but were nominated by the officer administering the Government of the Colony. This is the way in which the Imperial Government kept and exercised control over the Colonies. Another fact that is not generally known, especially in the United Kingdom Parliament, is that Barbados does not have to run to the British Treasury for grants-in-aid to balance its finances, neither do we have Orders-in-Council like those which still exist in the Island of Trinidad. There is no such thing as a Law of Trinidad. Everything is an ordinance and all legislation is done by Orders in Council. Not only is that the position of Trinidad but it is also so in British Guiana and the Gold Coast. It has been so since 1855, therefore any step that those Colonies made forward was something which should be applauded on all sides.

Colonial constitutional development evolved in the following manner. We had the idea of one-chamber Colonial constitutional development, we are involved in this manner. We had the idea of one-chamber government at first completely composed of nominated members, largely representing commercial and industrial interests. The second stage was that of partly elected and partly nominated members and the third stage was of a wholly elected chamber. There are few territories in the British Empire, excluding the Dominions, which have a wholly elected chamber. Trinidad does not have one, neither British Guiana. Jamaica has one to a very limited extent. As a matter of fact, even in the Gold Coast where thirty-five members of the Chamber were elected by popular franchise it is not a wholly elected Chamber. The Leader of this House therefore may be correct to say that we have a very highly developed form of government. However, despite the fact that for fifty-five years we have had a fully representative Lower Chamber, we still have an Upper Chamber and the Executive Council reflecting interests other than those of the popularly elected Chamber.

We come now to the Bushe experiment in 1946. Even at that time the Executive Committee Act of 1891 had not been changed. As far as I can see, it may be changed in 1953 in one respect and one respect only. I am coming to that in a short time. In 1946, instead of the Governor appointing four members of the House to the Executive, we have Sir Grattan Bushe saying he "will send for the person who appears to him to be best able to command a majority in the House of Assembly and will ask him to submit to him names from the House for membership of the Executive Committee and members of the Executive Committee will be asked respectively to take charge of the general policy relating to particular departments of Government." We then have Sir Hilary Blood saying, as a general rule, he would accept the advice of the four members of the House of Assembly who sit in Executive Committee. That is the position up to today. As I was saying, the Executive Committee Act was not changed as a result of this new set-up.

The one significant feature of the Message which came from the Secretary of State for the Colonies is that our revolutionary changes are going to be brought about by conventions rather than by Act of Parliament. So, it can be seen that the Executive Committee Act will still be on the Statute Book mainly as it is. By the change, there will be five members from the House of Assembly on the Executive Committee instead of four. It is still open to the Leader of this House, if he so desires to add this other member from this House and, if he does so, then the Executive Committee Act of 1891 would have to change, but that would be only in so far as numerical strength is concerned.

We can look at this in two ways. We can say that the late Sir Conrad Reeves was very far-sighted, and far more politically advanced than was popularly accepted at that time or afterwards; or, alternatively, we can look at it in the light of our recent constitutional development and say that it is safer to leave the Executive Committee Act as it is and deal with conventions. I support Ministerial Status heartily. As a matter of fact, I assisted the honourable member on my right in writing what is contained about Ministerial Status in the Manifesto of the Labour Party. I felt at that time that it was a right thing to let the people under the banner of the Labour Party know that Ministerial Status was one of the desirable things for the good government of this country. Of course, it is not one of the things which spring from the people or the Colonial Office or from the masses themselves, although some countries have evolved in that way. It is a question of what is expedient or what can be done without causing any harm at the particular moment. As I have said before, the significant thing about these changes is that they are to be brought about and completely engineered by the process of convention. Although for fifty-five years we have had the Executive Committee Act, I wonder why the people living in that period were not aware of the fact that it provided an excellent training for ministerial responsibility? If they had thought about it, I am sure Ministerial Status would have been brought about before. It may be that the Leader of this House has the genius no matter what its political complexion may be, to be *persona grata* with the Metropolitan Government and by that he was able to get his views and that of his Party put over in acceptable form. That is no reflection on the Honourable Member. I look at it as a tribute to him and to his personality. Conventions are more or less made by personalities and brought into effect by people with the particular personality suiting the particular occasion. In this case, it will be

brought about by people with the personality suited for a political atmosphere.

To give you an idea that conventions depend a lot on personalities, I need only refer you to when Mr. Bonar Law died rather suddenly somewhere in 1922. When he died, Lord Curzon, who was a former officer in Mr. Bonar Law's Government, had been His Majesty's Plenipotentiary and Ambassador Extraordinary and Viceroy of India. As Mr. Bonar Law died, Lord Curzon hastened to England, but his personality was not one that was generally acceptable to the Conservatives in Parliament, and, because of their feelings against him, although he should have succeeded to the premiership of Great Britain, he didn't. Mr. Stanley Baldwin, who was the number three man in the cabinet, became Prime Minister when Mr. Bonar Law died. King George V sent for Lord Curzon who had made a big dash from the north to London. According to an eye-witness account, he set out for Buckingham Palace with his wife choosing the members of his Cabinet on the way. On receiving audience with His Majesty, he was informed that his Majesty had had consultation with quite a number of former Premiers of Great Britain—eight were alive at the time—and reluctantly he had come to the conclusion that a lord should not be Prime Minister and had appointed Mr. Stanley Baldwin as Premier of Great Britain. Up to that time, there was not such a convention that a member of the House of Lords could not be Premier of Great Britain, but by that particular accident, it is now accepted as a convention by people—and we can all see the good reasons behind it. Obviously, that convention arose because Lord Curzon was unacceptable to his own party, and not because there was any such convention in Great Britain at the time. Now we have conventions in Barbados and conventions are things which are flexible and depend on the personalities of those persons most in contact with the machinery of Government at high level. One convention, recognised by one Secretary of State, may never be recognised by another Secretary of State. Therefore, it may be a question that this Government might find itself undergoing drastic modifications when another Premier assumes office. Perhaps it may be a good thing that we are doing this by conventions, because the more flexible it can be, the more we can make it work successfully.

I now come to the point where I would say that, at this stage in our constitutional development, I do not see the Secretary of State for the Colonies granting us any new dispensation. So far, Barbados could have had Ministerial status already because it was further ahead than any other Colony in this respect. If other Colonies have been granted Ministerial status, there is no earthly reason why we should not have it as well.

We have found ourselves in the position where there are in the Executive Committee, members, who are virtual members of the Opposition. That is an anomalous situation. We want a constitutional advance which will give us Cabinet Government at this stage of our history. I hope that, in the not far distant future, this anomaly will be removed. I also hope that the Ministers will make such a success of this new development that, in the course of time, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whoever he may be, will say that it is quite useless to set up a government and then to have virtual members of the Opposition in the Cabinet.

As regards the expenses, I do not intend to say that the salaries are too high. I am not going to say that Mr. So and So should not have that money. I do not look at personalities. However, I would advise

the Government of Barbados to follow the example of the Government of Jamaica and abolish some of the overlords and the Directors of the different departments which are at present in this Colony. Nearly every Government department is a small empire—every Head of a Government Department acts in his own right. If you take the salaries of the head officers of the Departments of Government and add them up, you will find that they come to thousands of dollars. In Jamaica, they have abolished the post of Director of Education as the senior man for the Education Department, and appointed advisers to the ministers. I see no need for Ministers administering the Departments and all these high-salaried Directors too.

The next measure I would like to suggest is that departments like the Public Works Department, the Highways and Transport and the Waterworks Department can all be amalgamated with a general supervisory officer and specialised engineers for each department. Instead of having in one department, six high-salaried engineers, you can make three do and employ three other surveyors. I do not think there is sufficient in this island to justify all these technical men. Most of the work that is done by these departments is that of maintenance. Most of their work in its nature is supervisory and not of an exploratory nature. Therefore, a lot of these departments can be amalgamated and the functions of the dignitaries should be telescoped and put under the general supervision of the Ministers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I made and the brief examination into the constitutional issue is purely for disposing from the minds of certain people that we were granted some wonderful dispensation, which we were not entitled to and which we did not merit. When I was in England, I mentioned to some members of Parliament that these Colonies should move on to self-government. One of the members, who was on a Colonial Parliamentary Committee said, "We are educating you people for self-government." I stopped him and asked him to allow me one question arising out of the answer. I asked him "When you talk of educating us for self-government, when is the examination?" We, in Barbados, are prepared to sit the examination now, and not only now, but for a long time. When the British people were granted universal suffrage some years ago—I am not good at dates—about 80% of them were illiterate and the *Times* newspaper called it a "shot in the dark." No one can think with a degree of accuracy how smoothly this system of Ministerial status will operate in its first stage, because there may be resentment and friction from the Administration. Ministers will have to get acclimatised to their new positions and it will take some time for them to adapt themselves to the new conditions, but that does not mean that it will be a "shot in the dark," as it was when the British people were granted universal franchise some years ago. I do not think anyone will have to educate us to this position as so many British Parliamentarians to see how far we have advanced. This general momentum nourished by the personalities of the moment and at different points in our history will illustrate that we do not need an examination on these matters. It is largely due to our good sense and expediency that this change has been brought about. It would be surprising if, after having the Executive Committee functioning for fifty-five years, the colony is not now sufficiently tutored to handle this experiment.

I do not think that ministerial status is at all synonymous with a high level of unemployment. The only exhortation which I shall give is for the

Ministers to perform their functions in a statesman-like manner and, if there is some kind of machinery implemented for the wishes of the people to be reflected in the actions of the Government, I think that there will be a great chance of improving the general economic conditions of this Colony. What I think we are not fully aware of is that, although we have a party system, we do not have a democratic party machinery, either on this side of the table or on the other side. We should have a set-up for letting the electorate in the rural and country districts know something of the workings of party government. There are no delegate conferences at present. I believe our party is going to see about this in the near future although it is true we have that set-up in the Trade Union movement but not in the party to which I belong. Except at Election time, we have no means of reflecting the sentiments of the people who support us in this House. Our measures are somewhat empirical. All that we have is a rough platform of what we are going to do and we have to assume in many cases that what we are doing comes from the mandate we have received from the people, and has not been revoked since then. The people should approve of our doing certain things under ministerial status. For us to do things on our own would not be good enough. I do not think the salaries of Ministers would be justified unless on this side of the table and on the other side, each party has some machinery for disseminating its views. In every democratic state, there is machinery for feeding electoral colleges and that sort of thing to keep the people in close contact with the wishes and aspirations of the people. If we wish to operate this Government properly, we must rectify that position immediately. We must have democratic machinery, especially in view of the fact that we do not have a representative Press. We must have some machinery to keep us in touch with the people of this Island — the electors of the parishes and the people who put us in the House of Assembly — to make sure that we have their confidence and that the Ministers have the confidence of the Members of this House. In that way, I have no doubt that, in a very short space of time, we will advance to full self-government.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: There is not one convention which I hope will take effect as much as that in which only a few members of either party will have to speak for the whole party. I would like to say that it would be fairly difficult for me to add to the debate, owing to the excellent speeches which I have heard and which cover the whole ground. I only rise to move an amendment, which is quite harmless except that it puts into effect what we all were saying as regards the cost of the scheme, which is not satisfactory to us. According to the amendment, we feel that there should be a further examination to see if it can be done with less cost to the Island. That does not mean an attack on any one person or any other person. It is only asking the Government to look into the matter again to see, as some honourable members have put it, whether or not this senior staff is necessary to carry out the proposals.

My personal views are — I am an older man than the Leader of this House—that he should take only the number of the Ministers he requires. Personally, I think it would be safer to start with four, and then if needs be to take along another. He will find that the amount of money which he might save could be put to certain other duties which are not expected to be done at this moment. I do not want to play with figures because we can make figures play any sort of tricks. I only will say that, at present,

you are taking five members out of twenty-four to run the Ministries, and if you make a percentage of that, you will find that in other countries which have six hundred members to form its parliament, there would be one hundred and twenty-five persons going to the ministries. But, of course, this is not so.

The honourable junior member for Christ Church and the honourable senior member for the City have expressed the views of the Opposition—I mean of the party to which we belong—on ministerial system. What we all said is that we shall be glad when ministerial status sets in. It is in the memorandum of our Party that we sent when consulted by the then Acting Governor, Mr. Turner, and the different letters and messages from the Governor and the Secretary of State for the Colonies have correctly outlined the proposals. Mr. Turner put forward his proposals to the Secretary of State for the Colonies from the suggestions of all shades of opinion in this Colony and in reply, the Secretary of State for the Colonies said in his despatch that “the proposals which I observe have been put forward after consultation with representatives of the political parties and other leading members of the community in the Legislative Council and with the members of Executive Council, involved the setting up of a ministerial system with the assumption by the House of Assembly members of Executive Committee of executive responsibility for a number of departments of Government.” The honourable senior member for the City and the honourable junior member for Christ Church pointed out that, so far as our Party was concerned, we have agreed to ministerial status. We have agreed to it since 1949, when the House passed an Address asking that we set up ministerial status with responsible ministers from this House operating the Government. It therefore can no longer be a question that we do not desire a form of ministerial system. When we were asked to give our opinion on the subject we said that, with the necessary safeguards required in any political movement, we thought it should be done.

After listening to the honourable member who has just spoken, I actually agree with nearly everything he said. I also share the view expressed by Mr. Turner in paragraph 19 of his letter dated 30th April, 1953, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Mr. Turner said: “It has been represented that the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General should cease to be members of the Legislative Council, that Government business should be conducted in that Chamber by one of the members of the Government Party who would be appointed by the Governor on the advice of the Principal Minister, and further, that the members of Executive Council should no longer be included in Executive Committee as such, but that Executive Committee should consist of the Chief Secretary, the Attorney General, the House of Assembly members and the member selected to be the Government spokesman in the Legislative Council. This, however, does not represent the majority view, which is that changes on these lines should not be made as part of the present proposals”. Mr. Turner said that he shared the majority view and that is my view also and the view of my Party.

The Honourable Leader of this House has stated that his Party's view is in favour of the Principal Minister being called Premier and that he is going to ask that that be the designation, with the approbation of the Government. Mr. Turner said that that designation did not receive the approval of the majority of the people whom he consulted and the Secretary of State for the Colonies did not approve of it, but stated that he would give way to it, if it were

insisted on. Speaking for myself, I would have preferred the title of Principal Minister.

Many of us think that when ministerial status is entered on, it will mean the same thing to us as it means in Great Britain. This is not so. However, it is the next step to self-government, which is a desirable step, and for other reasons, it is a correct step. I have every confidence that it will work right. Politically, we will be more capable of taking on that step than other Colonies that have been granted ministerial status.

I will not deal with the choice of the Ministers. That is a matter for the Leader of this Government. However, I hope that he will not go outside of the members who are at present serving on the Government, but that is my own personal opinion. It is a matter for him.

I refer to the amendment again. It is only on the question of cost—we accept, of course, the preceding paragraphs of the Address because they are merely introductory—that we are making an amendment to para. 4. We also accept the first part: “The House appreciates the difficulties inherent in financing a new system such as has been proposed, but this is what our amendment is saying for the balance of that paragraph—“The House is apprehensive of the “cost envisaged in Your Excellency’s Message. The “House is not convinced that the benefits derived “therefrom are commensurate with the large expenditure which will be necessitated and the House “is of the opinion that further study should be devoted to a consideration of means of reducing such “expenditure”. I will suggest that all Honourable members would agree to this amendment. I beg to move that this be the amendment to paragraph 4. I think it is the feeling of many of us. We should be prepared to vote for this amendment so that we can reduce the staff and the expense involved in this set-up. Certainly we can do so at the beginning. I know that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that you cannot have it on the cheap, but I want to tell him not to accept necessarily any advice on this matter. It is better to come to us afterwards and tell us it cannot be done unless we are given more staff, and we know that we will have to appoint more staff because we will have known that it was at the irreducible minimum.

There is an Efficiency Expert who is coming here shortly. I feel he can tell us something on this question. I feel he should be consulted on this question. We were told at one time and it was mentioned in this debate that some of the Assistant Secretaries were being obtained so as to prepare them for the time when this change would come about. Now it is proposed to set it up, it does seem to us strange that they are not using this staff for the set-up as had been planned, but have put forward the supposed needs for an increase of staff. I think the biggest mistake we can make is to think that we have the money to carry out the scheme as on the lines of either Jamaica, Trinidad, or for that matter, British Guiana. It is the natural desire of anyone, whether he is buying a car, a suit of clothes or ministerial system, that he would not want it on the cheap; but according to what he can afford. Therefore, you should only want ministerial system on what you can afford. I am hoping, as we have suggested in the amendment, and it can be done without any delay, that you should go back over this expenditure in order to see whether you can lessen the expenditure to the Island. The honourable senior member for St. George has put a suggestion that it may be possible, as I understand him, to lessen the expenditure of the Colony by decreasing the senior staff.

That would be the same in effect as disposing of some of the senior officers in the various departments and merely having necessary supervisory officers who would be required to do the day’s work. I believe that in one of the Islands that has adopted ministerial system, the office of Director of Education has been dispensed with. It is paying an educational officer a minimum salary in his place. That means to say that it only has somebody to give specialised opinions. He would be equivalent to the Director of Education. As I understand ministerial system, it is going to be the duty of the minister in charge of Education, to direct the system of education which he wants to put into effect, even if he takes advice from whomsoever he has to give it. I am merely stating that for this system of ministerial status which we have down here, we already have a top-heavy Secretariat and, because of that, you will have too top-heavy a staff with nothing to do. Don’t let us fool ourselves, if an officer finds himself with nothing to do, he will walk with paper from drawer to drawer. He will do that, because he knows that if he does nothing his job will be at stake. If you start with a certain staff you cannot cut it down. As some of us said earlier, we did not have much time to look through these proposals. Personally, I did not receive my copy until the 8th instant. There may be other criticisms, but in the short space of time at our disposal, this is the best thing that we can make of it. As is known, we got together so as to be able to cut down on the long speeches. That is why I think it is not necessary for me to make any more speech than this, because the hon. junior member for Christ Church and the honourable senior member for St. Michael have put in their speeches the points which may necessarily arise from this side of the Opposition.

I would like to agree with the honourable junior member for St. Lucy on this point. If you reflect on the ministerial status that has been given us, it does not give us complete control other than on this island itself. Not yet. I did interpret the constitutional change on much the same lines as the honourable senior member for St. George. I accept in these words which are given in the letter I read before that it involves “the setting up of a ministerial system with the assumption by the House of Assembly members of Executive Committee of executive responsibility for a number of departments of Government.”

In addition to the points I have made, it is important to get this Efficiency Expert who may be in a position to put up alternative suggestions as to the use of your staff. I think we should get a survey of the Colony in the particular circumstances. You should be able to get a survey of your members of the Secretariat and of the other branches of the Civil Service which deal with this matter. As I have said before, it would be better to find yourself in the position of having insufficient staff and using more from the Secretariat. The points I have already mentioned and the other points that have been mentioned by other honourable members cover all the ground I think should be covered on this ministerial system. I will only draw the attention of the honourable members for the last time to the amendment which I moved to the Address. In truth and fact, it does not change the special circumstances of the Address. It merely pleads for economy.

Mr. HAYNES : Mr. Speaker, I think on this occasion I should not give a silent vote, because this is a matter of very great importance. As far as I have heard from all sections of this House, the one

and only controversial point in this scheme is the cost of it. That is all our fears. I think the cost is worrying everybody. I believe it is even worrying the honourable senior member for St. Joseph because on one or two occasions before, I have heard him worrying over the increasing cost of various things. The Turner Report has cost us \$100,000. The Dos Santos Report starts with \$415,000 and now we are going to embark on this scheme as set out costing us the extraordinary figure of \$84,000. As has been mentioned by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, the pensions of the officers that will be appointed to these posts — that is, if they are pensionable — would also mean a 20% increase of the salary. Well, Sir, with regard to the 21 officers that you will have to appoint, if you appoint them, they will be here until their time is up. They then will be entitled to pensions and that will add to the cost of this scheme. It is amusing to watch how rapidly the Government Officers' Pension Scheme is rising in every year's Estimates. I am going to throw out a small suggestion and that is, that the additional 21 officers should be appointed on a temporary basis; in case their services will be needed after that they then can be appointed permanently. Our finances are low. We only have one thing to depend on for our economy and that is sugar. If that gets low, you must have retrenchment. If these officers are made permanent and you retrench with them, you must have pensions to give them. This is, very roughly, my suggestion for appointing temporary staff. If it is feasible, I would ask you to consider it.

I beg to second the amendment moved by the honourable junior member for St. James.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to speak now, because of the lateness of the hour, but on an important matter like this I must reply to the points that have been raised. If I may deal with the last two honourable members first, let me repeat — I will use words that the honourable junior member for St. James used — we have not taken word on the financial proposals from any imported officials. We have substantially cut down wherever we could. We are taking a risk to start with the amount that you have seen in these proposals. I might still be frank. In regard to the whole experience of the working of ministerial system, you must endeavour to go to the stage when Ministers run their own departments and do not double-up with somebody else. The last Honourable Member who has spoken has said that I am worrying over the finances of this country. Certainly I am worrying. I know what the Five Year Plan means. I see that things crop up that you do not foresee, and because of that we spend more and more money. I know what it means to be asking the people to support you and then you go and tax them. If I am beginning to look old, it is because of worry over the financial working of this Colony. We know what it means when you are demanding improved social services. We know what it means to keep them at a particular level. Sir, every soul that has spoken to us about running a ministerial system has said "do not attempt it if you think you can run it on the cheap. If you think so, it is going to break down" In spite of that, we are taking the risk.

Let us take some of the arguments used. Let us take the one about the Fifth Minister being pressed on us. Mr. Turner himself never talked of less than five. In his report, it was suggested that there should be a minister without portfolio, but that minister would have to be paid.

(A VOICE: But less salary.)

Sir, we cannot use less than five ministers when this system is brought about. To say that, because the four of us are functioning now, there is no work for the fifth minister to do is a mistake. The Hon. Member on my right is responsible for Trade and Commerce as well as Agriculture. It is considered unreasonable to continue to work these two offices in that way, because there is too much to be done on the agricultural side and too much on the side of trade and commerce.

With regard to staff, there will be one permanent secretary between two departments. This is my first point as regards to the Ministries. It was felt that, because of the intense work that will have to be done in these two branches of our public life — the agricultural and the industrial — it would be necessary to separate them. But, on the grounds of reducing expenses to a minimum, it was decided not to have two separate staffs. There will be an assistant secretary on the lower level attached to each of the ministries, but one permanent secretary of the rank of Assistant Colonial Secretary will look after two ministries. Later on, it will be necessary to have a permanent secretary to each ministry.

Let us take the question of the Upper House. I believe everybody knows my feeling on this matter. As the hon. senior member for St. George has said, it will be possible for a man, not of our party, but by his belonging to the Other Place, to sit on the Executive Committee though opposed to the Government. We know that is not going to work well. The fact that the Attorney General in recent years and the Colonial Secretary for years, if not centuries, have done the work in the Upper House for the Government and, because it used to work well in the old days, does not mean that it will work well under ministerial system. Obviously, it worked well then because they were all Conservatives together. The average Colonial Secretary, as far as I know, is generally conservative. Few are Socialists. Of course, that is presuming he has any politics. That is, speaking as far as you can guess. The obvious socialist of them all within recent times was Mr. Perowne.

Honourable Members can see that you must have members of the Executive Grade, Senior Clerks and Long Grade Clerks for each of the Ministers. We are adding three Senior Clerks, which means that there will be five instead of two at the present. You must face the fact that ministerial status will cost you money, but you must pay for it if you agree to have it. You will need staff other than that in the Secretariat.

Let us take the Upper House again. We have already dealt with the point of a person on the Executive Committee, who is not a member of the Party, administering the Government. They must be purely Government Officials, otherwise they will have to go. I say that, obviously, but as I have said already, it does not matter at the present moment to let it remain constituted as it is. In actual practice, the views of the Executive Members from this House will always be carried. Therefore, when they are sitting down in meetings, they will only be advisory to the Governor. He will have to take our advice. That is the system. They will be able to express their point of view and we will listen to them. If they do not agree with us, they are free to express their point of view, which can be ignored, but the advice of the Executive Member from this House will have to be accepted. As I have said, it will not hurt in the early stages of ministerial system if they are not members of our Party. It is for this reason that I am appealing

for Party discipline. While I am saying so, I do not mean to say that I will disapprove of any member expressing his point of view. As a matter of fact, I despise a man whom I think is a "yes man".

If I may go back to the question of the Upper House; if you have somebody in the Upper House conducting your business, you will have to pay him as a full-fledged minister. There again, on the question of sense, you are already paying the Colonial Secretary and the Attorney General to do your business. What I am pointing out to you is that you cannot look at the matter of having somebody in the Upper House from one angle. You have to look at it from every angle, particularly from the angle of cutting down your expenses. Let me say again that, on Mr. Turner's visit to Trinidad, British Guiana and Jamaica, he was advised on all sides that you cannot run this ministerial system on the cheap. You must have the full staffing for each minister. I am not really surprised at the turn the debate has taken on the question of expenses, because it is Barbadian all over to be as economical as he possibly can. You cannot accuse the people of this Island of being on the road to corruption. I would not put it stronger than that. I will only say that it is rather amusing when another Sister Colony is asking for £50 more for each minister we are questioning the amount that has been sent down for each minister. I will only draw to the knowledge of Honourable Members that they should know that the Income Tax Rates on a salary of £2,000 puts a man receiving that salary in just a trifle better position than the man receiving £1,500. It is for this reason that I thought some Honourable Member would have suggested that ministers get their salaries free of Income Tax and, of course, members of this House too. I am perfectly open to suggestions on this point from Honourable Members. They can say later whether they think they should receive their salary free of Income Tax on all or portions of it. It is true that, for political reasons, it was suggested that Honourable Members should pay Income Tax on the salary which they received from Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very short. I think it is only fair to say that we can congratulate ourselves on the standard of the debate at this meeting. I think we have heard some extraordinarily good speeches. I must single out that of the honourable senior member for St. John. I was pleased to hear him say that it was far better to govern yourself badly when you are grown-up than to have somebody governing you better than you could govern yourself. That applies to any nation. I wish to congratulate sincerely the honourable senior member for St. John. I, however, must say that his address went a little "wonky wonky" when he suggested salaries for the ministers and other honourable members of this House.

I think there are one or two things more which I should make clear. The honourable senior member for the City questioned on the phrase "grave and exceptional circumstances" as is contained in para. 20 of Mr. Turner's despatch. That is the phrase which is used in all circumstances such as that in which it appears. It amounts to this. The Governor must take our advice on all legitimate matters. But suppose we send down a Bill declaring ourselves not members of the British Empire, that would be an expression to amount to a grave and exceptional circumstance. I am glad that the honourable member referred to it. There are expressions of a more or less degree of the phrase "grave and exceptional circumstances". I think there is a different phrase to ours used in the Jamaica constitution.

I am rather sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable junior member for Christ Church in his speech repeated everything he read in a newspaper. He spoke of legislation being rushed through this House at late hours and during the wee hours of the morning. I will say at the outset that, as Leader of the House of Assembly, I fully respect his position as Leader of the Opposition, and in that position of mutual trust I have never tried to put anything over him. When the hon. member talks of rushing through things at late hours, he knows very well that I have never done anything without telling him that it would be dealt with at such a time. The same co-operation existed between the former junior member for St. James, who was the then Leader of the Opposition, and myself. It is not good enough to say that legislation is rushed through the House during the wee hours of the morning, because the chief mouthpiece of the Income Tax Payers Association says so. The fact that the debates are late has nothing to do with ministerial status. The lateness of the debates is due chiefly to the fact of the death of two reporters. When the honourable member refers to the conducting of Government business in such a manner as to have recesses, I am very glad he agrees with it but, of course, in order to do so, we would have to meet more often during a week. If we do that, probably we can have three breaks in the year. The honourable member also referred to question time. Again, that has nothing to do with ministerial status. In my opening remarks, I did point out that questions had to be put in the usual manner—there is no other way than that we follow at present—when they would be sent to different departments of Government. Under ministerial status, there would be a minister in charge of a particular Government department. The answers will be made and, after they have been given, if honourable members want to debate them they can do so. I do not think there is any other point which I should reply to.

In conclusion, I will again say that the four of us from this House, on the Executive, have examined and re-examined the financial proposals and, as far as we could cut them down, we have done so. We cannot cut them down any more. We are asking the House to give us a fair trial. We will bear in mind all the suggestions that have been made, especially what the honourable junior member for St. Andrew said. It may be possible with officers lower down the scale that you can put them on probation for a few years until you see how it works. I do, however, ask the House to accept the fact that we have cut the expenditure down to an irreducible minimum and I do not see how we can cut them down any more. We will take the necessary safeguards; if we can retrench, we will do so, but there is little chance of that being possible.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part was put, and on a division being called for, was decided in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows —

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. COX and Mr. WILLIAMS—(12).

Noes: Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—(6).

Mr. SPEAKER: I now declare the Ayes have it.

The question that the words proposed to be deleted stand part was put, and on a division, being

called for, was decided in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. COX and Mr. WILLIAMS—(12).

Noes: Mr. VAUGHAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. GODDARD—(6).

The question that the Address do now pass was put and agreed to without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will call on the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— As I have to leave the Island very soon and I may not be back for about three weeks, I must ask to be excused

from presenting the Address. Other arrangements can be made for its presentation. I beg to move, Sir, that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, the 17th instant, at 3.00 o'clock p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, — I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 24th of November, at 3.00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: I would suggest to honourable members that they meet next Tuesday to deal with certain items of Government Business and they can then have a long adjournment.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday next was put and agreed to without division, and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.