

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1959

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5th May, 1959.

Pursuant to the adjournment the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon today.

PRESENT

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Leader of the Opposition*); Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Premier*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); His Honour Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. C. E. TALMA; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES and Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*).

Prayers were read.

Messrs. STRAUGHN, CRAWFORD and CORBIN entered the House and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting held on 28th April, 1959 have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members, and unless there be any objection, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. (*After a Pause.*) There being no objection, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

By command Papers were laid as follows:—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General and the amounts due by the various Post Offices etc. to 28th February, 1959.

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise receipts for twelve months ended 31st March, 1959.

Barbados Statistical Service - Selected Monthly Indicators - February, 1959.

Barbados Statistical Service - Monthly Indicators - March, 1959.

Barbados Statistical Service - Quarterly Digest of Statistics No. 9 - March, 1959.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) (Amendment) Order, 1959.

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1959.

Hon. M. E. COX: The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1959.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 5) (Amendment) Order, 1959."

Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 10) Order, 1959."

Resolution to place the sum of \$776,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1959-60 Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1959-60, No. 1 which form Schedule I to the Resolution in order that with effect from the 1st of April, 1959, a non-pensionable Cost of Living Allowance may be paid to persons in the full time service or employment of the Government.

Resolution to place the sum of \$32,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part I, Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates, 1959-60, No. 2 which form Schedule I to the Resolution in order that with effect from the 1st of April, 1959, a non-pensionable Cost of Living Allowance may be paid to members of the staff of Government-aided Secondary Schools.

Resolution to place the sum of \$67,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1959-60, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1959-60, No. 3 which form Schedule I to the Resolution in order that with effect from the 1st of April, 1959, an additional Cost of Living Allowance may be paid to persons in receipt of pension from the Government.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to deal with the money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:—

WHEREAS the maximum expansion of the Tourist Industry is of the utmost importance to the economic future of the entire West Indies Federation and therefore every possible effort should be directed to the achievement of this end;

AND WHEREAS one of the main obstacles to the increase in the flow of visitors to the area is the high cost of air transport to and throughout the West Indies, as

compared with transport costs obtaining to other centres of tourist attraction or indeed, with the average cost of air transport elsewhere;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Barbados take the initiative in the calling of a conference of all air transport lines serving the area with a view to obtaining drastic reductions in the aforesaid rates and with a view to placing the resort and recreational amenities of the West Indies within reach of the maximum number of potential visitors from North and South America, Europe and elsewhere.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. junior member for St. James be appointed to act as Chairman of Committees for today's sitting.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I propose to make a statement relative to a statement which was made in this House on Tuesday last. The hon. senior member for St. Peter in the course of a debate on another matter, I think it was the reply to the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor, did state that the Government had appointed two Ministers to Guardians Committees in the Southern area.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You cannot allow the hon. member to speak on something when it had been drawn to your attention and corrected by you. That is nonsense. The statement was made and corrected in the debate and the debate is still going on. This idea of coming in with statements.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not now speaking on a point of order, and should desist from any personal reference.

Mr. WALCOTT: He made personal reference to me. He said that the hon. senior member for St. Peter made a statement about something which the Government did.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a personal reference.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is a statement which you have already corrected and you should not allow the hon. member to continue.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: That would happen to me. He was out of order when he made a statement which you corrected before.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two wrongs never make one right. The hon. member for St. Peter said he got that information at the time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: If the hon. member will allow me to continue, he will hear the substance of what I want to say. The hon. member's statement was substantiated by the hon. senior member for St. George.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, I never said the Government had appointed anyone.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It is true, Sir, that I did try to correct that on Tuesday last, but there is something further I want to add. On further inquiries I found out that there was some truth in what was said, and in the interim in personal consultation with the Ministers concerned and realising that their continuing to sit on these Committees might be somewhat embarrassing to Government at some future date, they have agreed not to serve on these Committees; but at the same time they want to make it quite clear that there is nothing which legally prevents them from serving on these Committees, and there is nothing which prevents any Local Government

authority from appointing Ministers to these Committees. I want to make that quite clear, but what I am saying is that the Ministers have agreed not to serve on these Committees.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the House of Assembly (Remuneration of Members) Act, 1949.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION OF MEMBERS) ACT, 1949.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order deals with the proposed amendment to the Remuneration of Members Act, 1949, with special reference to the office of Speaker. It is felt, Sir, that the office of Speaker of this Assembly should be put on equal footing and status with that of other Speakers in the Caribbean area.

I have before me figures which give the salaries paid to Speakers in the other islands. In Jamaica, the salary paid to the Speaker is £1,500; he gets an entertainment allowance of £200, a travelling allowance of £522, a subsistence allowance of £220 and an office allowance of £500. That brings it up to almost in the vicinity of £3,000. In British Guiana, the Speaker gets a similar salary of £1,500, a house allowance of £200, travelling allowance of £125 and a chauffeur allowance of £150. 12.35 p.m.

In Trinidad he gets £1,500, furnished quarters, the nominal rental of which amounts to £50, entertainment allowance amounting to £300, travelling allowance £225, chauffeur allowance £187. 10s. and a free telephone provided. In Barbados he gets £1,000 and an entertainment allowance of £125.

As I have said, it is proposed to place that office as nearly as possible on equal status to persons holding the office of Speaker in the area. As is proposed here, the amount is \$6,480, travelling allowance at the rate of \$720 per annum and it is not here - but it is proposed that he be given a free telephone.

The office of Speaker becomes a wholetime office and he is, so to speak, the Head of a Department. He has under his supervision two Clerks, Reporters and Typists, Messengers and a Librarian. He will be required to come to his office daily and the reason for the service of a free telephone is this. As Your Honour and the House knows, Your Honour very often has to be called to the telephone on the business of the Legislature in order that Ministers may get your permission to proceed with certain orders relative to the House such as Bills, Resolutions and things of that sort.

There is hardly anything more I can say except in order to repeat that by this Bill we are making an effort, as some people say even though belatedly, to bring the office of Speaker up to the status of similar offices in this area. I may add that this is in accordance with the agreement of other parties in this House. This was submitted to them and we have the agreement of the leaders.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that this matter has been the subject of discussion between ourselves and we understood what the Government proposed to do and this Bill has come down to us only after previous discussions. However, I would say that I was rather surprised when I heard mention of a free telephone because I do not recall that being the subject of any prior discussion. I was also rather surprised to see that the travelling is a separate and distinct thing instead of that amount being part of the salary, so as to bring it into line, as desired, with the salaries of that of the Speakers of British Guiana, Jamaica and Trinidad.

Of course, Sir, I see in the future that a difficulty may arise if we agree to this salary of Mr. Speaker and at the same time stipulate that it is to be a wholetime

office. It is obvious, though one may look forward to Your Honour occupying that position for very, very many years, that Your Honour will probably not be Speaker as long as this House of Assembly lasts, and in the process of time we all know that the undertaker has duties to perform as well as anybody else. The difficulty may well arise that the person selected or favoured for the post of Speaker will not be prepared to give up his other occupation, as I understand Your Honour is prepared to renounce.

I wonder what the Hon. Introducer has in mind in the event that there is a candidate for the Speakership who in other respects may be quite favourable but is not prepared, whatsoever his duties are, to give them up. Should he revert to the salary of the part-time Speaker or should he remain at this salary of the whole-time Speaker?

I am not sure if the Speakers of these three other colonies with which we are comparing this are whole-time or part-time officers. If the Barbados Workers Union can see its way to spare you, I am sure the daily newspaper of this island will begin to pride itself that its leaders and articles recommended the disassociation of the working of the Barbados Workers Union from the Speakership, and as they so recommended, the Government agreed with them and has taken heed.

Sir, as you will be coming here every day and, in fact, your office will be here, one wonders if it is so necessary for a free telephone allowance, because shortly in the normal course of events the Government will only approach Mr. Speaker at a reasonable hour of the day when he will be in office, say from nine to twelve and one to four, and one would imagine that when he is not in the House, the Government would not be ringing on urgent matters of state. However, this is a comparatively small matter and, of course, it will only be a matter of nine dollars or so a month.

Now that it is a question of principle that a whole-time office will be created and Mr. Speaker will be attending office every day in the pursuit of the duties of the whole-time office, it will be well if the duties of the Librarian should be clarified because there seems to be ignorance of what he has to do and what are his functions. No doubt, when you take over in full your whole-time office, these duties of the Librarian will be clarified.
12.45 p.m.

We have such an extraordinarily legal and efficient Clerk who is keen on doing what is his work and what is not his work that there must be a certain amount of overlapping. The Clerk not only does his duties but what were regarded as the duties of the Librarian as well; and when you have more time at your disposal, Mr. Speaker, you should clarify and allocate the duties of Mr. Clerk, those of Mr. Deputy Clerk, those of Mr. Librarian and so on. As I say I would appreciate the point of view of the Government with respect to a Speaker who would not be disposed to give up his other allocations, whatever they may be. Of course, the answer to that might well be that we will not appoint as Speaker a person who is not prepared to accept a whole-time office.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is true that the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition in his approach to this matter mentioned that he had discussed it in all its aspects with his Party Colleagues. Unanimity was not reached in the Party on the matter and therefore individual members are entitled to express their individual opinions on the matter. I know that the hon. introducer of this Bill claims that he is endeavouring to bring the salary and emoluments of the office into line with those obtaining elsewhere in the area; but what mystifies me from time to time is that when members of the Barbados Government are thinking of comparing the emoluments of their employees with those of other parts of the West Indies, they speak of Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana, and even then they only make comparison with these places when it suits them. I have before now protested in the strongest terms against our believing that whatever Jamaica or Trinidad or British Guiana does, we can do. Jamaica has a population of 1 1/2 million; ours is less than one quarter million; so that Jamaica's population is more than six times ours. Trinidad's population is three times ours. You never hear

the Government bring the comparison of the Leewards and Windwards where the combined population of each group more approximates to ours. When it comes to the Head of a Department as in the case of the Speaker now, or a Permanent Secretary or an important Head of the Service, they trot out these comparisons with Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana; but you never hear them trot out those comparisons when it comes to making comparisons with salaries in the lower ranks of the Civil Service, especially Public Works employees or unskilled labourers. You never hear them say that an unskilled labourer in Jamaica would draw \$25.00 a week as compared with such a labourer drawing \$15.00 a week here; but whenever they want to justify the salary of the Head of a Department, they compare us with Trinidad, Jamaica and British Guiana. Trinidad has an annual revenue of more than five times ours, because Trinidad's budget is over \$100 million a year, and we are asked to fall into line with Trinidad.

On the basis of these comparisons, obviously we are at a disadvantage. If we say that we are comparing the Speaker's remuneration with that of the Speaker of the Jamaican Parliament, obviously the remuneration falls far behind. But that is as it should be. We cannot afford to do what Jamaica does. I want Your Honour to understand that in so far as you as an individual, are concerned

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is really speaking on the Speakership and not on the matter which is before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am trying to make it clear that I wish Your Honour nothing but the best, both in your official and in your private capacities; but I do not see any reason why my well-intentioned wishes for you as an individual should interfere with my conception of what this country can afford to pay the Speaker of the House or any official employed by Government. I must confess that, in view of the things which we have to leave undone through insufficiency of money to do what we want to do, it does appear to me that this is a matter which does not demand or deserve any priority being given to it. I am afraid that the Government is allowing itself to be led away in this instance, not by considerations of the post, but by individual considerations.

While I am willing to go with the Government up to a certain degree, I go thus far and no further. We have been reminded in the Memorandum which has been circulated on this matter that Your Honour occupies another position in the Labour Movement of this country. You are an official or an Executive of a Union. Agreement has been expressed and quoted here today by the Leader of the Opposition that this post is somewhat incompatible with the post of Speaker. I quite agree with him that a certain amount of incompatibility does exist between the two posts, but in order to resolve this difficulty there is no reason why the taxpayers should be penalised. This is the second occasion within recent times on which the taxpayers of this country are being called upon to vote money for the office of Speaker, not, I submit, on the basis of the office itself but on the basis of the individual who is occupying the office. The Speaker's office is not a political pawn or a matter of a chess board where you move a man from place to place in order to satisfy the whims and caprices and ambitions of the Government Party. A few years ago when the present Premier was elevated to the Speakership of this House we raised the remuneration attached to the post considerably in order to suit him.

12.55 p.m.

At that time there was no question at all of any real reason for pushing up the remuneration of the Speaker except that the person who was to occupy it, who is now Premier of this country, had it done to suit himself. Just as in a famous opera the punishment fits the crime, so now the present Government of Barbados is making the salary and office of Speaker fit the person who is to occupy it. If the Government feels, Mr. Speaker, that your present position as a Union official and Your Honour's position as Speaker of this House is incompatible, it lies within their power to adjust this difficulty in another way, in any way they like; let them pull their pockets if they

like. They have to have Party officials and what not, and if they feel that you should relinquish your post as a Union official and have called upon you to do that, in fairness you must be remunerated with compensation to which every reasonable person will agree. Let them in some way or other, Mr. Speaker, account for the difference in salary, or the remuneration which Your Honour may lose if you vacate your official Union post. But I do not see why the public revenue should be called upon in this instance to pay for a solution to this problem.

The Government of Barbados will realise that there is nothing in the Barbados House of Assembly for a Speaker to do which can occupy his attention all day. Of course, the Introducer of this Bill was very careful. All he said was that the Speaker will come in daily. He means that he is going to come to the door and peep in or probably come in and warm a chair for five minutes, but he does not say that he will be here all day. He will come in daily; therefore any Speaker appointed under this consideration will only come in the Chamber daily and go into his office and go back down the steps, and I submit that there is just not sufficient work for a Speaker to do in here every day of the week. What would he do? There is not sufficient work for a man to do even if he were cleaning glass-windows, because there are not enough glass-windows; a Speaker of this Assembly need not come in here every day of the week to do the work attached to the office; there is just not enough work and it is merely fooling the public to talk about a whole-time office. The Ministers themselves have not got enough to do all day long; because if that were so, many of them could not attend to their private practice and business in the way they do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should get back to the subject.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I never strayed from it. There is no more demand for a whole-time Speaker in here daily than there is for a whole-time Minister in his office daily, and it is not to say that the Premier does not know that. The Premier in this Chamber occupied the post which Your Honour occupies. Apart from the time he spent in here when we met on Tuesdays, or if we met more than once a week, ask him how much time he spent in here or ask him what he would have done in here every day. He maintained the demands on his professional status as a doctor when he was Speaker because the time he spent in here was the time he would normally spend in the Assembly, and there was no further demand on his time as Speaker than there was on his time as an ordinary member; therefore he is talking with his tongue in this cheek. He is taking the public for a ride when he comes in here and talks about a whole-time Speaker; and if you want a sinecure, that is one.

There are phases of the administration of this institution which need checking up on, re-organising and what not, and I do not agree that the public need be told that this will be a whole-time post in future merely because of this increase in salary. If for special reasons the Government wants to increase the remuneration of the Speaker, let them do it; but do not come here and tell the public that it is going to be a whole-time office and he will come in here daily. It only means that he will come in every day but it does not mean staying.

The main thing, Mr. Speaker, is for us to realise that if Barbados is to follow Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana in some respects, it should follow in all. Let the Government begin at the bottom and let our remuneration be on that basis right through. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between your present remuneration and that of other Speakers; but in so far as I am concerned, since this differential exists in so many other matters, it could be allowed to remain in this. If they want to give Your Honour a travelling allowance because you may be called upon to come here more often than the ordinary member, I am willing to support it. If they want to give you a free telephone, I am willing to support it; but I certainly do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that at this stage of our development or in our present economic position we can afford to pay a Speaker more than £1,000 a year. However you look at it, Mr. Speaker, that is reasonable remuneration.
1.05 p.m.

I certainly, do not feel that at this stage of our economic position we can afford to pay a Speaker more than £1,000 a year. However you look at it, Mr. Speaker, that is a reasonable remuneration in view of the basis of other salaries in the island. The Headmaster of Harrison College gets £1,500 a year. Certainly, that is an important institution. The Headmaster of Harrison College is called upon to work probably from seven o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock at night because besides his normal duties as Headmaster which he has to perform, he has other activities arising out of his duties as Headmaster to perform.

Sir, in 1956, the remuneration for the Office of Speaker was increased by more than 50%. It was then \$3,000 a year and was carried to the present rate. While it is true that in this particular case there may be some difficulties in resolving the two posts which Your Honour now holds, it does not of necessity follow that anything of the same difficulties may arise with any of your other immediate successors and, therefore, my opinion is that if this is a special case, a special effort should be made to deal with it. If Your Honour must be removed from your present position, a special effort should be made to deal with the situation but do not come and penalise the country to the extent proposed today merely because the particular difficulties are faced with the particular Speaker. In other words, I am absolutely sure that were it not for the fact of the peculiar difficulties with respect to Your Honour's position, this Bill would not have been before us. If it were any other hon. member occupying that position, I am sure the Government would not have felt constrained to talk of bringing the remuneration of the Speaker of Barbados in line with that of Speakers of British Guiana, Jamaica and Trinidad.

Sir, I am always opposed to any attempt to use Government funds, its position, or anything over which the Government has control, merely to resolve the Government's personal difficulties. There is too much of that going on in this country. There are too many attempts to abuse power and to utilise power not in the best interests of the public but merely to advance individual interests and to resolve difficulties of the Government party.

This matter can only hold water if you look at it from the point of view of comparison of the emoluments of Speaker of British Guiana, Jamaica and Trinidad; it cannot hold water otherwise. The total emoluments in the proposals before us will mean that it would be a salary of \$6,480 for the Speaker and Travelling Allowance of \$720 which amount to £1,500 a year. The service of a free telephone is neither here nor there.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure of that in view of the remuneration now attached to a number of Government posts which, if the Government were called upon to review, the first thing they would say is that the country cannot afford to do it. Here last year repeatedly, when protests were made with respect to public workers getting between \$13 and \$14 a week, we were told that the Government would like to do this and to do that but that this country would not afford it; this is one of the reasons why we cannot afford to do necessary things because in so many instances, Mr. Speaker, the sky is the limit to what the Government is prepared to do in certain instances while in other instances the exigencies of the situation and the limitations imposed by economics are allowed to carry full weight.

Mr. Speaker, I could not sit here and agree silently to these proposals because in principle I am not in complete agreement with them. I am not prepared to have the public think that, in view of the millions of things that are to be attended to, I am of the opinion that the matter before us is one which is deserving of priority or that the economics of the country warrant our taking this step.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I have to take a different line from all three of the previous members who spoke on this Bill. In these days of constitutional talk I am somewhat surprised to see that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is a Barrister and who, apparently, agreed to this matter before it came to this Legislature, did not refresh his mind that according to constitutional law, anything which deals with the Speakership of this Chamber and

anything pertaining to its office are matters for Parliament and to delegate any of those matters to the Government in power is to make the office of Speakership of this Chamber an office of the Government.

Now, I say that because I believe that Your Honour concurred in the method used in getting this matter agreed to by other members of this House, and because of that I am quite free to say what I am going to say now. I happen to be a member of this Parliament and one of the old members elected, not nominated, in here although I know that members of the Government do not desire that I should be here. In spite of their attempts to keep me out of here, I was re-elected to this Chamber. What has happened is this: this matter was dealt with not as a matter of Parliament but, as the Hon. Premier has said, it was agreed to by members of the other parties in this House. This is a matter for Parliament and not a party matter; this is not giving a person a post. If there were such a thing as a memorandum or a note circulated on this matter to members of parties, as a matter of courtesy, every member of this Parliament should have been informed of it. I do not intend to delegate my rights to anybody else or to the Government in power.

Sir, what is wrong with every single member of this House being informed that there is a proposal to increase the emoluments of the Speaker and that these proposals should become the subject of discussion by hon. members not necessarily at a meeting of the House? Whatever agreement is arrived at, the agreement would be an agreement of members of the House and would not necessarily need to be debated in the House, it only being dealt with formally. 1.15 p.m.

I am going to repeat what has been drawn to my attention. It has been drawn to my attention that some members were even told that if you vote for this there is a possibility that the Government will come down at some later date with some Bill to provide travelling allowance for hon. members. I do not want to be associated with that type of political bribery.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. That could never emanate from this Government; this Government has never considered that. I have heard hon. members, and even the hon. senior member for St. Peter, talk about that, but we have never considered it. I want to give a categorical denial to that matter.

Mr. DOWDING: On a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Peter in the course of his remarks said: "If you vote for this". I take it that the hon. member means if the Speaker votes for it. The word "you" is reflecting on Your Honour and I would be glad to get that point clarified.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am quite sure the hon. senior member for St. Peter could not mean that. I think he meant a rhetorical "you".

Mr. DOWDING: The word "you" refers to Your Honour in your office.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member means me.

Mr. WALCOTT: Whenever I speak, there are lots of points of order taken. The Hon. Premier rose on a point of order, but what did he point out? I will repeat what I said, and if he is intelligent enough he will understand what I did say. I said that this is a matter which was drawn to my attention. The Premier said that the Government has never considered the matter; I am nothing to do with who said it; I did not mention the Government's name. I said that the matter has been drawn to my attention and if Your Honour wants me to change my words...

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to clear up what seems to be a doubt in the mind of the hon. senior member for St. George, that "you" refers to me.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to worry with trivialities and foolishness. I am a busy man, I have a lot of work to do and I do not waste time. What I am

saying is that this matter was not circularised to hon. members in a manner in which Parliament should have been informed of such a matter. I maintain that, and I make no apology whatever for saying so. I want to say that it was drawn to my attention that this matter was coming up and one of the suggestions made was the one I have just mentioned. I said that I am not going to be a party to that type of political bribery. I am not responsible for the Premier's means of comparing things; I have never compared any Speaker's travelling allowance with any hon. member's travelling allowance. Perhaps the Hon. Premier thinks that I am afraid of saying anything; I say what I have to say in public; I do not say it behind any closed doors so that somebody can know it and then I am afraid that it will be repeated. I say in this House that hon. members are entitled to travelling allowance vis-à-vis the travelling which the Ministers get. That is what I said and I want to explain the reason why I said it. But when it was suggested that if you vote for this matter you will get something, I say that I will not be a party to that type of political bribery.

I have no objection to a salary revision for the office of Speaker as such, but I will have to make this comparison. What the hon. senior member for St. Philip has said is not far from the truth; it is really the truth in that as far back as 1948, the Speaker of this House was elected and while I do not want to make any personal reference, yet I will say that Your Honour has been Speaker of this Assembly since 1948 except when the break took place. I say that this should be a matter for Parliament because the present Government should be the last Government to say that they have to look after the office of Speaker when you, Sir, happen to be the incumbent of the office. We all remember that unfortunate episode which took place at the beginning of the present Parliamentary Session in 1956. When the Premier talks about status, the status of the office is not conditioned by the salary. Anyone who is beginning to think in this cockeyed fashion, that the status of the office is conditioned by the salary I ask: Is the office of Speaker higher than what it was without emoluments? Is the status of hon. members less now than when they were not paid? Hon. members are being remunerated and obviously the Speaker will have to be remunerated too. But in 1948, when this office of Speaker was made a paid office - there is a fundamental difference and I am surprised at the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. senior member for St. Philip falling into error with what is predominantly a Conservative concept. There is a conservative view in Barbados that when you hold a high office and you are a Socialist - or I should say that there is a view in Barbados that if you are a Socialist you should not have a bank account, that you should look dirty; and there is this view of educating people that in order to be a real Socialist you must not have any money and that if you have money you are not a Socialist but a Capitalist.

I do not subscribe to the view that because a man is Speaker of the House of Assembly there are certain things which he should not do. The Hon. Minister of Education would not know this, but the Speaker of the Puerto Rico House of Assembly was associated with the Labour Movement with which Mr. Munoz Martin was associated. There was no question of any incompatibility. What happened in the old days was that the office of Speaker was never associated with the working-class movement, and the proletariat wants to come into power with the same conditions as the Conservatives.

1.25 p.m.

The proletariat never held the office of Speakership; the office of Speakership was occupied by Kings, Barons and people like that who lived leisurely. If the proletariat brings somebody into power and the member became Speaker of the Assembly because the proletariat gave the power, are you going to say that he can no longer represent the proletariat if he holds this position? How unfortunate would that be! The proletariat has been good enough to put you there, but after that you cannot be associated with them any longer.

Dignity of office is not conditioned by one's profession or vocation; it is associated with the person's character, integrity and outlook in life. By that I do not mean that if a man holds an office

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, the reference made to me in this debate by the hon. senior member for St. Peter claiming that I made an error by regarding the occupation of the post of Speaker and the Trade Union post as incompatible in themselves, is not the idea I had in my mind at all. What I had in my mind was that the occupation simultaneously of the two positions might lead to a clash at some time or other where the interests of the two conflicting posts might meet, and not that it was *infra dig* for a Union official to be Speaker and vice versa.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the reason why I say that is because the Leader of the Opposition went on to speak about the newspaper making that statement, and it is true. The daily newspaper is a Conservative newspaper. That is the sort of thing that appears; but I am making this statement because not only in this particular instance but in others that is a statement that should be made so that people can get an understanding of what work is and why people do work; and in a political context, when you are ushered into power by a group that belongs to the working class, you cannot be clinging to the things that meant that this class should never have been in power, because the other class when they were in power create certain things away from people to make them believe that these are not things for working people to have. I say that to the question of the man's status *vis-à-vis* the job he does.

This is not a matter for the Government to deal with; it is a matter for Parliament. The House can make a recommendation to the Government saying that we desire the Speaker to have this and that is the end of the debate but the reverse has taken place and it is being done in this way. Imagine I saw the Premier smiling when I said I was not informed! There is some idea in Parliament - and I do not know who guides it - that so long as you are not a member of the existing Parties in this House, you have no right to be informed of things that are going on in Parliament. What type of behaviour is that? Why is it that as a member of Parliament I have no right to be informed of the memorandum that was circulated? Was it circulated to other members of this House? Is it something which by a special vote made, only twenty members were allowed to see it and not the others? Can anyone tell me why I was not given the opportunity of seeing this memorandum?

I am making this statement here and now, Mr. Speaker, that if something like this occurs again, it might not be in a debate like this in which it does not matter, but it might be a debate which would be of vital concern to my own political future.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking personally of me?

Mr. WALCOTT: I understand that the memorandum was circulated with Your Honour's knowledge.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is that to do with my political future?

Mr. WALCOTT: I said it might be something to do with my political future. I am not concerned with Your Honour's political future; I am concerned with my own. The other matter which I thought the Leader of the Opposition would have dealt with is the one where he fell into error by admitting that this post is a whole-time post. The Premier uses his words very loosely; that is on record. The precise use of words does not appeal to him. The Premier said that the Speaker will be required to come in daily. Required by whom? Does he understand that under the Law in Barbados when we pass anything for the Speaker, it is not a matter for the Governor-in-Executive Committee to sign? We can pass a Resolution to give the Speaker £10,000; that is the House's business and it ends there; but other things have to go to the Governor-in-Executive Committee for the Governor to sign.

The Hon. Premier talked about Head of a Department. The Speaker is not a Head of a Department, so what nonsense are you talking? The Speaker is Head of Parliament and Parliament is not a Department. The Chief Secretary

is the Head of a Department. By this the political powers will feel that they will be able to dispose of the post of any Speaker in the way they did in 1956, because they are rapacious and savage enough to do any of these outrageous acts with impunity and then smile at them.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member referring to members as being rapacious and savage?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is abstract.

Mr. WALCOTT: All I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, is that I am not going to subscribe to the view that the office of Speakership is any Head of any Department. I may be dead and gone, but I have been in Barbados too long and have too much experience to know that sometimes the Chief Secretary wants something done in Parliament, and if the Speaker does not jump to his heels, somebody wants to report him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should cross the hon. member here and say that that has never been my experience.

Mr. WALCOTT: It has been my experience that things have been asked of the Speaker and he did not do them and certain officials were annoyed; so if Your Honour says it is not your experience, I am sorry you do not remember.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think I should clarify this. I should not like to misquote the hon. member but I think he gave a reference like this: that if the Speaker does not bend the knee to the Chief Secretary, he is apt to be called into question by the Government. I have never yet bent the knee to any Chief Secretary and I do not think the hon. member could have heard that. I remember clashing with the Chief Secretary more than once and I remember clashing with members of the Government more than once, but I have never bent the knee to them.

Mr. WALCOTT: Maybe the microphone is not carrying to you well. What I said in connection with this idea about the Chief Secretary is that if you have a Speaker who would not bend, you would get the matter being carried to the Government, and I said that I had the experience of that sort of thing occurring in the past in which the Speaker did not agree with somebody and the matter was carried further. That is the statement I made. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because if the idea is going out today that this is done by the Government and all money Resolutions will have to be introduced by the Government, this is something which in Parliament can be initiated from here without coming from the Government, and I do not feel that the office of Speakership is an office of the Government.

There are one or two things in which I agree with hon. members when they say that the office of Speaker should be above Party. I feel very diffident that something is being circularised only to certain members and other members are not aware of it.
1.35 p.m.

I know in 1959 owing to the present tempo of things, the Government feels that from Speakership down, so long as you hold a post under Government, it is a matter of whom they control.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip made a comparison. I wish to say that none of these things is personal. Now, when the Hon. Premier was Speaker of this House this post was upgraded and it was upgraded from the time he held the office, which was at the beginning of this Session. It was upgraded to £1,000 in order to suit the Hon. Premier because it was his sole intention to practise as a doctor and to do something which would not prevent him giving up his practice. It was not a question, when that post was upgraded on the last occasion, of its being a whole-time office. Far from that, it was repeated by members on that side that the Hon. Premier was taking over the office of Speaker so as to add status and dignity to that office. That is as true as John. 3: 16.

I can very well understand that you want to review the office of Speakership in the context of what is taking

place in the West Indies today and I do not take exception to the Speaker of this House having comparable emoluments with Speakers anywhere else. As a matter of fact, I always felt that the emoluments of Speakership of this Hon. Chamber were too low. However, I do know for a fact that they were kept to the position they were on personal grounds. Now that circumstances have changed, you are saying that they have to change too. All I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, is that the office of the Speaker is one of the highest in this island. The position of Speaker, so far as Parliament is concerned, is not the highest office based on the salary one gets as Speaker. This island is not a Crown colony as Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana. When those colonies made recommendations as regards the salary of Speaker, they did so on the basis that they were taking such people as retired judges and lawyers and making them Speaker: and I would say that that was the very intention of the present Government if they had their way and had won the by-election in St. John, and I am sure that Your Honour would not have been the occupant in that Chair today.

When it comes to the question of the emoluments for the office of Speakership, what is being done today should have been done before; but when the Hon. Premier was occupying the office of Speaker, owing to the taxation policy in Barbados and owing to what he wanted to continue to do, that is to practise as a doctor, the emoluments were not increased to more than what they were increased to at that time. Tell me, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference? The Hon. Premier held the post of Speaker from 16th December, 1956, until some time in 1958, just before the Federal Government came into being. Why did they not think of putting his emoluments as Speaker then in line with the others in the area? Did they not know then that his status should be in line with the others? How long has the status been changed? For nearly two years he held the office of Speaker, but he did not know that the status of that office should have been what they propose to make it now! I say that it was because the financial position was so much in concern that if you had increased it to £1,500 along with his practice as a doctor it would be a lot of money going into the Treasury from him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to desist from personal remarks.

Mr. WALCOTT: The reason why I say that is because of the point which the hon. senior member for St. Philip made that he does not like to increase the salary of a post on the basis of convenience and, so far as I am concerned, I too do not like fixing a salary on convenience. I like to fix a salary on the merits of the post.

I do not know what is the position, if Your Honour chooses or if any subsequent Speaker would choose to be in office on the basis of not participating in any other employment, but I feel that any such decision must be the decision of the person who is Speaker; therefore, I do not feel that putting this office of Speaker on a full-time basis should be a condition precedent to the holding of the office. The reason why I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that there is not one member of this House who is a Director of a business who is going to give up his job of Director because he is Speaker. As a matter of fact, the Clerk of this House is not a whole-time officer, neither is the Deputy Clerk.

Mr. SPEAKER: In a way, the Clerk is a whole-time officer; he is always on call. The Deputy Clerk is not a whole-time officer.

Mr. WALCOTT: It is true that the Clerk is always on call, but he is not a whole-time officer. There is nothing to say that he must be in here from 8 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are Regulations which lay down his duties.

Mr. WALCOTT: There is nothing to prevent the Clerk from performing his personal duties as a Solicitor. There is nothing at law to prevent the Clerk or the Deputy Clerk from so doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a difference between the Deputy Clerk and the Clerk.

Mr. WALCOTT: I know that; but the statement made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was that he understood that the duties of Speaker would now be whole-time and that the Speaker will be required to come here every day, and that was what the Hon. Premier said too. There is no law which states that and for obvious reasons. The office of Speaker, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said, is likely to be more than what it is in his own private capacity. I do not think there was any question of incompatibility when the Hon. George Evelyn was Speaker of this Hon. House and along with that was also head of a firm of solicitors, nor was there any question of incompatibility when the late Sir Harold Austin was Speaker and also head of the firm of Messrs. Gardiner, Austin & Co., nor was there any question of incompatibility when the Hon. G. D. L. Pile was Speaker and also head of the Bulkeley group of estates; therefore, there should be no question of incompatibility with the present Speaker holding that office and also dealing with matters pertaining to the Barbados Workers' Union or dealing with matters affecting his own interest. Therefore, Sir, the question of the office of Speaker being a whole-time office would have to be clarified. If any subsequent Speaker decides to relinquish any private position he holds, that certainly would be a matter for the particular Speaker and I do not think that should be a condition precedent for the holding of the office.

1.45 p.m.

In so far as the emoluments are concerned, what would appear to be somewhat unscientific is that the Speakership has been singled out for this sort of treatment at this time and no particular reason for that was given. Why is this being done now, having regard to the fact that the same thing was done two years ago? You are not reviewing this situation generally and that is why you will see that the point I made was a moot point. The reason why you are doing this now is because the same incumbent of the Speaker's office two years ago is not the incumbent today; if he had been Speaker today, the question of raising the office to this status would not have occurred because it would not have been necessary to do this. If it is on these grounds mentioned, you could not say that you did it two years ago and you did it with the clear understanding that it was done in relation to what existed and that the salary bore some relation to what existed. In order to show you how these things can be done to suit certain people, in this present Assembly you have the Deputy Speaker at a lower office than that of the Chairman of Committees. The Deputy Speaker is equal to the Speaker in status; the Chairman of Committees is not as near to the Speaker as the Deputy Speaker is, but here you have this financial arrangement. You want to give somebody a sop at some point and so you make the office of the Chairman of Committees higher than that of the Deputy Speaker so that the Deputy Speaker may not aspire to the Speakership.

I would never oppose anything which is laudible; if you are dealing with these offices, you have in order, the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, the Chairman of Committees and Members; but you cannot say that you will have the Premier getting something and somebody who is third down the line, higher than somebody else who is before him. If a comparison is made for personal reasons, well, you only have to do a little research so as to see where these things lie. What I am particularly worried about is this: when these things are being done in Parliament - I want to make it crystal clear that I am not in here on the good wishes of any other Member; I am in here because I have been elected to come here and I feel that all the courtesies of this House should be extended to me just as they are extended to every other member. I do not believe in Party business being done to the exclusion of other members. You do not take a vote by parties, but by every member; and as to everything which comes from the Speaker's Office, every hon. member should know about. If it is a question of having Sub-committees, then members should go on these Sub-committees.

I am not a member of any of the Parties. I do not know if it is true, but it has been drawn to my attention that part of the salary of the Speaker is to be deducted and paid into Party funds. I do believe that when a Member is elevated to Speakership of the House of Assembly, he must remain above Party; the Party cannot expect the Speaker

to be contributing to their Party funds to be put in a Treasury like that. If there is going to be incompatibility, there is greater incompatibility when hon. members sit down and grin, feeling that because you subscribe to the Party's political fund you cannot come down against them. What greater incompatibility is there? I do not like this idea of incompatibility in the job which you are doing. In Barbados a layman has the idea that a lawyer can do anything and still be a lawyer. I heard the former Premier of this country say that being in the Government does not prevent you from giving an opinion at night.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Speaker of the House of Commons contributes to his particular Party. The method of deduction is just a matter of detail; it is just the way in which the amount is deducted but the principle of it obtains with the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would tell Your Honour that you must be very careful about this back advice which you are getting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I knew that before the Clerk of this House was Clerk of the House. The present Speaker of the House of Commons contributes to the Party funds.

Mr. WALCOTT: Then this is a check-off system, to use a Union phrase. I have no knowledge that that is done in the United Kingdom and it is not that I am suggesting that Your Honour cannot contribute funds to any political Party; but if there is any talk about any incompatibility, it is a greater incompatibility to find that the Speaker in Parliament is subscribing to a particular Party in power. One can easily see where he is coming down in any matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can assure the hon. member that the occasion will never arise when there will be any partiality on my part. Contributing to the Party funds is one thing but the question of impartiality is quite another.

Mr. WALCOTT: That concludes what I have to say about incompatibility. There cannot be incompatibility in one thing and no incompatibility in the other. As I said, when we come into power at the hands of the proletariat, there seems to be a group of people who feel that the proletariat should not have any say in such things.

In so far as the emoluments of the Speaker are concerned, they cannot be regarded as emoluments which are beyond the basis of what the Speaker should have. I do not think that these emoluments are extraordinary ones, but I am concerned about the method in which this matter has been done. I feel that I should have been informed of this matter in Parliament, that we should not delegate our authority and that the House by Resolution should agree that the post of Speaker is worth so much and that is where the matter should end.

Messrs. TALMA and CORBIN rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for Christ Church giving way?

Mr. TALMA: No, Sir. I thought that I had caught your eye first. In this matter, as some of my colleagues have outlined, the members of our Party were not unanimous in their feelings. That point has been intimated by the hon. senior member for St. Philip and so I shall speak on my own behalf. I feel Sir, that this question of regularising the salary of the Speaker has been left pending for too long. I commend the Government, whatever be their motive, and I presume that it is a good motive, for trying to regularise this matter and not to delay or postpone it for any longer.
1.55 p.m.

As we all know, Sir, the post of Speaker in the past has been kept out of alignment and proportion with the salary scale paid to Speakers in the other colonies like Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana as outlined by the Premier, and was done merely by virtue of the fact that an *ad hoc* salary was attached to the post of Speaker in that they regarded it in the past according to the individual. It was based on that hybrid set-up. In other words, it was based

on the fact that the present Speaker at the time in 1954 when salaries were being adjusted when Ministerial status came into force - who incidentally was Your Honour - had a part-time post as Assistant Secretary of the Union and also the post of Speaker which was then regarded as a part-time post. That was a hybrid set-up and the wrong method of approach, and I commend Government for today trying to regularise that and they deserve full credit. On that hybrid set-up of 1954 and taking into consideration this *ad hoc* situation, the post of Speaker was never regularised and it is good now to see it being done today and being brought in line and comparable to the salaries, emoluments and perquisites paid to Speakers in the other colonies; and when I say that, I am not referring to Your Honour, I am speaking of Speakers from now on. You have been victimised in the past and called upon to accept a salary of \$250 or \$260 a month for years, and it is only when the present Premier became Speaker that the Speakership was regularised to some extent and put on a basis of £1,000 a year. I am speaking in a broad and general way and not being petty.

It is a good thing to see the post of Speaker being regularised at this time and not have the old policy of the former Premier and Government, of which unfortunately I was a member once, and appeared to have agreed with something with which I never agreed. You had under that system collective agreement and the Speaker then was terribly underpaid and taken advantage of. Today we are now regularising the post of Speaker and regularising the remuneration to be paid to the Speaker. This idea of members talking about public works employees is entirely out of place, because the post of Speaker

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m.
2.00 p.m.

On resumption

QUESTION TIME

Question Time was called.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Private Members' Business was called.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 under Private Members Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Joseph to move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to His Speech delivered on the occasion of the re-opening of the Legislative Session 1959-60.

On the last occasion the hon. senior member for St. Lucy was speaking.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I had left off last week at the point at which I was discussing the attitude of the Opposition Party on the question of the composition of the Legislative Council with particular reference to the reply to the Governor's Speech on the point, and I said my Party feels very strongly on the fact that a communication which we addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies through the Governor was replied to not in the normally accepted form through the Governor to us, but in the Speech from the Throne; but because that has been done we have to deal with the reply as though it represents Government's policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in September of the year before last, the Cabinet system of Government was debated in this House, at any rate the proposals for the setting up of the Cabinet system. Generally speaking, there was agreement on both sides of the House with the proposals, although the Democratic Labour Party did feel at the time and said so that with the Federal Elections coming on early in the next year, we would personally have preferred to see the new system come into being after the elections, because naturally there would be a certain amount of re-organising to be done with the resignation of the Ministers and other members of the Government Party, there would be a new Ministry being formed, and we felt then that the Cabinet system would be better ushered in on that occasion.

Opinion in Government circles felt otherwise and it was consequently quite early in 1958 that the Cabinet system was established. We had no quarrel with that because we did say that we agreed with the proposals as they were put before us. But while we gave our agreement and support to these proposals, we did still reserve to ourselves the right to take up the matter of representation in the Other Place whenever there was opportunity to do so.

2.35 p.m.

When we saw that three months had passed since the establishment of the Cabinet System and nothing was done about it, we sought an interview with the Governor to raise this matter with him again and at that interview which was attended on our side by all our Parliamentary members—the hon. junior member for St. John had just recently been re-elected a member of this House—and also by the Chairman of our Party, Mr. C. F. Broome, we put our case to His Excellency and he on his side was attended by the Hon. Premier, the Acting Chief Secretary and the Attorney General. At that interview between us and the Governor two points emerged which required clarification. One point was as regards what the position really was with respect to the membership of the Council: on the official side there seemed to be the opinion that the membership of the Council was fixed and limited and that nothing more could be done with the matter even supposing there was an agreement on extra representation in principle. We do not take that view.

The second point that emerged in that discussion was this. The Attorney General appeared to hold the view that the position of the Hon. Mr. Morris in the Other Place was special and unique in that he was there as Minister Without Portfolio, so to speak, but not as Mr. Morris, and that consequently any argument based on his position there as a member of the Government Party would not be as strong if we used it as an argument.

The hon. junior member for St. John who was a member of our delegation, disagreed on the legal advice and so strong was the disagreement on our side that we could not accept that point of view; so we asked that this matter should be put to the legal advisers of the Colonial Office so that the Secretary of State for the Colonies would pronounce judgment on the matter. Obviously, the matter was considered so important by His Excellency that he himself said that he would seek overseas opinion on it. I said that I hoped when he said he would seek overseas opinion that he meant he would seek the opinion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies because I wanted to make our Party's position clear on the issue. We did not want this issue submitted only to the judgment of the Cabinet of Barbados or to the President of the Barbados Labour Party. It was a matter which we wanted to be taken up by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and, therefore, we left with the assurance that our representation was forwarded by the Governor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I do not know if that was done because up to this day my Party is not in a position to say that our representations were forwarded; although we asked that the judgment of the Secretary of State for the Colonies should be passed on what we have put forward, we have not received any communications from the Secretary of State for the Colonies; so the reference in the Speech from the Throne on this matter is entirely unsatisfactory to us. Because of that, we reserve the right to take the matter up as often as the situation warrants it, and it is not a matter on which we can accept the final judgment in the Speech by the Governor which incidentally was written by the Cabinet.

I go further and say this: so long as you have a two-party system in a two-chamber Legislature, both parties should be represented in both Legislatures. Now, in the elected Legislature, you cannot guarantee that any party would always be there because that rests with the verdict of the electors; but in a democracy it is almost certain that two parties would be represented in the House, and, therefore, you do not worry too much on that. The situation is rather different in the Other Chamber. That Chamber is entirely nominated. But if you take the composition of the Other Place at the moment, you will see that there is party representation of the sixteen or so members, for

fully ten can be said to have Conservative leanings, judging by their published speeches and by their leanings politically. You have no doubt that they are Conservatives, even though they may not be members of the Conservative Party. Now, there is the Minister without portfolio who has identified himself with the party in power. So far as party strength in the Other Place is concerned, the Government Party is in the minority. Formally speaking, there are more avowed Conservatives in the Other Place than there are supporters of the Barbados Labour Party. But although you may say that the two-party system in a certain way works in the Upper Chamber, yet that situation does not reflect the situation of the country as a whole or of how the two-party system works in this House, because the party which is the Official Opposition in this House and which is acknowledged as such has no representation whatsoever in the other Chamber of this Legislature. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, they cannot argue that they have the two-party system in the Other Place as they have it in this House because one of the parties represented in this House is not at all represented in the Other Place although two of the parties represented here are represented in the Other Place.

The position, therefore, of the Democratic Labour Party is clear and unequivocal. It is this. Our party should be invited to nominate at least one but preferably two members of our party for membership of the Other Place so that our distinctive point of view which is expressed here in the Opposition should be expressed there in the Other Place. It was notified that the reason why we were asking for representation in the Other Place was because we wanted a seat for one of our defeated members but I wish to point out that we have not yet reached a decision on whom our nominee may be. We want the principle firmly established that so long as a party is represented in the elected House in the Opposition or indeed anywhere, that Party should have its spokesman in the nominated Chamber.

While there are a lot of reasons for our taking that point of view, one of the most obvious reasons is this, Mr. Speaker. They have extended the Cabinet system to such limits that they are provided in the Other Chamber with a spokesman for the Government. It was felt, and quite rightly so, that the Attorney General or the Chief Secretary should not under the new system of Cabinet Government be the Official spokesman of the Government Party. We all agree on that point.

2.45 p.m.

Up to that point there is general agreement on that subject. We only want to carry the Party system a step further than they were prepared to take it by saying that if the Government is represented in the Other Place by its own Spokesman, the Minister without portfolio, then the official Opposition should also be represented in the other Place by an Official Opposition spokesman. That is our argument in a nut-shell and if you examine it you will see that it is a reasonable argument. It is not true to say that you are not represented in the Other Place because of a Party member there; the very existence of the Minister without portfolio proves that there is party representation in the Other Place; therefore, that is why we find ourselves unable to accept the contention that the Minister without portfolio speaks for the Government and not for the Party. If that is true, a farce has already been made of Cabinet Government; if it is true, it means that there are two elements of the Cabinet system at war with one another and that this disparity was acquired inside the Cabinet System of Government is borne out by the fact that the Governor said that the Minister without portfolio speaks for the Government and not for the Party. But the policy of the Government is the policy of the Party which forms it, and it is difficult to conceive of a Minister speaking for the Government as a Government and not for the Party which forms the Government. It is axiomatic of responsible Government that the policy of the majority Party is also the policy of the Government when that Party forms the Government. No matter what the outlook is, whoever speaks for the Government in power speaks as a representative of the Party; therefore the contention that the Minister without Portfolio is a Spokesman for the Government and not for the political Party which is running the Government, is one that the Democratic Labour Party finds itself unable

to accept and must reject as being spurious and insipid. Since we hold that the Minister without Portfolio speaks for the Government and for the Party, we are more encouraged in our contention that we, as an Opposition, should have spokesmen in the Other Place to put forward our distinctive point of view. We have put it down in black and white that we do not expect any member of the Other Place to speak for us or to put forward the particular policy or attitude of the Democratic Labour Party. It is true that from time to time we find that individual members of the Other Place have been criticising this or that aspect of the Government policy and so they have been echoing sentiments which have already been expressed in this House by us; but such an occurrence is not a reflection of our policy; it is just a coincidence and we would, therefore, rather than have a situation of a chance presentation or agreement as to our point of view in the Other Place, prefer to have one of our members there.

I pause at this moment to draw to the attention of the House some development which has taken place in the membership of the Other Place in recent months, and it is a very welcome development from our point of view. I do not know whether Your Honour listens very much to political meetings; (Mr. SPEAKER: I never do.) And you are wise, Mr. Speaker; but it must have been told to you that it was the Democratic Labour Party who first in this island suggested that Trade Unionists should become members of the Upper Place. We said that in public at a meeting which we held in front of Government House, a meeting which was called to debate the constitutional issue. Our point of view was spoken by the mouth of the hon. junior member for St. John and the publicity given to that part of the hon. member's speech was really terrific. From the scream of terror which arose in certain people's throats, you would have thought that we had suggested the worst possible thing. You would have thought that we were advocating the most terrible and heinous crime; but the hon. junior member for St. John and the members of his Party have lived long enough to see the suggestion made by us and ridiculed by our opponents become an accepted thing and there is now in the Other Place a representative of the trade Union Movement.

When we advocated that, we were ridiculed. It was said that Mr. Barrow - I am not now referring to him as a member of the House, but this is what was said: "Mr. Barrow wants a lot of Negro men put in the Legislative Council and who will the Democratic Labour Party put next?" That was the attitude adopted. Our attitude towards this matter has been accepted and by now you will find that Mr. Bayne holds an honoured seat in the Other Place. We therefore have proved ourselves to be right in this respect and we do think that in this more important matter you will see our point of view carried, because we are right. Not only do we want to see representatives of the political parties, especially of our Party there, but we want to see in addition to that, and in addition to Trade Union representatives in the Other Place, representatives of that large and important and influential body of small peasant proprietors. Why should there only be the big factory owners represented in the Other Place and not the small peasant proprietors? And we go further. We want to see some representatives of the small businessmen there too, because they have a point of view as distinct and as important as that of the big merchant. And what about that large mass of consumers, the people who buy commodities over the shop counters and who have to meet all the difficulties of the cost of living? We need a representative for them too as we need representatives of others, until every important and responsible section of the community is represented either in one way or the other in both Chambers of the Legislature. That is how an important two-Chamber system of Legislature should work and that is the way in which to guarantee that all points of view will be expressed in either or both Houses of the Legislature.

This is no favour which the Opposition Party is asking of the Government. We do not think so well of them as to ask them for a favour, nor have we got any political axe to grind; nor, as it has been stated, are we thinking only of placing this or that member of the Party, however distinguished he may be or however useful he will be, in the seats of authority.

2.55 p.m.

We take our stand on an entirely different principle. If we were in power, Mr. Speaker - and I am not saying this now because we are not - no Opposition Party would have to argue this particular case against us. We would see immediately the justice and the wisdom of it and I can imagine that when the change over comes at the next elections, Mr. Speaker, our Party may not be inclined to disturb Mr. Morris from his seat in the Other Place; we may allow him to speak for the Opposition because our Minister without portfolio will speak for the Government. That is our attitude towards it; and if they can make out a case for greater representation of their minority Party as it will be then in the Other Place, we will be pleased to hear them and to accede to their request because we do feel that whether in Government or in Opposition the Party system must be made to work.

For fear, Mr. Speaker, that the Cabinet should feel that the issue is dead with us, I have been authorised by my Party to state that we have not accepted and do not intend to accept the contention made in the Speech from the Throne that political representation is undesirable in the Other Place, because we know and the public knows that political representation does exist there; but we feel and we are prepared to argue it against all comers and take it to the highest authority that the Opposition Party has as much right to be represented anywhere in a nominated House as the Government Party.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Thus, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the position of our Party is clear. We reserve ourselves the right on any future occasion to re-open the matter as we intend to do when the new Governor comes, because it is not with us a matter on which an opinion could be passed one way or another and then allowed to drop. We insist very strongly that if our Party while it is in opposition is expected to cooperate with Government in making the two Party system work, all things necessary to making the two Party system work should be guaranteed to both Parties. We are not prepared any longer to tolerate a situation in which one side has all the say in one Chamber of the Legislature and the other side, which side happens to be the official Opposition, has no say whatever, and we are prepared to let our case rest before any amount of impartial and knowledgeable people, because we know that we have not got to seek very far for arguments to buttress it with. We feel, too, that any further constitutional change of whatever nature which is to be put into operation in this island should be accompanied by a clear understanding that the two-Party system must work, and we would not be hypocrites to give a blanket assurance to the Government that we are willing to play our part as a responsible Opposition and at the same time be denied our rights.

I know that some people fear that the quiet and tranquil atmosphere of the Other Place would be somewhat disturbed by party political strife; but why should people be afraid of that? Why should it be thought that the Other Place is so sacrosanct and so different from any other legislative body that the clash and strife of party battle should not resound there? We do not take that view at all. We take the view that just as here in this Chamber different points of view are expressed and the House divides when it has to and allows the majority to have its way, we feel that in equal measure in the other Chamber of the Legislature the same division of opinion could take place whenever necessary. That is our point of view on that matter and we cannot therefore agree with those people who feel that the Legislative Council is a different sort of Legislature from this one, and therefore the disagreements and the clashes of opinion which go on in this Chamber should not go on there. It is a Legislative Chamber; it is one of the two Chambers of the Legislature of this island, and therefore it has a right within the limits of the nominated system to be as perfectly and as reasonably constituted as the people themselves constitute the elected branch of the Legislature.

Now there is another argument with which I must deal which runs somewhat like this. 'It might well be,' some people say, 'that you have a case for representation in the Legislative Council of political parties; but is

it really worth it? Don't you agree that at some time or other, perhaps soon from now, the Other Place will be abolished and that a single Legislative Chamber will do all the lawmaking that is necessary in this island? If you agree that the second Chamber is not necessary, why make all this fuss about representation in it or on it? My Party's answer to the contention is this: in the first place we do not waste our time in idle speculation as to whether or not or how soon or how long from now the Other Place will be abolished. We take it that the constitution of Barbados provides for two Chambers of Legislature, one elected and one nominated, and we are prepared to accept the Barbados constitution as it is with both Chambers, and therefore we do not speculate on the usefulness of the other.

Unlike some members on the other side who from time to time have complaints to make about the Other Place, our view is that so long as safeguards are made for its proper functioning, it can play its part in its own way as well as the elected Chamber plays its part; therefore we have no quarrel with the Other Place as such. It can be made to work as this Chamber works in its own way.

Our second answer to that is that we cannot talk about abolishing the Other Place by a mere vote in this House or by a mere expression of opinion whether by the Majority Party or anybody else. The existence of the Other Place and its place in the scheme of things here is guaranteed by Letters Patent and the Royal Instructions, and therefore if the Constitution of Barbados calls for an elected House and a nominated Council, unless you are altering the entire constitution you have to put up with the Other Place. We agree therefore that it is very idle and very unprofitable to wonder when we are going to get rid of the Other Place. We cannot foresee the time, at any rate in the near future, in which they will enter the realm of practical politics.

3.05 p.m.

We take the situation as it is and we do our bit. We consulted and made suggestions about this important matter. We accepted that the Other Place is an integral part of the Legislature and we are prepared to make our contribution towards making it work. The Government Party has made its own contribution to the efficient functioning of the Other Place. It has taken away the privilege of chief spokesman from the Chief Secretary and from the Attorney General and has put in their place, as chief spokesman for them, a Minister of their own Cabinet who is a member of their own Party. That, therefore, is the contribution made to the efficient working of the Other Place by the Government Party itself and now we ask on our part this question. If the Opposition Party is to make any contribution whatsoever on its own side to the efficient working of the two-party system in a two-chamber Government and if the Government is now represented by its own spokesman and not by any official in the Other Place, is not the Opposition Party rightly asking to be represented by its own spokesman? If you tolerate that this is the one system which should work with the existence of a Leader of the House in the elected Chamber speaking for the Government and conducting Government Business, what is your opposition to seeing the same system at work in the Other Chamber of the Legislature with the spokesman of the Government who is the Minister without Portfolio and a spokesman for the Opposition Party? We feel that you should have a Leader of the Opposition in the Other Place, at least the chief spokesman for the Democratic Labour Party. That is how we feel about it; therefore, it is no favour which we are asking. If we ask anything, it is for the opportunity to make the system work as it should be worked. It is no special consideration which would be given; we are prepared to abide by the verdict of the electorate.

When in the last Session before the General Election our Party had four members and the Conservative Party had four, there was no question of our wanting to be the Official Opposition because, in the first place, the Conservative Party had been recognised as the Official Opposition before our Party had been established and, in the second place, our Party had been established at least in this Chamber from among individual members. We did not win the General Election as a Party, neither did we

fight the General Election as a Party at that time; therefore, it was not a question of our being recognised as a Party then. But after the last election when we did emerge as the second largest party, well then, obviously, we became the Opposition Party although the powers-that-be on the other side took some time before they gave recognition to the person whom we chose as the Leader of our Party in the Legislature.

While we on this side from time to time had certain doubts as to the sincerity of hon. members opposite when they protested that they wanted the two-party system to work, yet generally we feel that they do make an attempt, however half-heartedly, to make it work in this Chamber. In recent months, since Sir Grantley Adams has left this Chamber, it is the experience that there has been more courtesy between members of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition and we have been handed certain things for perusal beforehand by members of the Government and kept informed of matters from time to time; so, we are not flattering them when we say that they do make an attempt to make the two-party system work in this Chamber. Why cannot they make the same attempt in the Other Place? I know it is the fashion on the other side that unless they can have all the power and authority over people in the various positions, they feel that they cannot justify themselves as being the Government. That is a temptation of Governments from time to time. They like to hold themselves the powers of nomination and making appointments; but in a democracy it is a temptation which Governments would do well to suppress. In a democracy, the running of the State is not always kept exclusively by the Government; there are other bodies, whether political, social or economic, who in their own way exercise just as much an unchallenged supremacy in their own sphere as the Government does in its sphere; therefore, to work a democratic system properly, you have to give heed to all these sections of opinion whether opposed to Government or not.

I do admit that if our request were granted I could not give the assurance that our representative in the Other Place would not criticise the Government bitterly; as a matter of fact, that is what he would be there for. He would be there to put forward our point of view with the same strength and courage as we do it here, and we could not give them any guarantee that the spokesman of ours in the Other Place would pursue a quiet policy and not disturb the sleepy old gentlemen whom they have in the Other Place. We are a political Party which delights in putting forward its point of view and that is what is expected of any political Party. Are we to understand that because there is the fear that party politics will at least come in a more direct way to the Other Place or because that fear may exist, that that is the reason why right should not be done? It would be a bad day anywhere, not only in Barbados, if the Government or the advisers to Government, or the Secretary of State for the Colonies refrained from doing anything that is right for the fear of what the consequences may be. This is no favour which is being asked; we are going to insist on it and I know we are going to get it. While there is a lot of pleasure in getting things after long agitation and there is pleasure for winning your point of view in the teeth of opposition, there is much more satisfaction in your presenting a reasonable case to people whom you believe are reasonable and relying on their good sense of seeing the justice of your case and accepting it. When they published in the newspaper that we have been prevented from getting our member in the Other Place through the back door, they missed the whole point because what they said showed quite clearly that they do not understand the system which they are called upon to work; and the Government in power, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should understand that in a matter like this, no matter how large the majority is, no matter how much you may feel that you have the support of the largest number of people, you cannot work a system properly without the help of the other Party.

3.15 p.m.

A case in point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this recent excursion in stupidity which has passed for a constitutional crisis. Sir Grantley Adams complained in public that the Constitution had not been set out in the right way; he was under the impression that some mistake had been made

as to what the interpretation of the Constitution was. He complained that he understood one thing but apparently somebody else understood something else. But how could a situation like that come about? If you look upon the Constitution of Barbados as something belonging to yourself as Premier or to the Government and nobody else, then you are bound to run into difficulty. You arrange your secret matters known to you, known between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Governor and you have a chance agreement; you did not invite the co-operation of the people of the country; therefore you have to carry the whole weight yourself and then you complain about your misunderstandings. If, when the proposals were being agreed to, the Opposition Party had been called into them fully and frankly before anything was settled, and if the major and more important consultations between the Government and the Opposition had taken place, everybody by now would have known whether the Government acted rightly or wrongly in the appointment of Aldermen; but the chickens have now come to roost. Sir Grantley Adams, for years, has treated Barbados and the Constitution as something which he had bought or as if he had bought this whole island at an auction sale at the cheapest possible price so that he could do with it as he liked; so that he would not have to consult anybody in the matter and therefore he would be responsible to nobody. If you take that view of your responsibility to the country which you govern, then nobody is going to pull your chestnuts out of the fire, because the people will feel that what they have not been consulted about they are not going to get into; whoever was at the wedding should be at the burial, as the old people say. If there had been an agreement reached between the Government and other Parties, then the Government would find favour if the Governor had strayed from such an agreement. You will see that in order to work the Party system properly, you need to have consultations between the Government and the Opposition. It is not now a matter of betraying any official secrets. When you tell us what is proposed for the Cabinet or what new changes are going to take place, you are not really telling us any official secret because you are outlining some extension of the form of Government under which the people of Barbados have to live. Even if in the exploratory stages it is a matter of private conversation, as soon as agreement is reached then it is a question of the Constitution under which everybody must live. The Ministers therefore must not treat it as a private concern, accountable to nobody but themselves, to hide it away as if nobody else should know it because we all have to know it when the trouble comes. If they argue in their difficulty now that everybody should know what the Constitution of Barbados is, so that no future Governor should humbug them, then the same argument holds good for everybody in the country; we should all know what the Constitution is so that no Cabinet, Governor, or anybody else should be able to monkey with it.

Much as I sympathise with them in their present plight, I am unable to be very sorry for them because they brought it all upon themselves. The Constitution of Barbados is public property, and, by the same token, an improvement or extension of it is public property; therefore we have as much right as they have to make our contribution and to give our share to the extension and improvement of it. Therefore the Speech from the Throne has certainly done us and the people of this island an injustice, because it has rejected a principle which was right. I suspect that our proposal for representation in the Other Place has been rejected, not on its merits, but because the Democratic Labour Party had asked for it. I am convinced that if, on that side, they had thought, as they have shown, that this, or that person is one who deserves elevation to the Council as a member, you would not have to argue too long with them; they would see it immediately - especially if the person is known to be a supporter of theirs or, at any rate, if he is not known to be an opponent. That is how they judge things; they judge who support them and they also judge who do not support them. You cannot work the Party system in that way; they will have to see, even before they go out of power, that the Opposition Party bears as much responsibility for making the system work as they do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have purposely spoken in a restrained manner in this matter because the debate on it

is taking place in reply to the Speech from the Throne; but I would not wish it to be thought that we have heard the last word of this matter. I feel myself that sometimes our Party remains too quiet not challenging these obvious issues and they on that side get away with political murder by default; but I am glad to see that opinions which we have held on another matter of a more recent occurrence have borne fruit and that the persons in question have beaten a retreat. I understand from a statement issued today that no Minister will sit on the Board of Guardians of the Local Government Councils. We were prepared to carry that matter to any length, but it has been settled in another way (Hon. M. E. COX: Do you think we care two hoots about them?) Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is just the trouble with them; they are made to retreat and instead of bowing gracefully they are making the issue a virtue of necessity. You were made to come off the Board of Guardians (Hon. R. G. MAPP: Not through you.) Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is curious that in respect of the Ministers who are cross-talking with me, neither of them is involved in the matter.

3.25 p.m.

One of the persons at least who could have been involved in it has been very respectful and has treated it with dignified silence as usual.

As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have purposely spoken in this strain because the debate is taking place on the reply to the Speech from the Throne. We have not finished with it and we propose as soon as the new Governor comes to make additional and further representation through him to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. We are not asking the Ministers of Barbados for anything. We are not seeking any favours from the Cabinet of Barbados and we have always said so. If they are opposed to it, as I know they are, they are not opposed to it on constitutional grounds; they are opposed to it out of political spite. They feel that they get enough trouble as it is from this Party in this Chamber and they do not want poor Mr. Morris to spend any sleepless nights in the Other Chamber wondering what the Democratic Labour Party Opposition will do there; but that is a political reason for not allowing us to be represented there; it is not constitutional. There could never be any constitutional reasons and that is why we are prepared to pursue the matter.

With respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to other matters covered in the Speech from the Throne and the amendments which have been moved by my colleague, I am in agreement as always with the points he has put forward. The Speech as an indication of Government policy is woefully lacking in assurances which it should give to the community of what Government intends to do. Even some of the information contained in it is not what we all like to see and we are all disturbed on this side to see that the matter of unemployment and the statistics of unemployment should receive such scant attention in the Speech from the Throne; but as was said before in this House, Government must see to it that more accurate information is known about this matter and that they do not fob the House or the public off with the figures which only come from the Employment Exchange. This is not reliable data for gauging the extent of unemployment; that has been spoken so often that we need not labour the point now.

Everybody knows by now what this Party feels about the establishment of a Schools Meal Service - the Hot Meal Scheme. We are never tired of talking about it because we feel sooner or later Government will do it. The only difference will be then that when they do start it they will want to make people believe it was their idea originally, and they will hope that the short memories of the people of Barbados to which they are always drawing attention will enable them to escape censure for not having done it before.

We have spoken at length on other occasions in this House about Old Age Pensions and the necessity for increase. I do not know of any new argument which can be used to convince Government as to what should be done.

The question of increase for the lowest paid categories of public employees has been aired already and

will be aired soon again. They know our views on these matters, and we had wished that in the Speech from the Throne some positive assurances would have been given. These assurances have not been forth-coming and any reference made to any of these matters have been very vague and very nebulous.

Now if the Governor's Speech is the policy of the Cabinet in power, then that policy stands condemned because of its ineffectiveness; it does not seem to go far enough to meet all the pressing needs; it does not seem to touch on all the important issues which affect the people of Barbados today. For instance, and I must draw the attention of the Minister of Education to this, for some months now everybody has known of the closing down of that School in Jemmotts Lane. Even on the Order Paper of this House there is an Address standing in my name asking Government to do something about it. So far as I am aware, the school has not been re-opened, at least to the end of last term; I do not know what has happened this term; but more significant than that, Government has not issued a statement on the matter showing what it can do, and we are yet to hear from the Minister of Education that the matter has been considered. Now 900 children out of school is a problem of vast proportions. It will cause among other things over-crowding in the surrounding schools, and more important than that, it will deprive hundreds of children of their opportunities. To miss a term's schooling for a child in Barbados is a terrific thing; yet from the silence of the Government on the matter you will presumably be forgiven for supposing that the Minister of Education has forgotten all about it. That is only one of the dozen or perhaps twenty issues which are of paramount importance now, and we want Government to understand that when we raise these issues here we are quite prepared to hear them say that it will take time to solve them; but what we are not prepared to tolerate is a complete and utter silence on the matter as though the issues themselves are not important and as though the people who raised them do not deserve the dignity of an answer. That cannot be the best way; and to say in the Speech from the Throne that you are satisfied with the financial and economic stability of the island when the Premier himself in his Budget Speech nearly made our flesh creep with what he called the difficult state of things is a discrepancy which perhaps only a member of that Party can reconcile.

I wonder how long the hon. junior member for St. Joseph can genuinely and sincerely think or rather say that the House is pleased with the financial and economic stability of the island when his own Party Leader, not as much as two months ago, said that there was little money to do all the little things you need and that you have to put a little more on beer and do something about the Pools. So you have within the same Party on two distinct, but not distant, occasions - you have the Head of the Government warning the people of this island that they may have to tighten their belts and pay a little more for this, that and the other, and the junior Minister without portfolio, the Premier-to-be, ... (A VOICE: There is no election on.) When the hon. member tells me that there is no election on, he and his Party should be the last persons to say that, and when there is no election on they seem to suffer worse. Two defeats in six weeks; that is a record even for them. Who can stop the current? Only God. (Laughter.)

3.35 p.m.

Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a discrepancy. If even in the Government Party itself - and the Government Party is in two minds about the economic situation of the island but is saying that more must be paid for beer and stout because revenue is needed, and having got that off their chest they now say that the House note with satisfaction the financial stability and economic advancement of the island. How can they say that? On our part, we are not pleased about it. A lot of things have gone wrong for which we want some assurance. I would like to see that some of the money is being kept in the peoples' pockets. I know that they would say that we are electioneering. Sometime ago, I moved an Address asking for an increase in pay for cantoniers and the Hon. Leader of the House said among other things that I was three months late because Government was working on the matter already and

soon from then would be bringing down a Resolution to that effect. If he said that we were electioneering when I brought down that Resolution, then what he said in reply shows that we were all playing politics then. (Hon. M. E. COX: It was introduced today.) Sir, I am very glad to hear that. If the Government is generous in its proposals - I do not know what they are yet - then the Hon. Minister need not have any fear that he would get the support of members of this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side cannot share all their enthusiasm and satisfaction on the way how things are going. There are a lot of things which I want them to put right. None of the things which we hear from them are things which are impossible to be done. The time has come for them to consider the old people and all sections of the community; at least the people in the lower income groups are suffering terribly, but no section more so than the old people. Their income is not only small, but fixed and certain; and I am sure the Hon. Premier himself has seen a lot of that in the course of his duty whether as doctor or Premier. Therefore, as soon as he can bring proposals to the House for an increase of old age pension it would not be a day too soon.

Sir, that and other matters should be engaging the attention of the House and we regret that we see no distinct and direct mention of these things in the Speech from the Throne; and for that reason, much as we would like to be unanimous in things like this, we would have to divide the House because of our dissatisfaction, because of the inadequacies and the omissions in His Excellency's Speech from the Throne.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will seize this opportunity to reply to one or two points raised by the hon. member who has just sat down. This would not in any way prejudice the right of the Hon. Introducer of this Address from replying. Perhaps I should apologise because on account of my absence last week I was unable to follow the entire speech of the hon. member, but as far as the part of his speech as regards the appointment of a member from his Party to the Other Place, I would just like to say that I have never heard more nonsense displayed by a supposed M. A. in this House of Assembly.

What is the position, Mr. Deputy Speaker? He told us that they stated to the Governor that his Party should be represented in the Other Place and he would have this House to believe that the Barbados Labour Party, the Government in power, has the majority in the Other Place.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What I did say was that formally the Conservatives are the majority in the Other Place and the minority of persons there consists of either supporters or members of the Government Party. I never said that the Government Party was in the majority in the Other Place.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, if the hon. member said that, that helps the case which I am putting forward. That shows that the Conservatives who are in the majority are in opposition to the Government. What more representation do you want? What greater representation does the Opposition want? The Conservative element dominates the Other Place and the hon. member knows that. He said that the Opposition is not represented up there. You cannot have it both ways. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy is the accredited and Official Leader of the Opposition in this House. If they agree to make it appear that there are two groups of Opposition in this Chamber, that is entirely a matter for them. It is clear, however, to us that whenever a motion is being put to the vote, they all join and vote against the Government; therefore, they are at one in voting against a particular motion of the Government but yet at the same time the hon. member wants to show that his Party is slightly different from the other people in the Opposition.

Sir, you have in the Other Place people with conservative views and policy; but he wants to make it appear as if his views are different from theirs, and therefore, you must put somebody up there to express his Party's point of view. At the last General Elections, his Party

got four seats and the hon. senior member for Christ Church who came in as an Independent joined that party later. If you come in as an Independent, you cannot claim that the people elected you as a member of that Party.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal explanation. I came in here as an Independent Labour candidate.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is exactly what I was saying. He came in as an Independent Labour candidate and he was not attached to the Party in which he now finds himself; therefore, that Party cannot claim that he faced the electorate as a member of their Party and was elected as such.

Mr. Speaker, they have three members now who were elected at the last General Elections as members of their Party and there is also a collection of so-called Independent members and three members of the other party - the B.N.P. - but it is understood and recognised that in any Assembly there is only one Opposition Party. Whether he likes it or not - and I know he likes it - members of the Democratic Labour Party along with a few scattered Independents here and there and the three members of the Barbados National Party form the Opposition to the Government in this House. As I have said, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, is the person whom we regard as the Leader of the Opposition and not really the leader of their group. We do not recognise that hon. member as Leader of the Opposition and along with him somebody else from the B.N.P. We have one Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, just want to quote what the Secretary of State for the Colonies said when Ministerial System was about to be introduced. This was written on the 24th August, 1953, and this is what he said:-

"I regard salaries to be paid to Ministers as a matter primarily of domestic concern. I should similarly regard the question of payment to the Leader of the Opposition but I know that the feasibility of such provision would depend on whether such a person could be readily identified."

3.45 p.m.

What is the position? Split up as they are over there, the Secretary of State for the Colonies found difficulty in selecting whom he could regard as the Opposition or rather the Leader of the Opposition; but again I repeat it is the height of nonsense to say that this group should have somebody in the Other Place to say what on their behalf? No legislation is passed here through the three members who represent what they call the D.L.P. and therefore what representation in the Other Place are you referring to? The Other Place, as you know, is in an advisory capacity or in the capacity of delay and despite the fact that they have the right to reject anything which has been passed here, it has been the custom that where anything has been rejected for the first time and re-introduced on the second occasion, it is accepted by the Other Place and passed. What is all this representation which the hon. member wants in the Other Place? He goes further and says that he believes that their suggestion was not carried out because the Government or the Ministers do not want any representation in the Other Place. But representation about what? It sounds so childish to me to see an hon. member who is an M.A., get up in this House and hear him make a plea as if there is a prize in the Other Place to be captured and they are denied the opportunity of capturing that prize. We are in the majority and we have one person representing the Government and putting forward in the Other Place measures which have been passed by this House, and that is the convention which has been accepted by all advanced Governments or Legislatures. It has been accepted that the Party in power should have somebody to speak for it in the Other Place.

The member in the Other Place is not representing the Labour Party; he is representing the Government of Barbados. Quite recently a gentleman was put in the Other Place, a gentleman called Mr. Bayne, not as a member of the Labour Party but as one who is representing the underprivileged people of this country and more particu-

larly because of his Trade Union representation. I sincerely hope that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy will not waste any time after now to talk about putting in the Other Place a member from his Party. I repeat that the Government passes legislation and the Member in the Other Place is responsible for seeing that that legislation is put through up there. If the hon. member wants more opposition than there is in the Other Place, I would like to say that the Other Place is not a reflection of this House; it is a Conservative Body which represents views and therefore the hon. member's views are well taken care of in the Other Place by people with whom he is associated.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of personal explanation. The hon. member is really going too far when he talks about my views being properly taken care of by people with whom I am associated. He knows much better than that. There are two Labour Parties; one Party runs the Government and the other runs the Opposition. In the Other Place there is one member of the Labour Party and the Conservatives, but the Labour Party which is the Official Opposition in this House is not represented there. If there are three Parties, we feel that they should all be represented in the Other Place.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am glad to hear that there is another Labour Party over there, but we do not regard it as such. We regard it as a satellite of the P.C.P., the B.N.P. or whatever it is. I would go further and say....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has finished his speech.

Hon. M. E. COX: No, Sir. The hon. senior member for St. Lucy rose to a point of explanation and I sat down because I am prepared to follow the Rules of this House. *(Laughter).*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member talked about this constitutional issue and he went on to say that members of his Party were not consulted in this matter beforehand but he actually insinuated that if they were consulted before about this constitutional development and anything had happened, we could rely on them to stand solidly together. I want to say that that is a grossly misleading statement; when the Ministerial discussions were taking place, all sides of this House were consulted; they met at Government House and discussed the matter. When the Cabinet System was about to be introduced these proposals were also

At this stage, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that as to the proposals to establish a Cabinet System, long before they were decided upon and brought before this House, they were discussed at Government House and members of that Party or rather of that group to which the hon. member belongs, were consulted and they discussed this question. I would say that all the Leaders of the Opposition were present.

3.55 p.m.

I go back as far, Mr. Speaker, as the 24th August, 1953 when Oliver Lyttelton, Secretary of State for the Colonies sent out a despatch to the Governor of this country. In paragraph 2 of that despatch, this is what he had to say:-

"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 members of the Executive Council involve 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. Subject to the results of consideration of the proposals by the Barbados Legislature and to the comments which follow I should be prepared to agree to such a change."

He goes on to point out apparently how pleased he was to see that there was a sort of unanimous agreement

between all Parties on our Ministerial advancement. The member gets on the floor of the House today and tells you that they were not consulted. He said that if they had been consulted on these ministerial talks, they would have agreed with us or they would have been able to support us in this present crisis.

Now I want to say, Sir, that I know for a fact that while they do agree, as they have hinted to their friends and sometimes to their foes, that we were right on this issue, they were never prepared to come out in public and say so because they believed it would have been a fillip to the Labour Party. They are dumb on it because they do not want to make it appear that they support the Barbados Labour Party on this issue, but they know that the convention has been contravened. But what amuses me so much, Sir, is that some of those members on the other side, especially those who call themselves D.L.P. members will get up and attack and accuse us of being colonial-minded and that sort of thing, of being run by the Colonial Office and that whatever the Colonial Office says we will agree with, and no doubt nobody has suffered worse from that sort of cheap, unjustifiable criticism than the Prime Minister of the West Indies. But what do you find happening? Whenever anything takes place, what do they do? They run to the Governor. They go to the Governor and want him to use powers which he has not got to help them, which is Colonialism to the core.

Look at what he said here ever since the institution of Ministerial Government in this island. We made it clear that when you pass an Address to the Governor of this island it meant absolutely nothing. He had no power to tell us what to do and that has always been the case and they ought to know it, and I believe some of them do. If today we decide we are going to carry something down to the House of Assembly, the Head of the Administration can say that he does not agree, but he cannot say we cannot carry it. He has no reserve powers and never had any. What he can do, after we have passed it, is to refuse to assent to it and that is what we call vetoing it; neither can he tell us to carry down something. We made it clear to the members on the other side that it was the height of nonsense to get in the House of Assembly and pass a Resolution or an Address to the Governor, when in truth and in fact, the Governor was merely a figurehead. He cannot send us anywhere with anything; he never had that power and never will have it; but they still persist in asking the Governor to do this, that and the other although it was made clear from the beginning that any question which concerned a Minister might only be done either by a Resolution in this House to the Ministry or by a question as is done in the House of Commons. They bypass the Ministries and push themselves up to Government House to get things done, but the Governor cannot do anything for them. They persisted in doing that until the Federal Parliament was inaugurated and they saw then that the House of Representatives could at no time send a Resolution or Address to the Governor General, and it is only after that that the members over there decided to come in here and change their method of presenting these Resolutions or Addresses.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order, the hon. member is not strictly accurate. If we have changed it, it is because the Rules of the House have been changed. The Rules of the House no longer allow us to do these matters that way, and if they had not been changed, we would have continued as before.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am glad to hear him say that; but having said it, I will continue to say that they are still Colonial-minded. It only shows that if people like him had an opportunity on that side, whatever the Colonial Office and the Governor say would be a law for them. He read the Speech made by the Governor on Ministerial Government, he read the despatch or despatches by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and yet he bypasses the Ministers and goes to the Governor. The Governor cannot send down a Resolution to do anything, neither can he instruct or ask us to bring anything here.

There is one last point I should like to make, Sir. I heard the hon. member say that it was because of the

stand they took that the Ministers who were appointed as members of the Guardians Committee had refused to sit after they were appointed. I should like to say here and now that that is a falsity. He is merely crediting himself with more influence than he will ever have, and he made it appear also that the Ministers were forced to surrender or give up the appointments. The way he put it made it look as though they were forced by some big official.

4.05 p.m.

(A VOICE: Public opinion.) He now says public opinion. Up to now, the public does not know. He reminds me of some newspaper in which you see some correspondence on public opinion when in truth and in fact the writer has no idea what public opinion is.

I almost understood him to say or to insinuate that they were forced by views from above. That means that this Crown Colony mentality is still so pronounced.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I did insinuate that it was forced by views from above, I would have meant the Almighty.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am sorry for him. If I remember correctly, the hon. member almost threatened that he would go and see the Head of the Administration. I would like to say here and now that it would not amount to one row of pins if the hon. member went to him. As the Hon. Premier pointed out, there is nothing in the law against it, neither is there anything in the conventions which prevents a Minister from sitting on any Board. What perhaps may be wrong and where perhaps one may be unseated is if one sits on a Board which might be regarded as an office of the Crown. I wish to say that a Minister can sit on any Board. There is absolutely no law or no convention which states that no member should sit on any Board.

Mr. TALMA: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I hate to interrupt the Hon. Minister but I cannot sit here and allow a wrong impression to be created. For a Minister to sit on a Board is against the conventions in the first place if he is a member of the Executive Committee, no matter what portfolio he has. Let us assume that the Minister is Minister of Local Government affairs.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is now making a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is getting at what he wants to say rather slowly, but he will get there in the course of time.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, when I say that a Minister is forced under the conventions to resign from membership of Boards, I also wish to say that not only is that so for Boards run by the Government but other Public Boards too. I had to resign my seat, after I became a Minister, as a member of the Governing Body of the Boys' Foundation School- and the Foundation School does not have to render accounts to the Governor-in-Executive Committee whereas under Local Government you will find that a Minister who is holding an important post in the Local Government would have to be rendering accounts to himself, he being a member of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. Therefore, you can well see that he will be occupying a dual position as master by being a Minister and as a servant by being a member of the Board.

Hon. M. E. COX: There are 24 paragraphs in this convention which I hold here. I will give it to the hon. member and let him show me any part which says that a Minister cannot sit on a Board. If you say that it is not keeping in dignity with their status as Ministers, I would understand. Let me point out that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture was a Minister from the last General Elections, yet he was Churchwarden of the Vestry of St. Philip, Poor Law Guardian and all that sort of thing.

I think I know a little of matters pertaining to this. If you feel that it is not in keeping with your status as a Minister, you need not sit on a Board. But there is absolutely nothing in the conventions which precludes a Min-

ister from sitting on any Board in the Island; therefore, it would be purely a question for the Minister himself, of course in consultation with the Premier, whether he would like to remain on a Board if he was appointed. It is not the concern of anybody else - no public opinion, no Governor. That is the position as it stands. Sir, I was not prepared to speak at such length, but too often I find that my colleagues on the other side (Mr. TUDOR: Colleagues?) I withdraw that word. Too often, Sir, I find that hon. members on the other side of the House get up and just talk through their hats and just ramble and say anything they think would please the Gallery. I do not refer to the hon. senior member for Christ Church.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I take objection to what the Hon. Minister has just said.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said that I was not referring to the hon. member. Sir, again I repeat.....

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since he is replying to me, if he says that I speak to please the Gallery, I admit that, but he speaks to displease the Gallery.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. members to keep the people of the Gallery out of this debate.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sir, I believe the hon. member could have made a better contribution. I understand that a question was raised about unemployment. In the very near future I will inform this House as to what industries are likely to be established here. This Government is doing everything possible to relieve unemployment in this island. There are over 3,000 people employed in capital works alone by this Government.

The hon. senior member for St. Lucy not long ago referred to an Address which he attempted to pass some time ago in this House relative to an increase in wages for people in three departments of the Government - the Public Works Department, the Highways and Transport Department and the Waterworks Department - but as I have said then, the Government has to take care of all its people and more care of the people in the lower walks of life. I made it clear that we could not agree to that Address although I have been criticised by those who cannot think for themselves and who accept what others say gullibly. They said that I was opposing the granting of increases for these workers.

I must state here and now that I have never opposed anything for the good of workers and I do not think I will live long enough to oppose anything for the good of workers in the lower categories. As a matter of fact, I have fought for these people all my life in this House. I have this to say. It would be the height of folly and it would create more confusion if we were so silly as to accept the Resolution as presented by the hon. member which contained increases for people in the Public Works Department, the Highways and Transport Department and the Waterworks, but not for anybody else.
4.15 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: On a point of order. The hon. member is referring to a Resolution which is not even on the Order Paper. That died with the last Session. There is a new Resolution now which should meet his requirement because it is asking for money for everybody.

Hon. M. E. COX: If the hon. member wanted to play the game and he did not want it to appear that he was doing something when he was not doing anything, he would not have introduced that Resolution. He was told that the Government was considering the question and that the Government would soon be coming down with something for everybody and not for merely two or three Departments. The hon. member listened to the Speech from the Throne - I saw him listening up there - and in that Speech His Excellency made mention of the same thing; His Excellency made mention of the intention of the Government to introduce in the near future a Resolution to provide for increases for these people. Although the hon. member heard that, he still introduced this Resolution. What does that

mean? It means that he wants people to feel that he is interested in them and he is doing something for them. The Resolution referred to by His Excellency was introduced today and that covers the service; that is what we feel should be done. It is not a Resolution including members of the House or the Ministers. (Mr. TUDOR: It is not the service; it is the disservice.) The hon. member can only think in a small way; he can only think in his circumscribed way but the Government has to think in general for the good of the community as a whole.

Hon. L. STA. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make any speech, but I think it is my duty to make just a brief remark in reply to the hon. senior member for St. Lucy with regard to the question of the Government Elementary Schools. I am to say that I have given the matter very careful consideration and I have arrived at a decision; perhaps next Tuesday I may be able to tell hon. members what that decision is. I want to assure hon. members that I am extremely concerned about the children and I am prepared to see that something is done for them.

With respect to my withdrawal from membership of the Guardians Committee of the Local Government Council, I want to assure the hon. member that I am a believer in the old maxim that "He who would command must first learn to obey." When the announcement was made here the Premier knew nothing about it; he has expressed the feeling that I should not serve on the Guardians Committee and therefore I will not serve...

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate.....

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order. If I am reading correctly, the hon. member has already spoken on this matter.

Mr. DOWDING: I think that the Premier's copy is wrong. On the last occasion I rose and spoke on a point of explanation. On that same point I would like to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Hon. Minister of Education who, after their Party colleagues had decided to put them on the Guardians Committee of the Southern District Council and they were appointed to that Committee on the votes of Labour Party members present, they, of their own free will, have decided to withdraw their membership of that Committee.

Now, Sir, I am sorry that the Hon. Leader of the House has vacated his seat for the moment, but I would like humbly to submit to him that his post as Leader of the House is one which he should take in a more serious manner. I would suggest to him that a little reading on the subject of tolerance would show the importance of Parliament; in general, accusations which are vague and thrown and hurled all about tend to keep the debates on the low level to which the House is now sinking. I had sincerely hoped that they were being buoyed up all the way. When the Hon. Minister says that members on this side of the House vote as one in opposition to the Government, that is an absolute terminological inexactitude and a falsehood. I remember the time when I, myself, was being accused by hon. members on this very side of the Table of being a member of the Government Party. I want to make it quite clear to the Hon. Leader of the House or to any other member of this House that we should conduct the debates devoid of personalities and inaccuracies and vague indications; otherwise I will reply in a fitting manner. When accusations are made and thrown at me I will reply to and refute them utterly in this House. I submit that the Hon. Leader of this House should pay a little more attention to the facts and to the daily working of his particular post in this House.

I regret very much that I have to stress that, but I think that it is important enough that it should be repeated until we can get some action in this connection.

Under the Head of "unemployment", as hon. members have said and I intend further to stress it, His Excellency in the course of his Speech from the Throne said this: "No reliable statistics of unemployment are available." That in itself is a terrible admission. Here it is that a Government which has been in power for some ten years now, is

not, at this date, able to give this overcrowded and over populated place the unemployment figures. We hear about unemployment and nobody can refute it; we must go by this statement: "No reliable statistics of unemployment are available." That is a serious matter.
4.25 p.m.

The Hon. Leader of the House in his speech said that in five or six weeks we will be hearing something. In the past ten bountiful years there is nothing in this island that one can point to and say it is going to employ people. There is nothing at all apart from what was existing these past three hundred years up to now; there is nothing new of any consequence in this island. It is a matter which I deprecate strongly and there is no bold message to counteract it, and when they go on to say that the number registered at the Employment Exchange at 31st December was 1,162, I can say that the number I had registered in my file for one year was more than that. (Hon. R. G. MAPP: What did you do about it?) I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if he can do nothing about it and his hands are not tied, perhaps he would be the one to tell us what to do about it. Those of us who love this island and the people in it will not be tied forever. On that point, Sir, it is remarkable that there is no information whatsoever on the unemployment of this island. I myself morning after morning receive as many as six youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 mostly, who are out of work and have no possible chance of getting any work, not only because of the fact that they are taught above a certain level and therefore quite rightly should not be doing mental tasks, but also because there is absolutely no opportunity for them in this island.

Unless this Government takes this matter seriously, I do not know in these five or six weeks' time what we will hear. This is not a matter of a few hundred thousand dollars which need investment; this is a matter of a vast, bold plan, a matter which, you will realise, in the sugar industry and in all other industries means the necessity to compete in the world. It may be surprising to know that, having to mechanise further, we cannot get persons to work in the sugar industry. When you realise that no longer in this world today do men and women do the jobs that are fitted for machines, and when you realise that the educational system which is being used is training these men and women to accept a different job in life

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 4.30 p.m. o'clock, this House now reverts to Government Business.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for Christ Church was addressing the House.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on this question of the Bill which is before us for the increase in the remuneration of the post of Speaker of this House, I was making the point that I am thorough agreement with the principle of the Bill for very many reasons.

In the first place, the post of the Speaker of this House is one of the most important legislative posts in this island. It is probably the third most outstanding post, coming immediately after that of the governor and the Premier, and from that point of view, it has always been said from all sides that the dignity of the Chair should be upheld and the post of Speaker should be paid a salary whereby it may be possible to uphold that dignity, because how can the dignity of the Chair be upheld unless there is attached to the post some form of reasonable remuneration and perquisites? If we are to uphold the dignity of the Chair on that principle - and there can be no empty dignity - it must be reinforced, so to speak, and buttressed with adequate remuneration. That is the first point; and while I am saying that, I am not referring to the present Speaker, but to the post of Speaker. I am afraid that it seemed to me that one or two of the previous Speakers, not the Leader of the Opposition, were more attached to the present Speaker and not to the post of Speaker. While I am on that point, I would like to withdraw a rather unfortunate remark which I made, as I misunderstood a statement made by a previous speaker, when the question of some sort of simile or comparison was being

drawn. I misunderstood him in that his argument was that only in the case where Heads of Departments were being considered was the argument used about comparable wages in the other colonies whereas in the case of the underprivileged that argument is never used. He also said that the present Government can never find money for the underprivileged. Of course, we are all in agreement with that. (Cheers.) I really did not mean any malice when I said it, and I want to withdraw that remark. I am saying that there should be no simile drawn with respect to the remuneration to the post of Speaker, because the Speaker should be put on a proper basis and given a reasonable remuneration and the necessary perquisites, and travelling allowance attached to the post, as exist in other colonies. Naturally the Speaker of the Barbados House of Assembly should be put on a basis comparable to that of the Speaker in Jamaica, Trinidad or British Guiana as outlined by the Hon. Premier, and I feel that the present Government is doing a good thing in trying to adjust the salary attached to this post at this time, and not to adopt the old policy of the last Government in that the salary was not attached to the post but attached to the individual who, unfortunately then, was your Honour. That is the wrong method of approach. You do not always have the Speaker occupying another position at the Union as Assistant Secretary. The Speaker is to be paid a reasonable salary in his own right and should not depend on any subsidiary or ancillary salary from the Union or any source in order to lump both together to receive something reasonable by way of remuneration.
4.35 p.m.

We are not dealing with the post of Speaker as such plus that of Assistant Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union. We are dealing with the post of Speaker. Let us deal with that alone and independently. I am now censuring the Government of which I was a former member for what they have done previously and it is for that reason that I am commending the Government and the Hon. Premier now for taking this able stand.

Apart from what I have just said, though agreeing with my colleagues and the hon. senior member for St. Peter, who is General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and a very outstanding Secretary, I wish to say that there is nothing degrading for a Speaker to be an Assistant Secretary of the Union; but I feel that it may be embarrassing to the Speaker at times to find himself on the waterfront on a Monday fighting the cause of the workers against the employers, trying to get the best wages and conditions for them and then the next day he is sitting in the Chair and is supposed to be impartial. That can be very embarrassing, and if you view it in that light you will see that the Speaker should be above party politics. I will go as far as to say that you should give him the honour of being a representative of a single-member constituency because you will be putting him in the best position where he would be dropped in the next elections, although I feel the present Speaker has no fear of retaining his seat. As I have said, I feel that, as the Speaker is expected to administer impartially in here to all hon. members holding the post of Assistant Secretary of the Union along with that of Speakership would embarrass the Speaker. The second point which I have just mentioned is that he should not be put in the position of having to stand for election at all. I feel that should be remedied.

Sir, I am very pleased to see the adjustments being made and I regard the salary being paid in the past to you personally as being unfair. Of course, it was adjusted recently when the present Premier was promoted or demoted to Speaker. I do not know which it was. However, that salary was adjusted to suit the holder of the post then. It was done to cushion the fall. Anyhow, whatever motive may have been behind it, it was increased to \$400 a month and now it is brought into line and comparable to similar salaries paid in the other colonies to the Speaker. I feel this a move in the right direction and anyone viewing things in a particular way will note that the post of Speaker is now being adjusted for all time. I hope when the time comes when there will be a new Speaker that he will not be demoted from the present salary to \$400 or \$200, whatever it was.

Now Sir, on the question of making the post of Speakership a whole-time office according to what the Hon. Premier

said, I take it that that was done to justify the increase; but I regard the present post of Speaker as being whole-time in this sense that the Speaker is always accessible to private members or members of other Parties. The post is already a whole-time one in that the Speaker has a Department functioning under his control and he has to account for that Department. He has to account for the Clerk, the Deputy Clerk, the Reporters, the Marshal, the Typists and everybody else. He is already open to interview by any hon. member at any time of the day or night and when you give him a telephone, you are only giving him the allowance because he has already a telephone installed at his home. It is not a question of the Speaker now being put on a whole-time basis, but I would like to say that he is expected now to pay more time and attention to the office of Speaker now that his salary is being regularised. I would not expect the Speaker to be here the whole day from Monday to Saturday; but, as I have said, he is already accessible to hon. members and by this he will be more accessible in the future.

I thoroughly agree with the proposals, and I say that it is not a question of political bribery which was a point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Peter as regards travelling. I see in the other colonies, Trinidad, Jamaica, British Guiana and even the little colony of Grenada that members are paid for travelling. I am speaking on the general principles. Just as I support the principle of the payment of a travelling allowance for the Speaker, I am suggesting that all members of this Chamber should receive travelling allowance. I am suggesting something reasonable based on fairplay, justice and equity; I am not suggesting \$90 as what is given to a Minister or even \$60 which is now proposed to be given to the Speaker. As a matter of fact, even the constituency which I have the honour to represent is bigger than what some Ministers of the Government have the honour to represent. I know that they have fought to throw me out at the last General Elections but they have failed and they will fail again if they try to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now straying.

Mr. TALMA: I am justifying why travelling allowance should be given to other hon. members of the House just as the Ministers are paid \$90 for travelling and the Speaker in future will receive \$60 a month. I am saying that the principle of paying ordinary members a travelling allowance should also be agreed to. They should be paid at least \$25 or \$30 a month. I was making the point that the Ministers receive \$90 a month for travelling and that is for Governmental work. We have no grouse about that at all or of the Speaker receiving a travelling allowance, but I am saying that the principle also holds good for all other hon. members.

There are other points which I would like to make but I think they are all covered. I am glad that for the first time Your Honour the Speaker is treated in an equitable manner and is given what you deserve. What really strikes me is whether they should consider giving you back pay for the money which they deprived you of.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Bill for the increase of salary of the Speaker and of granting him a travelling allowance, I realise that a workman is worthy of his hire whether he is doing a whole-time or a part-time job. He should be paid for the work he is doing. I am saying that a Speaker should be given all the allowances and the facilities that are due to him as Speaker. I do not think that it needs that we should get up in here and contend and make any racket to give the Speaker this increase. If we mean to increase his salary, we should increase it without any fuss because he has important work to do. I am an independent member; therefore I can speak wholeheartedly. I am saying that the Speaker should be considered and paid according to his high office of Speaker. You do not need to refer that to the country. I say that the Speaker in his high office deserves being paid a proper salary and I see no cause why we should have kept it back so long. 4.45 p.m.

He should be considered and paid according to his post. We have proved that the Speaker is in a position to receive his proper remuneration and I do not see why this matter has got to be discussed for so long. I do not think that the Speaker should ever be obligated in any work;

he should not have to be going down to the Wharf in order to do this and that. He should be paid a proper remuneration so as to prevent him from going anywhere to do any work at all. I am very sorry that the Speaker did not receive this remuneration before because he is worthy of his hire, and we should not have to argue about what is paid for the Speakership of the Legislative Body in Trinidad, Jamaica, British Guiana or anywhere else. This post should not be considered as a whole-time or a part time post; it is an important job which the Speaker is doing. I want to say that when we have raised the remuneration of the people in the higher brackets, I hope we will also consider the people in the lower brackets. I am in agreement with this Bill and I am therefore supporting it.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I think it has been made clear in the course of this debate that all of us who took part in it are taking part in it as individual members of the House - on this occasion, at any rate, irrespective of Party affiliation. While I do not pretend to know the situation with respect to the Party opposite as to how strongly the various Party members feel on this or on that aspect of the matter, I know that we have differing views in our Party. We have agreed to differ in this matter because it is a matter which we discussed as members of the House and not as members of a political Party. I am entirely in agreement with the proposal in this Bill because I have long been looking forward to the time when certain Parliamentary usages would be brought to Barbados, or rather that they would be developed in Barbados as they are elsewhere in the Commonwealth, and one of the first usages I am glad to see is that the office of Speaker is coming into its own. This is nothing to do with the scale of remuneration or level of the salary, but at long last we are beginning to understand that something attaches to the dignity of the office of Speaker.

I would like to see the day come when a matter like this would be handled in such a way that the necessity for a debate would be removed. In the House of Commons, in respect of anything having to do with such salaries and emoluments, the House has never objected; but there is a Committee - I do not remember what it is called - which goes into these matters *in camera* and makes representations to the proper authority, and those recommendations are accepted by the majority of members. When these questions come up, the Parties are represented on the various Committees. It is not that there is anything undignified about this debate, but things have been spoken which need not to have been spoken. I understand that the Hon. Premier, in justifying this increase in the emoluments of the Speaker, mentioned that the office is a whole-time one from now on. I do not think that that needs to be said because the Speakership has always been a whole-time office, only that the nature of the work was such that you did not need to see the incumbent of the office every day; but he was always on call whenever a special meeting had to be summoned, or whenever a Bill had to be signed to be sent to the Other Place, or in connection with any similar matter. I think it is a fact that even at the end of a Session when all of us are without seats in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker remains Mr. Speaker for the duration of the Election campaign - Your Honour will correct me if I am wrong - and of course, the members of the Executive Committee remain the members of the Executive Committee. Therefore, there are some people who are whole-time officers without reference to the part or the portion of the day which they spend on their jobs.

Although I agree with the proposal to pay travelling allowance to the Speaker, I must say that as far as I remember, at least in discussing the matter with the members of my own Party, we did not reach any agreement on that. I do not know if the matter has been mentioned, but I am in favour of it and therefore I have no quarrel with it. I think that such a case can be made out for members of the House without exception. There are four members of this Assembly whose constituencies are in the metropolitan area, but it would be invidious to leave them out because if as members of this Assembly, they are representing these areas, they have to be out and about, and therefore a case can be made out for the payment of travelling allowance to all hon. members. We should be realistic

about these matters; so long as one is prepared to do work conscientiously for which he has been sent here, if there is anything which is given out of the Public Treasury, so long as it is given within reason, having regard to the financial position of the island, you can afford to justify its acceptance without being shamefaced about it. From my own side of the House, we certainly do a lot of travelling in our own constituencies and in other parts of this island on business of a public nature connected with legislative matters, and therefore the payment of a travelling allowance for members is something which should be taken seriously; and hon. members should be paid such an allowance so long as a reasonable amount is given.

There is something which strikes me as being very peculiar about this Bill, and I think my attitude about this matter is sufficiently well known. I have always said that, in this island, whatever obtains in the case of the Speaker should obtain in the case of the Deputy Speaker especially where allowances are concerned. I am not asking for any increase in the salary of the Deputy Speaker, but I am asking for a travelling allowance for the Deputy Speaker. Before I go further in this matter, just let me say this: The Deputy Speaker is a member of the Government Party. I have not had any consultation with him on this issue; as a matter of fact, I need not to have any and there is not need, therefore, for me to be "currying favour" with him or to want to embarrass him in any way; but I am astonished and surprised to see that the members of the Government argue that Mr. Speaker, who lives in St. Peter, is entitled to travelling allowance; and I do think they should be able to see the force of the argument that Mr. Deputy Speaker, who lives in St. Joseph, should also be entitled to travelling allowance.

4.55 p.m.

I do not know why a motion has not been made and I sincerely hope that, it having mentioned here now without controversy, those responsible for these matters will make the adjustments and will ask Government to send down the necessary legislation to make it right. Do not make it appear that the House has got to ask for this. It is money which I think the House will agree to and the sooner you can adjust it, the better.

The Deputy Speaker is the Speaker's Deputy, and his status and dignity should be safeguarded to the same extent that you safeguard the status and dignity of the Speaker. He does not need the Speaker's salary, but presumably if he were acting Speaker for some length of time, some necessary adjustments would have to be made; but so far as travelling is concerned, he is, I think, equally entitled to it. Later on this year, Mr. Speaker, when the General Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meets in Australia, I hope that Your Honour will be chosen to represent this Branch; that is to say, if the majority on the other side feels that way. In that case Your Honour will be away from this House for a considerable period, probably more than two months, and the Deputy Speaker will be very much then in demand and will have to find himself here on these premises, both on occasions when the House meets and when the House is not meeting, more than he has to now. That will be the time and occasion when the force of the argument for travelling allowance for him will be felt, and I do not think that even among members of the Government Party there should be that discrimination between two members of the same Party who occupy two positions such as these. The travelling allowance for the Deputy Speaker should be placed on all fours with that of the Speaker, and I sincerely hope that the Government will not want this House to speak on that matter again.

Now we are on it, I am mentioning that it can be taken to be the wish of the whole House. It certainly would meet with favour on this side and I cannot imagine why it would not meet with favour on that side; so all that remains to be done on that matter is for the legislation to be brought down as quickly as possible.

There is one more point, Mr. Speaker, which I should like to speak on before I close on this matter. There has been some argument in the course of this debate on the impartiality of the Speaker, of his attachment to a political Party and the subscription which he may make financially to the funds of that Party. Again, I have a slightly different view on that matter than perhaps some of my colleagues and some members of the House. I feel that the one thing a

Speaker can decently do is to subscribe to a political Party of his choice. I know that so far as the conventions of the House of Commons go, unless I am very much mistaken, the Speaker can do that and it is expected that he will do it. What he is not expected to do is, of course, to appear on political platforms or take part in any political controversy inside or outside of the House, but he can contribute to his political Party - and I think quite rightly so, because you cannot even talk of dignity of office of the Speaker and presume to tell the man why he should or should not affiliate with this or that political Party. Affiliation is all right; and if he is affiliated he can subscribe to it and support it with his money, but he is not to allow his judgments when the House is sitting as a House to weigh more heavily on one side than on the other. That is how I see it and therefore I do not think we need make any quarrel about Your Honour's subscribing, if it is a fact, to a political Party so long as that affiliation to that Party does not impair and affect Your Honour's judgments and rulings in this House.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to notice that the second part of this debate has taken what I personally consider to be a very more pleasant turn than it was heading for when the hon. senior member for St. Philip was speaking, because when he was speaking I was wondering whether he was talking something about your personal position as such rather than the office of Speaker as I thought the purpose of this Bill happens to be.

There is one thing however, that is a further cause for concern and it is that the hon. senior member for St. Philip mentioned that there was a memorandum circulated. I do not know if you yourself or the Hon. Premier can shed some light on that for us, because if the memorandum was circulated I wonder how the hon. member for St. Philip would have seen it, as was hinted by him, to the exclusion of other members of this Chamber. If it happened that it was sent to the Leader of the Opposition, then I thought that everybody from the Opposition would have seen it. The hon. member for St. Peter did mention that a memorandum was circulated to that effect, and either you or the Premier should be able to shed some light on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no such thing as a memorandum sent out by me and I do not know that it has been sent out by anybody else.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position in this matter abundantly clear. On a matter of this kind, we exercise, in the Party to which I have the honour to belong, a free vote. If I say anything on the merits of this Resolution, I want Your Honour to extend the same privilege which you as Speaker of this House invoke from the Officer administering the Government of this Colony on the occasions of the openings of the Legislature, and that is, to place a most favourable construction on what may be said.

AS to the question of the amount of money which it is reasonable to pay someone holding the office which Your Honour now occupies, it is not for me to enter into the arithmetic of the situation. If there is to be independence attached to a certain job, then the officer is entitled to receive remuneration commensurate with the dignity and other demands of the office. If I do not entirely agree that we in this House should sit around and vote money either for ourselves for meals in the dining-room or for Your Honour as Speaker, it is not because I do not believe Your Honour does not deserve it or that the office does not deserve it, but I would enjoin hon. members to be very careful to impose for ourselves or for the anointed ones additional burden upon the taxpayers of this island so that people may get the impression that we are doing a certain amount of backscratching. I am sure that Your Honour will not be paid more to do your duty; you will do your duty whether or not you are paid a good salary.

5.05 p.m.

In other words, to put it the other way, by increasing your salary that is not an invitation to you to do better than what you are doing now and I hope it is not. It is only that you should have been drawing this salary before. I am sure that it is the light in which you will view this matter.

The other aspect to which I wish to draw Your Honour's attention is that I have always maintained that

when domestic issues of this honourable Chamber are under discussion, these domestic issues should be threshed out, as it were, around the conference table and not in the arena of the Assembly itself. I feel in that way a lot of recriminations will be saved and a lot of misunderstandings will be avoided and a better solution arrived at because it would be away from the thrust and parry of parliamentary debate. All then that would remain is for the members of the Government or the Premier himself as Finance Minister to make the financial provisions available on the Table of the House, and for hon. members to approve of them in a merely formal manner. But since we have been subjecting you to much embarrassment since we have been dragging you into the public arena, I, personally, feel if I were here, as I should have been at the commencement of these proceedings, that Your Honour should have vacated the Chair and allowed the Deputy Speaker to preside and in that way Your Honour would have been able from the floor of the House to give your point of view as a member of the House and no one could accuse you of being a judge in your own case. If I do not appear to be enthused over the Resolution, it is not because I regard the salary to which you are entitled as too much, but I am using this occasion so as to draw to the attention of other hon. members of the House that there is a way in which we should do these things and I do not think that the procedure which we have adopted at this particular juncture is entirely befitting the dignity of your office or the ancient traditions of this hon. Chamber.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker, the office of Speaker in this Hon. Assembly is, in my opinion, the most important office of this Island. What greater office can there be among the Chambers of members elected by the people than when these members elect someone to the office of Speaker? Sir, your office is one which is arduous and it is one that calls for absolute utter impartiality; therefore, by that significance, it should not be any longer an office which is held by a person who may have the necessary financial means so to do. It is my humble opinion that this Hon. House should remunerate that office in such a manner that the person holding it could of necessity convey to all concerned his ability and what is needed of him as Speaker. The office which you hold at the present moment is one which calls for a great deal of tolerance. Indeed, Sir, at times it calls for not befriending your friends and it calls for the greatest possible care in the administration of the duties which come under the Chair. On account of that, I feel that it should be given even greater consideration than what we are proposing at this present moment.

Admittedly, Sir, that there are those of us who may feel that this money in increasing the salary of your office may not be warranted; yet, Sir, I will go as far as to say that the success of a democracy depends on that Chair which you occupy. It has been proved time and time again that if the person who occupies that Chair is not financially capable, he must of necessity have a burden on his mind which will cause trouble in any democracy. It is all well and good to suggest that the office can be carried out without any financial aid whatsoever; but I am afraid that in the evolution of democracy and the general levelling up, those days are gone; and the fact that that office still retains its stability to assist a democracy to go forward, as indeed is done by the Mother of Parliaments, I, personally, feel it should be well compensated.

Sir, I understood you to say that the Speaker of the House of Commons contributes to his Party. I will bow to your knowledge; but I want to clearly make my point that I am extremely doubtful, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter has said, that the check-off system exists in the Mother of Parliaments. I feel that the office of Speaker should have no power whatsoever to be brought to bear on it, and the check off system is not one which I feel the office of Speaker should have.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will correct me if I am wrong when I say that the Speaker of the House of Commons is not even allowed to enter a political club.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have never ever entered a political club.

Mr. DOWDING: I hope Your Honour appreciates that I am not in any way personal. I am speaking of the office which you hold and it is only due to the fact that Your Honour stated that the Speaker of the House of Commons does contribute to his Party funds that I mentioned Your Honour directly.

5.15 p.m.

I am extremely pleased to see that this Bill has been brought down to us today for the purpose of remunerating the office of the Speaker to a point where I feel that it will be possible for us to continue to have in office a Speaker who is financially capable of being impartial and quite separate and apart from any Party whatsoever. I feel that that is a very important point and I want finally to repeat what I said at the beginning: that is, that in my humble opinion, in respect of the office of the Speaker and the Chair of this Hon. House, there is none greater in this Island, if this democracy is to go forward, and consequently should be remunerated commensurately.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is expected that I am going to support this Bill because many years ago I said, when the salaries of the Ministers were fixed, that the remuneration of the Speaker should have borne some relationship to the salary of the Ministers. When I said that, hon. members who were then in charge of the Government, sneered at the idea; they did not want to do it then because they themselves were looking at the person and not the office. It is absolutely evident and clear that during that period the members of the Government, who were responsible in a way, because of their majority, for getting any Bill through for paying the office of the Speaker, were then looking at the person and not the office. That was made clear when Your Honour was ruthlessly thrown from that office and relegated to be a member of the Opposition; and I repeat that that showed that it was a matter of the person holding the office and not the office itself. Fortunately, conditions changed and things were not really what they seemed to be; the plans of the present Government Party had been veered and the result was that you had again to be asked to accept this most high and dignified position. That has come straight from my breast and those whose mentality is not warped will know that what I am saying is true.

I thought at the time and I said that it was a most disgusting state of affairs to raise the Speaker's salary to £1,000 a year merely because of the person who was then in office; I thought that it was most disgusting behaviour. I am supporting this Bill because I feel that Your Honour has been elected to this Chamber by the proletariat, as the hon. senior member for St. Peter would say - by the man in the street - and any argument that you would be removed from him because you are Speaker would be so much nonsense. I do not think that anything would remove you from your association with the man in the street.

There is one thing on which I would like to be enlightened: I have heard it said that you contribute to Party Funds. I want to say that in a small community, if you are hoping ever to have single member constituencies, if you are asking us to have that regard and respect for the office of Speaker and not to contest that seat, then we must be absolutely sure that when a person comes into this Chamber as a member of a Party, as soon as he is elected to the office of Speaker, you ask all Parties to pay that regard to the Speaker and not to contest that seat. If that is so, we must be satisfied that you are not in any way contributing to the downfall of any Party; otherwise I regard that it is not then a question of the office but of the person. Even with my regard for you, if I have anything to do with contesting the seat, I would not adhere to any convention of not contesting your seat if I felt that you were contributing from a financial point of view to.....

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have already said, the Speaker of the House of Commons contributes to the funds of his political Party. Did the hon. member hear me?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes Sir, I heard you and I do not think that you will mislead this House. While that is so, I want to assure you that so long as the Speaker is contributing to the funds of his political Party, I would not agree

to any convention not to oppose his seat. I am happy to see that those who are responsible for bringing down this Bill have seen the wisdom of putting the salary of Mr. Speaker more in line with that of the Ministers. I do not feel that you should be taken away from any organisation or anything of that sort. I do not subscribe to the idea of any whole-time office; I feel that the office of Speaker is one of the highest offices in this island, just as you have the Chief Justice of this island. I feel that if there is one person who should be allowed an entertainment allowance, that person is the Speaker of this House.

In conclusion, let me say that, whatsoever political views you may have, I would be proud to see that I have lived long enough to see that a man like Your Honour has become Speaker of this House. That would apply to anybody of African descent. If the previous Speakers were those of affluence, we could understand why they were not given any travelling allowance.
5.25 p.m.

If it is a question of a telephone, you will recall that I have always argued for that. I have always argued for a salary in keeping with the status and dignity of the office of Speaker when other members sneered at the idea. On the question of travelling allowance, I want to be honest with you and say that I do not favour it. I am supporting it today but I do not favour travelling because it means that I must travel to get here and you must travel to get here; you get a salary in keeping with the office and although I am not comparing my position as a member of this House with yours as Speaker, I feel that just as the Premier of this country is allowed, and rightly so, an entertainment allowance - it is not something which he draws monthly but it is there so that if he sees the necessity for entertaining dignitaries and V.I.P.s he can do it - His Honour the Speaker of the Assembly, who represents not merely the Government of the country but the Legislature, should be allowed an entertainment allowance, not an amount to be drawn monthly but with the same opportunity as given to the hon. Premier to entertain when he sees the necessity.

As a matter of fact, in order to ensure the harmonious relationship between all Parties in this House, His Honour the Speaker should be in a position to give at least one entertainment to members of the House each year. I am sure that you will agree with me that you should be able to bring us together to forget the soap-box rancour, and you alone can do it. I do not favour a travelling allowance and I make my position clear, but I certainly think that a decent entertainment allowance should be given. I think the Premier has something in the vicinity of \$3,000, and similarly I think that your entertainment allowance should be double what it is.

I have much pleasure in voting, Mr. Speaker, for this Bill and I know that in future, not as the member for St. John has said, this Bill when it has increased the remuneration, will not cause you to be any more efficient or impartial in your office, but I think it is in keeping with the dignity of your office and in relationship to the salaries offered to Ministers of the Government that you should receive the salary which it is proposed to give you in this Bill.

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

COMMITTEE

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. SEARLES being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX, Mr. CHAIRMAN resumed

the passing of the Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded in each case by Hon. M. E. COX, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.5) Order, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No.2 The reason for that is that there is an amendment to this Order which has been introduced today, and I think it should be properly postponed until next Tuesday.

I am asking leave to take Order No.3 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier is asking leave to take Order No.3 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

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

RESOLUTION re HEADTEACHERS AND TEACHERS IN GOVERNMENT AIDED SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order, Sir, is the long awaited Report of the Anomalies Committee so far as teachers in second grade schools are concerned. On Tuesday last, we dealt with some of the others and this was left over until today.

Now, Sir, I should like to begin by saying that, as we all know, the senior Assistant Teachers in Second Grade Schools were dissatisfied with the Godsall recommendations as far as teachers themselves were concerned, and the Government thought that it could be resolved by referring it to an Anomalies Committee along with the complaints from other groups.

I will try as far as I can to describe the rationale of the Anomalies Committee as far as these second grade teachers are concerned. I think, Sir, that these Senior Assistant teachers felt, as was suggested by Mr. Godsall in his Report, that they should be placed on the professional grade, hence the referring to this Anomalies Committee. The first task of the Anomalies Committee was to try and remove the anomaly existing between these Senior Assistant teachers and the professional grade as recommended by the Salaries Commissioner, and then from there, as you will see from the Report, work up to the salaries of Head-teachers.

5.35 p.m.

They recommended, as you would see, that these Senior Assistants, being people of a professional grade, should be put in the scales which we now see before us; that is to say, the men starting at \$4,896 x 192 - \$5,280 x 240 - \$6,000. I think they originally stopped at \$6,000, but now there is a qualifying bar there, and having passed that they go to \$6,240. The women according to practice are put a little below the men.

Then in the case of the First and Second Class Honours Graduate Teachers, the figures which the Anomalies Committee recommended for the men was \$3,600 x 144 - \$4,320 x 192 - \$5,280 x 240 - \$5,520 and then you have a qualifying bar which takes them to \$5,760, if they pass the qualifying bar. In the case of the women, the salary scale is a little below that.

One other point which influenced the Anomalies Committee at arriving at these new scales was the fact that Barbados was finding difficulty in recruiting suitable teachers because of the salaries then offered. At one time it was hoped to recruit most of the teachers of that grade from the U.C.W.J., but it is remarkable that up to that time there was hardly anybody who was recruited from that field. Some went further; some went to West Africa; so, as I have said, that is another consideration which the Anomalies Committee sought to remedy and which influenced them to arrive at these scales.

After arriving at these scales in the case of the Senior Assistants, the Anomalies Committee then considered the people above them and that group is known as Deputy Head Teachers. The Anomalies Committee concluded that it was difficult to keep Deputy Head Teachers on the same grade as the Senior Assistant Teachers; consequently, they stepped up a bit on the salary recommended by Mr. Godsall for Deputy Head Teachers and I very well see that it would be an undesirable thing to exist in this class whereby a Senior Assistant Teacher and a Deputy Head Teacher would be getting the same salary. It would be an impossible situation. Consequently, they recommended a higher salary for the Deputy Head Teachers.

After recommending these additional increases for these Deputy Head Teachers, the next concern of theirs was the clashing of these salaries for Deputy Head Teachers with that of head-teachers in some of the secondary schools, and that led to the addition to the salaries of most of the Headmasters and Headmistresses of these schools. The only one who did not come in for consideration was the Headmaster of Combermere School.

In arriving at these scales for the Headteachers, they took also into consideration the number of pupils attending the school as well as the grade of teaching. As I have said a little earlier, the Anomalies Committee also considered the fact that some of the salaries which were then offered by Mr. Godsall conflicted with the increased salaries paid to the Deputy Headteachers in these Schools.

The reason why the Headmaster of Combermere School did not come in for additional salary was the fact that Combermere School while it goes up in some cases to teaching to the advanced level in one form, at Harrison College and the Lodge School they offer that standard of teaching in three or four forms. On the question of numbers, the Headmaster of Combermere qualified for that salary; but when you took into consideration these other schools which I have mentioned - especially the Lodge School which does not accommodate the numbers as Combermere, but yet the advanced teaching at the Lodge School surpasses the teaching at Combermere. That is the reason why the Headmaster of Combermere did not qualify for any addition.

The salaries of the regular teachers also come in for an increase; but from what I have been hearing, the groups which are still dissatisfied are the Senior Assistant Teachers and the Non-graduates. This is the recommendation of the Anomalies Committee. They say that appointments to that grade will be restricted to officers who are appointed in the teaching service on or before 1st April, 1946 and who meet the requirements of the Committee. The reason why I understand that 1st April, 1956 was preferred was for two reasons. It was considered that this grade of teachers was a dying grade and consequently I think in some cases in a previous recommendation the scale went back to 1941. The second point is that younger teachers who would have the opportunity more so than these older teachers should be encouraged to go to Erdiston to further qualify for the teaching service.

5.45 p.m.

They were selected because the Committee felt that entrants to the Service in 1946 would be young enough to take advantage of the teaching as is now being provided at Erdiston. That applies to the Senior Assistant (non-graduate) Teachers, men and women. Then there are the other two types of Non-graduate Teachers, Grade "A" and Grade "B"; they do not come in for any increase and the reason for that will be better explained by the Hon. Minister of Education. That covers all the scales in this Grade of Secondary Teachers.

I want to take this opportunity of saying that it is inevitable that, whenever any recommendations are being made for, and consideration is being given to, the adjustment of salary grades by an Anomalies Committee, very often in adjusting one anomaly, you open other anomalies; that is to be realised. A little time before I left my office to come here, about 10 or 15 minutes before, I saw a Paper which was presented to me by other members of the Civil Service. In that Paper it is stated in effect, that now we have made some adjustments or, in fact, now that the Anomalies Committee have recommended some adjust-

ments to the salaries of these Teachers, that has created anomalies with regard to one or two other grades. As I said just now, it is quite inevitable that a thing like that would take place. It is not the function of the Anomalies Committee to go over the whole salary structure which now exists in the Civil Service; the Committee is asked to relate the salaries as are paid in some grades to what are paid in probably one or two other grades and to make recommendations. I do not think it is the function of the Committee to go over the whole structure of the salaries which are paid to Civil Servants and to make recommendations on that scale. While it is inevitable that there will be fresh grievances, I will say here and now that it is not proposed that the Government will take the opportunity to go over the whole salary revision at this stage. I want to make that quite clearly understood. The Government does not intend, even where there are anomalies created, to have a whole salary revision. Anomalies will arise; human nature being what it is, people will always be dissatisfied - as soon as one grade of people is pushed a pillar or two above them and you will get a howl and so on throughout the Civil Service. The Government has tried to be fair to everybody in this matter, but there is a point at which we must call a halt in order that finality in a situation of this sort may be reached. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two remarks or comments which I should like to make about this Resolution and, of course, the first is similar to that which I made in connection with the Resolution of last week when we were dealing with Elementary Teachers - the principle of equal pay for equal work, irrespective of sex. So far, the Government has not been disposed to accept such an obviously elementary piece of justice for a section of the community which has been underpaid and unfairly paid during the past. It is time that the Government should be moved to set an example to private employers in respect of this principle. If a woman does a job which is on all-fours with that which is done by a man, what is the justification for paying that woman less than you pay a man for doing a similar job? Obviously, there is no justification for any differentiation being made. We have this Resolution coming to us with recommendations from the Anomalies Committee and that anomaly did not strike the Committee or if it struck them, it did not receive the approval, sanction or approbation of the Government. That is my first comment.

5.55 p.m.

My second comment is, Sir, in respect of what you may call the Definition Clause. It says in paragraph 2 that for the purpose of this Schedule the following expressions, letters and symbols have the meanings hereby respectively assigned to them:-

"Graduate Teacher" means a teacher who is a graduate of a University within the British Commonwealth or of a University recognised by the Director of Education to be of equivalent status."

It is to that Clause which I invite the attention of the Minister of Education. Likewise in the next paragraph is the definition "First or Second Class Honours Graduate Teacher".

It speaks of "a teacher who has obtained a First or Second Class Honours degree of a University within the British Commonwealth or of a University recognised by the Director of Education."

After all, Sir, reading that Clause, one would wonder if we did not have Ministerial status or have a Cabinet, or if one does not recognise the merit and work of Ministerial status. It should not be a question of a University recognised by the Director of Education, but a University recognised by the Ministry of Education. The Ministry will presumably act on consultation and would not dream of acting without consultation with the Director whose advice as their Specialist Adviser would naturally receive the attention it merits; but the final decision as to whether a University is to be recognised should not be the decision

of the Director who is a servant, but it should be the decision of the Minister after consultation with the Director, and I suggest to the Minister that that matter should receive his urgent consideration and necessary steps be taken to change the definition.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard a fanatical product of the University of Cambridge say that Oxford is no University. Suppose you had a fanatical Cambridge man as Director of Education and he failed, refused or declined to recognise the University of Oxford, or if not that, Sir, another University less famous, but for some reason or other he did not regard it as sufficiently venerable and sufficiently ancient, then the last word according to this definition would be with the Director and not the Minister. We no longer in respect of officials in a system of Ministerial status leave the last word with any Director. I am not for one minute suggesting that with respect to the Director it will happen that he will refuse to recognise a University which is worthy of recognition, but I am suggesting that this matter and this final word should rest not with the Director but with Her Majesty's Minister in the Colony who is responsible for Education. The last word should be his and not the Director's. One wonders if that proposal came from a Civil Servant and if in the pressure of work the Minister has not noticed this, or whether he deliberately gave his sanction to putting the power in the hands of the Director of Education to make the decision and not merely leaving that power with the Minister of Education himself.

There is one other point to which I want to refer. I am not dealing with the individual salaries mentioned, but just one or two matters of importance as they seem to me, and the third matter is this: there is a strong feeling that the classification of graduates is unsound and that graduates should not be classified as First and Second Class Honours—one scale, and Third class and Pass degrees on the other scale, but that either they should all be classified as Honours graduates or Pass graduates, or if you want to make a distinction between a Third Class which is the lowest and the First Class which is the highest in the class, what you should do is this: have your graduates First class in a class by themselves—they are A-1 people, then another class for Second and Third class graduates, and then your bottom class or Pass graduates. The point made by an Honours graduate which I am raising here is that Honours graduates have taken the same Honours examination; even the third class graduates has passed the same Honours examination, though he only got a third class, as the First class graduate, whereas a Pass man has sat an easier examination: it is not fair, whatever may be the precedent for it—and a bad precedent should not be followed—for the Third Class Honours man, who has sat a higher examination and passed it, to be in the same salary grade as the man who has not sat such an examination at all, and who, had he sat it, would not have passed and perhaps did not sit it because he felt that he would not pass Honours examination and he was entered for the Pass examination.

I know, Sir, that that has been going on for some time in this island. Why it originated I do not know, but it has been brought forcibly to my attention by Honours graduates. A Second Class Honours graduate only yesterday mentioned to me that he thought it was unfair that a man who sat the same examination as he should be on the same salary scale as the man who sat only a Pass examination.

These are general comments which I am making on this Resolution, of course, and with these misgivings and reservations, we are going to support it; the misgiving that the Government has not yet realised the necessity to treat people equally, that women and men each doing a similar job are both entitled to similar pay. Those days are gone when women are always paid for by men. Sometimes you see them entering dances and going places by themselves; they have to foot their own bills. This is a relic of the Victorian era when it was felt that a woman would never be so bold or so indiscreet as to pay for herself, and therefore you do not have to pay a woman so much because there is not the same amount of bills to pay. This is the second Elizabethan age and it is high time Government realises that the principle is overdue for acceptance by the Government of this country of equal pay for equal work, irrespective of gender.

6.05 p.m.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am in general agreement with the various proposals that are set out here. I feel that teachers should be encouraged in the teaching profession and that it is a very good thing that they should be given reasonably good salaries and reasonable conditions of service; so generally speaking, I am in general agreement with these proposals.

I would like to support the remarks of my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, so far as Third Class Honours Graduate Teachers are concerned. As explained by the hon. member, such teachers should be put in the Honours grade and not be regarded as only teachers who have qualified with a pass. There is a distinction between an Honours graduate and just one with a pass.

I would also like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier what has already been drawn to him, and it is the fact that for years past for one reason or the other the post of Deputy Headmaster of the Boys' Foundation School which has been a post in existence for many years has been removed without any explanation whatsoever. Now, the Foundation School has increased in numbers and instead of having a Deputy Headmaster now as we see at Queens College and Combermere, this post of Deputy Headmaster has been abandoned at the Boys' Foundation School. I drew that to the attention of the Hon. Premier in the last Government and he said that he would have that matter reconsidered but, here it is now, nothing has been done about it by the Anomalies Committee. I am wondering whether the Hon. Premier has looked into this matter at all or whether the Anomalies Committee has looked into it, because it was more or less an undertaking given by the last Premier that he would see to it that this post of Deputy Headmaster of the Boys' Foundation School would be re-instated. It is a bad thing to receive an assurance of something and later on you find that that assurance meant nothing at all. We had the assurance that the post of Deputy Headmaster of the Boys' Foundation would be re-instated but today you find that it is a broken promise.

The numbers at that school have increased and the time is not far distant when you will need that post more than ever. I will go as far as to say that in each of these schools—the Boys' Foundation School and the Girls' Foundation School—you have scope for that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I just want to comment on the tremendous disparity between the salaries of the graduate teachers, whether Honours or otherwise, and the non-graduates. Naturally, one has to conceive that you have to be placed in this upper grade by your receiving the maximum qualifications: but it does appear to me that in view of the fact that the non-graduate must have certain qualifications, appropriate emphasis was not placed on these qualifications.

Now, Sir, the First and Second Class Honours Graduate Teachers (men) go from \$3,600 - \$5,760 and the Graduate Teachers without Honours (men) go from \$3,120 - \$5,040. Now the Senior Assistant (non-graduate) Teachers (men) go from \$2,304 - \$3,360 and in some cases they only go to \$2,640 such as the Non-Graduates, Grade "A". As I have said, the graduates go as far as \$5,760.

Looking at the definition in the Addendum, a Senior Assistant (Non-Graduate) Teacher means a teacher who was substantively appointed to the teaching service of a Government-aided or Government maintained school on or before the 1st April, 1946, providing he qualified for recognition as a Non-Graduate Teacher, Grade A, and is capable of teaching at least one subject to Fifth Form level or is performing duties of a highly important nature in a school. Appointment to this grade shall be made on the recommendation of the Governing Body of a School and the Director of Education with the approval of the Governor.

Now it does appear to me that since these qualifications are called for and the Director of Education has to be satisfied that such a teacher is fully capable of performing his responsibility to this post, there should not be this tremendous disparity between the Honours graduates and the non-graduate teachers. I believe that the Anomalies

Committee have not paid this matter appropriate attention because this is a matter which needs further revision.

In passing it does appear to me as if there has been something wrong in the Committee's approach to this question of remuneration for Headteachers of the Secondary Schools for boys and even the St. Michael's Girls' School. I think that there is something wrong in our approach to this question.

It appears now as if the salary of the Headmaster of Harrison College is being brought into line with that of a Permanent Secretary. Your Permanent Secretary gets \$8,160 a year. You are going to give the Headmaster of Harrison College the same thing now. I believe that this entire matter of salaries for Headteachers still needs some sort of revision. It may be by paying out high salaries in the Secretariat you are laying a good case for paying your Ministers a good salary too and I believe that is responsible more than anything else for this state of affairs. Your Headmasters and Headmistresses of the Lodge School, Combermere, Christ Church Boys' Foundation, Coleridge-Parry, Queens College, the St. Michael's Girls' School, and the others are all getting less than your Permanent Secretary; and certainly in the case of some of these schools the responsibilities which these officials are called upon to perform are not in one way inferior to that of a Permanent Secretary. I have nothing at all against a Permanent Secretary getting that remuneration, but one must bear in mind that the Permanent Secretary should be regarded merely as a cog in the administrative wheel, whereas a Headmaster or a Headmistress of an institution like Harrison College or Combermere has to be completely in control of that institution. 6.15 p.m.

I cannot, for the life of me, see how we could have perpetuated this state of affairs in which your Permanent Secretary is drawing more money than the Headmaster of Harrison College. It does appear to me that sooner or later we will have to revise this entire matter in the same manner as the Government has at long last come to the realisation that certain things like Leave Passages, and so on, are beyond the capacity of the country to carry on. The Government will also have to realise that some of the remuneration paid in certain categories of the Service is not only out of conformity with others which demand equal responsibility and capability, but beyond the capacity of the colony to sustain.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the members of this Hon. House will agree with me if I say that it is perhaps a matter of impossibility for anybody to fix salary scales which will meet the approval of one and all. What I want to point out at the outset is that the matter which is before us is not really a matter of a salary revision; the Government did not set out to have salary scales with a general revision, but there were certain anomalies complained of by certain members of the staffs of various schools and those anomalies were more or less put right. Most of us, I think, at some time or other, have indulged in reading fairy tales and this salary scale has always made me remember a tale in Grimm's Fairy Tales where there was a seven-headed hydra which someone was called upon to kill. Whenever one head was cut off, several other heads sprung up in place of the one which was cut off. So it is with the attempt to deal with certain matters complained of here.

The last hon. member who spoke seems to have some misgivings with respect to what has more or less motivated the changes which have taken place in the salaries which are now proposed for Heads of Secondary Schools. I was not altogether disappointed when the hon. member saw fit to think that the changes were being made as a basis for getting more salaries for Ministers; I would like to relieve him and the general public of the misapprehension. There is nothing like that in connection with this matter. The anomalies which were more or less first complained of, took place in connection with Teachers who were First and Second Class Honours Graduates. An attempt was made to settle those anomalies as to these Graduates, and as soon as that was done, automatically the people above were pushed out of line and therefore we had to work on them. We got that right and then we found that the First and Second Class Honours

Graduates came too close to the Senior Assistants and we had to make an adjustment there. When that adjustment was made, then the Senior Assistants got too close to Deputy Heads and when the Deputy Heads were adjusted, then they got too close to the Heads. It was not a case of trying to get more money for Ministers. In dealing with the Heads of Secondary Grammar Schools, we can well regard these schools as having been divided into three distinct Grades and the third Grade being again subdivided. The First Grade would be the Schools like Harrison College, Lodge School, Combermere and what has been done there has been to maintain a differentiation of \$480 between the salary of the Headmaster of Combermere and that of the Headmaster of Lodge School and \$480 between the Headmaster of Lodge School and that of Harrison College. That is why the Headmaster of Combermere School did not come in for any change in that he was given \$7,200 at the outset; but when the Lodge School was raised from \$6,960 to \$7,680, that was the point where that salary was more than the Headship of Combermere School and it was \$480 less than the Headship of Harrison College. There is no idea of penalising anybody; it was an honest-to-goodness attempt on behalf of the Anomalies Committee to do something in the circumstances which they found.

Similarly with the Second Grade of Schools like the Christ Church Boys' Foundation and the difference in the salary of the Headship of the school and that of Combermere is \$480 and so is the case with the Coleridge-Parry School and Queens College. When we come to the Third Grade of Schools, the first would be St. Michael's Girls' School and there is a differentiation of \$960.00 between that and the three Heads above. When the salaries of the Heads were up to a point, we had to maintain a difference, which is recommended by Mr. Godsall, between the salary of a Deputy Head Teacher and that of a Head Teacher. If hon. members would take the trouble to examine the figures carefully, they will see that there is a stated difference between the salary of the Head Teachers and that of the Deputy Head Teachers and that difference is maintained all down the line. 6.25 p.m.

The next group of teachers who had a very strong complaint was the non-graduate teachers. What actually happened was this; it was felt, as the Hon. Premier pointed out, that there are a good many teachers in that group and they are young enough to do the necessary, and the necessary is to qualify themselves and put themselves in a position to be able to offer what is expected of them in our schools. But there are others who had served the country for quite a number of years and who were considered too old to undertake the grind of getting back to books - that may be so because they might not have been keeping up their studies - and we felt that something should be done for them, and in an effort to help the non-graduate, the senior assistant grade was created. That is a new grade that has been added to accommodate the non-graduate of long standing and who had given faithful service. As to the point raised by the hon. senior member for St. Philip with respect to the difference which obtains between that grade and graduates, I would like to say that the difference was very much greater before, but that it has been considerably reduced.

Now the hon. junior member for St. Lucy advocated equal pay for men and women. The same thing was advocated last Tuesday by the hon. senior member for Christ Church. I want to tell all hon. members of this House when they say that they are coming right home to me, that the point is this: it is unfair to saddle the Government or blame it for not having done that. I am saying this with a very full sense of responsibility; it is a point that I have not pushed yet since I have been in the Ministry, because I happen to know that there are members of the teaching fraternity who do not agree with it. I say that because of the fact that I advocated equal pay for equal work when I was a member of the teaching fraternity, and I know that some teachers have not been converted to the idea. They have not made any such representation, as far as I know, to Government, and therefore it is unfair to saddle Government with that; but I am prepared to say that that is something which I feel is good.

There was some comment with respect to a change which should be made in a definition. The hon. junior mem-

ber for St. Lucy feels that certain things should not be left to the discretion of the Director of Education and that these things should rest with the Ministry of Education. I am to say that these changes, I presume, will come in due course, but this is not a new salary scale we have been building up; that had been done long before there was a Ministry of Education. These things will, as I said already, take care of themselves and these changes will come in a very smooth way and without any fuss, I hope.

I do not think there is anything else that hon. members raised that is of much importance, and therefore I feel that there is nothing to complain of in so far as the effort which has been made to settle the anomalies complained of is concerned.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There is only one comment which I should like to make on this whole matter and it is this: I might not have spoken if the hon. member had not said what he said, that is, that representation had not been made to the Government for equal pay for equal work.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: On a point of order, I should like to correct that by saying that I was referring to teachers. That did not come up as an anomaly and nobody complained of that as an anomaly as far as I know.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is surprising that the hon. senior member speaking of his own profession should make that reference just the same. I advocate equal pay for equal work for teachers, and I thought the hon. member would have understood that I meant teachers and would hardly be referring to something else. The hon. member said that he knew some members do not agree with it; that is fairly obvious, but does the hon. member realise that in the teaching fraternity there are more female teachers? And if you must do the greatest good for the greatest number, are you suggesting that because no representation has been made to you for equal pay for equal work in teaching where the majority are women that they would turn it down? I do not want you to answer that because I anticipate what the answer must be. I am saying, therefore, that if you believe the greatest good must be done for the greatest number and equal pay for equal work in this particular sphere of the teaching profession, then I cannot see how you can say that it has not been done because no representation has been made.

Hon. L. ST. A. THORNE: I do not want the hon. senior member for the City to misunderstand what I am saying. I was at pains to point out that the Government was not carrying out a salaries revision. We were just called upon to correct some anomalies which had arisen in our salary scales. Two hon. members in the course of the debate made reference to the fact that they advocated equal pay for equal work where men and women are concerned. I want to say that I cannot agree with them more; that is a thing which I know is right and fair and which I myself advocate. (Cheers.) I have had the privilege of working in schools where the staff was all male and then I had to work where the staff was a mixed one, and I am prepared to say, if I am asked to give my opinion, that I had on that staff females who were superior to males. Women teachers can do their job equally as good as men. But the point I am making is that the matter is not before us at this time. We are only dealing with anomalies, and I do not think it would be fair for me to be pushing something like that, and it is also unfair to be attacking the Government on that principle.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Surely it is part of our duty to attack the Government, but you can hardly say that we are attacking the Government on this occasion. I appreciate what the hon. member has said, and most of all I think female teachers in the island at least can be assured that as long as the present Hon. Minister of Education has the honour to hold that office, they will be assured that in the not very distant future when we are revising and reviewing salaries, women teachers will get equal pay with men for the work performed.

6.35 p.m.

We appreciate the fact that the fixing of anomalies was a result of the last salary revision.

Now, Sir, as a member of the Governing Body of Harrison College, I believe I have gone into this matter carefully with respect to the masters of the School and I realise that it is a most difficult thing when it comes to this question of fixing salaries. At one time I remember a young man who after spending four years at the U.C.W.I. and getting his Honours degree came back to that school and from what I could see, he seemed to have wasted his time when he returned to that school to teach. I am sure he would have got a job in Bridgetown with the qualifications he held at a far better salary than what he was getting at Harrison College. He could have gone into a sugar factory and started at more than what they were giving him after he had completed four or five years at the U.C.W.I. and obtaining an Honours degree.

Sir, I welcome this putting right of anomalies by the Government but I want to throw this out. I am one of those people who feel - and I feel the Hon. Minister of Education feels so too - that the Senior Assistant Teachers who have been actually teaching for many years, so much so that you have made a special grade for them at the Second grade school - that the same sort of treatment should be given to those senior assistants who teach in the elementary schools. Now that you are setting these anomalies right so far as teachers in secondary schools are concerned, I am throwing this out with respect to these Senior Assistant teachers who used to teach in elementary schools. These teachers are selected by experts and the experts find that while they do not possess any proper qualifications academically, they possess certain qualifications which meet with the approval of the Director of Education in putting them in that grade for teaching in secondary schools.

Now, most of the teachers in this class were taken out of the elementary schools and carried to secondary schools because of their ability to teach certain subjects. As hon. members know, teaching does not necessarily mean a person holding a degree to teach properly. As the Hon. Minister has said, some of these teachers have been teaching for very long at these secondary schools but they are continuing at the salary of a non-graduate. If these same teachers had remained in the elementary teaching service, surely they would either have gone up to the post of a Headmaster or Acting Headmaster; therefore, I do not see if you keep them at secondary schools because of their ability to teach specialist subjects why they should be penalised and should not be given the opportunity of drawing a salary comparable to that of a headmaster of an elementary school. I am sure the Hon. Minister is following me in what I am saying. This is an anomaly which you must set right. You must give justice to that type of person and I am suggesting that the Hon. Minister should look into this matter.

Another point which I would like to raise is this. Your qualified Teachers at elementary schools are teachers who have been teaching for a long time. You cannot expect your teachers of the elementary schools to sit back now that you have set right the teachers of secondary schools.

Sir, I am very happy to support this Resolution. I feel myself, as the Hon. Minister has said, that we are really pushing open the door for equality in pay for male and female teachers which is something for which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been clamouring for a long time. I am happy to hear the Hon. Minister say that it is so in certain vocations and, as a matter of fact, in certain instances you can get more out of a woman than out of a man. The Hon. Minister spoke with a wealth of experience and I do know that his speech will give some hope to the female teachers that the day is not far distant when this House will see a Resolution coming down giving equal pay for equal work.

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

THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the thirty-first day of March, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill relates to Resolutions which were passed for the service for the colony for the financial year just ended. I do not think I need to say anything more on it.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SEARLES in the Chair.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were called separately and passed.

The Preamble was then called and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. Cox, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. M. E. COX in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

6.45 p.m.

HIRE PURCHASE BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour:- To move the second reading of a Bill to amend the law with respect to the Hire Purchase and sale upon credit of goods.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to provide for Hire Purchase Agreements in this island. It has been felt for some time that adequate representation, if I may so put it, was never afforded the hirer in many respects. The Government has given some consideration to that feeling and has decided to bring down a Bill to provide for these agreements. The main feature in this Bill perhaps is that if a hirer pays to an owner sixty-six and two-thirds per cent of the cost or value of the article, the owner cannot repossess the article as is customary at this time. As the position is at the present time, if a hirer fails to meet an instalment, the owner of the item can return for it or re-possess it even if it is only the last instalment which is due on the article. This Bill seeks to provide that where a hirer pays sixty-six and two-thirds per cent of the article, the owner of the article can only get the balance of the payment by passing through the usual channel and that is the Law Courts. That is, as I say, perhaps the main feature of the Bill.

I should like to say that before this Bill was introduced into the House, copies of it were sent to people who are interested in this matter, people like the Chamber of Commerce and the Traders' Credit Corporation Limited. We have had some comments from these persons, but we do not agree with the proposals which were put forward or with the replies given by these persons. The proposals which was put up to us was that the maximum amount should not be more than 2,000 and that the amount should not be less than 75% paid on the item before it can be re-possessed. In Trinidad from whom we copied a bit of this legislation the upper limit is \$2,000; in Jamaica it is only £50 and in England, in the case of livestock, it is up to £1,000 and in respect of other articles it is £300. We felt, and we still feel, that we should extend the provisions of this Bill to cover a low-priced motor car is in the vicinity of \$3,500. That is why we agreed to the upper limit being \$3,500. I feel that it is absolutely necessary to give protection to persons or to give equal protection to the hirer as well as to the owner of an article. Hon. members will see from the Bill that the hirer is, for the first time, empowered to return the item to the owner provided that he gives reasonable notice of his intention to return it to the owner; and, of

course, as is already provided for in the Hire Purchase Agreement, the article has to be in good order and so forth. On the other hand, the owner has to give 21 days' notice to the hirer; in addition, in the Memorandum of Agreement, the owner has to set out the price of the article and he also has to inform the hirer as to the cash price of the item.

Mr. Speaker, those points are the salient points in this Bill. I feel that hon. members will welcome a Bill such as this and perhaps there is only small point which I would make before I sit down. It is this; on the last occasion or on Tuesday last, the hon. junior member for St. John raised the point that there was no hire purchase legislation on the Statute Book and therefore there could not be any reference to any amendment which refers to Hire Purchase legislation. The particular wording to which the hon. member was referring at the time was: "An Act to amend the law with respect to the hire purchase and sale upon credit of goods." 6.55 p.m.

I should like to inform the House, Sir, that this is copied actually word for word from the Trinidad legislation and in addition the title is also taken from Halsbury's Statutes of England, Second Edition, Volume 22. This matter was referred to the Hon. Attorney General and he has pointed out that despite the fact that there was no Hire Purchase Legislation existing in England at the time - that is, in 1938 when this Bill was passed - yet the exact reference was made and he has explained the situation which can be found at page 1020. I repeat, Sir, that the Hon. Attorney General has said that there was no law in existence at the time, but reference was made as if there was law. This is what he said:-

"The word 'amend' in the Long Title of the Bill is, in my opinion, correct. The English Hire Purchase Act, 1938 (at page 1020 of Halsbury's Statutes of England, Second Edition, Volume 22) uses the same word 'amend' in the long Title. So also does the Trinidad Hire Purchase Ordinance, 1957.

At page 982 of the Halsbury Volume appears the following; the Hire Purchase contract is a variation of the contract of bailment and that at common law is a contract of hire giving the hirer the option to purchase an article hired as contrasted with a contract of purchase by instalments.

The words used in the Long Title are 'amend the law'. 'Law' does not necessarily mean *Statute Law*. The present Law as to hire purchase agreements and credit sale agreements is common law. This Bill seeks to amend that law. The common law will still apply to agreements which are not covered by the Bill."

This is the Government's legal adviser and the Government is prepared to err if it is to err by its legal adviser.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: May I just throw out this suggestion to the hon. member in charge? Some of us did not get our copies until yesterday; I personally got mine on Saturday. This is breaking new ground so far as the Law of this Island is concerned, and we would very much appreciate if after the second reading is passed he did not deal with it until the next meeting of this House if the hon. member would be prepared to agree. As a matter of fact, the feeling over this side is that we would not even like the second reading until we have had an opportunity of thoroughly digesting it. Some of us have not even read it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I will promise the hon. member after the second reading to let it remain until next Tuesday.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 7 p.m. o'clock, this Sitting now stands suspended until 7.45 p.m. 7.00 p.m.

On Resumption

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum and ask that you direct the Clerk to ring the Bell.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was formed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I gave an undertaking to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that we would pass the second reading and postpone the Bill until next Tuesday.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No.6 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.6) Order, 1959.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 6) ORDER, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The object of this Order, Sir, is to amend the salary of the Crown Counsel in the legal Department. This office was advertised for some time and there was only one applicant, but before the appointment was made, he withdrew and there has been none since. It is decided to increase the salary with the object of attracting a suitable candidate.

7.50 p.m.

The post is upgraded from the scale of \$4,560 - \$6,240 to the scale of \$5,760 x 240 - 6,240, 6,720 x 480 - 7,200. It is hoped that with the upgrading of this salary a suitable applicant will be attracted. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 7) ORDER, 1959

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.7) Order, 1959."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This next Order is also a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.7) Order, 1959, so as to make provision for the upgrading of one of the posts of Probation Officer of the staff of the Probation Service.

As is stated in the Addendum to the Resolution, the field work of the Probation Service has extended considerably in recent years, and it is no longer possible for the Chief Probation Officer to adequately attend to administrative and supervisory duties and yet deal with case work without the assistance of a Senior Officer.

It is therefore suggested that the post of Senior Probation Officer should be created in order to assist him more or less in administrative duties.

Reconciliatory work among juveniles and the supervision of cases relating to problem children (43 in 1951 increasing to 453 in 1957) entail much work and call for experience, but the results reveal adequate compensation by a decrease in the number of Statutory cases (981 in 1956 reduced to 868 in 1957). Experience has shown that many potential delinquents have thus been reformed from their drift towards crime and one of the duties of the Senior Probation Officer would be to take charge of the Preventive Branch of the Department.

In short, it is felt that there should be a senior man in this office to assist the Chief Probation Officer and he will have to carry out certain administrative duties. The Hon. Minister of Social Services will be able to add his quota to this should it be necessary.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No.8) ORDER, 1959.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.8) Order, 1959."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This next Order is also a Resolution to approve a Civil Establishment Order - No.8 - and it deals with the posts of Staff Officer, Local Forces and Adjutant, Barbados Regiment and the Instructor of the Barbados Regiment.

As hon. members know, these Offices are now filled by members of Her Majesty's Forces. Whenever there is an increase of salary to the corresponding Officers in their Regiments overseas, our Government is also called upon to increase their salaries commensurately with the salary which they would receive if they were with their Regiment. Their salary has been increased since the 1st April, 1958 and as a result we are asked to provide increases of salaries for these two posts.

As the Note points out, it is suggested that in order to save reference to the Legislature on each occasion that British Army rates are increased, it is proposed to make provision for the two officers to be paid at the rates which they would receive if serving in the British Army in the United Kingdom plus fixed local overseas allowances of \$1,357.80 and \$1,861.50 per annum for the Staff Officer and Instructor respectively. There are similar allowances which are paid to such persons in the British Army who are serving in British Guiana.

As I have said, in order that we may not have to come to the Legislature on every occasion that there is an increase in British Army rates, it is proposed that these increases should be done in this way.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 9) ORDER, 1959

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Resolution stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the passing of the following Resolution: Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No.9) Order, 1959.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, this Order is another Civil Establishment Order and the object of this is to create the full-time specialist post of Ophthalmic Surgeon on the staff of the General Hospital. As hon. members know, there are two part-time officers there and the work is increasing. It is also proposed to extend the work in this respect to the examining of the eyes of school children. At the moment this is very imperfectly done. That service will call for the work of a whole-time officer; therefore, it is proposed to abolish one of these part-time posts and to create a full-time post at the salary which is paid by the General Hospital for specialists posts in this respect, that is, he will be put on the salary scale of \$6,480 - \$7,440, plus fees.

As is stated in the Addendum to the Resolution, the holder of the part-time post of Ophthalmic Surgeon has recently retired, and the time is considered appropriate to bring the staff of this section of the Hospital over which he took charge into line with other sections of the Hospital for which specialist posts have been created.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think we all appreciate the stand which the Government has taken in this matter but I think we would have to get some figures in this respect. I became interested in this matter a few months ago. While I agree with the appointment of a whole-time specialist of Ophthalmic Surgery as suggested by the Hon. Premier, I am wondering whether in this particular field figures can be had to show whether it would not only be necessary to have this whole-time officer and one part-time officer, but to have two part-time officers in the field. It strikes me that if you are going to have one whole-time officer whose duties in the main will consist of the examination of eyes of school children - which is something that was frightfully neglected - it would be rather difficult for the number of people who now apply at the General Hospital for appointments for the treatment of their eyes to get attention within a year. I am wondering if the Hon. Premier can tell me the figures in this respect.

Quite recently, we observed in the Press that two Barbadians have specialised in this field. One is coming home and he has got the F.R.C.S. I think we are all very happy to think that we have a Barbadian who is highly qualified in this field and who would be happy to come here and practise.

8.00 p.m.

I am sure that the Hon. Premier will agree with me in saying that we are all happy with these persons who have such qualifications. In selecting your Specialists, this will be one occasion on which you will not have to look for people from outside. Recently we had another Specialist also highly qualified who is coming out to us too and I understand that he has been appointed temporarily somewhere. While I agree in principle with this matter, I should like to see from my knowledge of this matter, a third Specialist appointed but you should also get your part-time surgeons in this field. As I said, in this particular field there has been neglect for a long time. People are beginning to realise now that the highly qualified men as Ophthalmic Surgeons are the best people for doing this diagnosis. A number of people get messed up by merely going to those people who are not competent to deal with a case, but people who will just fit them with glasses. I think there is much more the desire for that Specialist at the Hospital. If you are going to take on what has been neglected - someone who would pay greater attention to your school children - then I say that the Premier should be able to say something to us about this matter. I do not know if he has the figures as to the waiting lists of school children but he should be able to say something about it. You have Dr. Gibbons; Dr. St. John has retired. Dr. Gibbons has been appointed in Dr. St. John's place and if you have the F. R.C.S. coming in a few days' time then there will not be any dearth of medical men in this field. You should not let it be said when you have Specialists in a particular line, that there is no opportunity for them at home. In this particular field opportunity must be given to the men to use your Hospital; and I think myself that if you have them at your doorstep, there is no need for people to be neglected. I say, despite what people might think, that I would like to see more Surgeon Specialists here. I do not favour abolishing the offices of Visiting Surgeons, but I think that if our youngsters realise that there is opportunity for them, now that you have these particular Eye Specialists here, the time is right here for you to use them now. What you are saying in this Resolution is that you are going to have a permanent Specialist post of Ophthalmic Surgeon on the salary scale of \$6,480 - 7,440 plus fees. Now that you have this other qualified man in your midst - you have Dr. Gibbons and this other man - and my suggestion will cost us nothing more than another \$40 a month; it may be only \$20.00 a month, because some Specialists would prefer to come as part-time Visiting Surgeons than to take the permanent Specialist job; but any man can qualify as an eye Specialist or a Ophthalmic Surgeon for a Hospital.

From the last figures I had in discussing this matter I find what we really needed - and I am told by medical

men that this is not a field in which the men who come out do not practise. I hope the Hon. Premier will be able to enlighten me on this matter. I have no brief for anybody; I am just thinking of the individuals whom you may have. You have promoted Mr. Thompson and you have an F.R.C.S. coming; is there or is there not any room? Can people benefit by having another surgeon at the Hospital? I am suggesting to the Hon. Premier that the matter should be gone into.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I really am not in a position to give the hon. member the figures now; I have not got the necessary information here. With regard to his proposals, the hon. member must realise that there is a big difference between having a man permanently employed from day to day doing this work and having two part-time men for two half days a week. Since it has been decided that we should have this full-time man who would be able to do more work naturally and thereby reduce the waiting list, I think that we should give this matter a trial first of all. I cannot answer the hon. member as to his enquiry now that we will have a full-time man.

8.10 p.m.

I can say offhand that it will upset the calculations and every thing that has been done to give hon. member's scheme a trial, but as I said I will watch it and if it is required, I promise the hon. member to come back for the necessary permission to put his scheme into effect.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 10 stands in the name of the hon. Premier; to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) (Amendment) Order, 1959.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1959

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This Order, Sir, is to give practical effect to the Resolution which we have just passed. The Order provides for adjustments in the Part-Time Staff of the General Hospital as follows:-

- (i) The replacement of the present part-time post of Ophthalmic Surgeon by a post of Visiting Ophthalmic Surgeon on the same salary;
- (ii) the abolition of the present part-time post of Assistant Ophthalmic Surgeon.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 11 stands in the name of the Hon. Premier; to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) (Amendment) Order, 1959.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PAYMENT OF PASSAGES) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1959

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This is another Civil Establishment Order, Sir, to deal with passages.

As you know, Sir, the maximum for passage expenses for officers coming from abroad is \$1,920 by sea and \$2,400 by air. These limits have been determined by the Governor-in-Executive Committee with the approval of the Legislature. We are today asking permission to remove the maximum and to give the Governor-in-Executive authority to pay reasonable passages. The reason for that is this; we have quite a few vacancies here - and I am thinking now especially of medical services - and we want medical officers for the Health Centres. Quite recently we have had an application from a gentleman - I think from Australia or New Zealand, I do not remember which - who was willing to come; it was a question of payment of passages. The amount it would have taken would have exceeded the maximum here

of \$2,400. Before we could come to the House and ask for permission to increase it, he withdrew; he had another offer. But that is not the only case; that is the most recent and that is why we are asking the Legislature to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee permission to extend that wherever and whenever necessary, that is, whenever we want to fill these posts that are vacant not only in the medical service but in other cases. The post of Electrical Engineer, Waterworks Department, for instance, is still vacant; I am not sure that in this case it is a question of passage but that occurred to my mind, and as I said, we are asking the Legislature to give the Governor-in-Executive Committee authority that when such a case arises, we can extend the amount for passage to a suitable amount to cover the travelling expenses of an officer who is willing to come to Barbados.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I sat here just now and agreed to a similar Resolution, but that had a different bearing because it was tied to something in which you were recruiting a man in the United Kingdom. By Law you had to have two British Officers and we agreed to pay them and to give them the other allowances. Do you realise how contradictory the Premier can be? Today he is making a plea for filling vacancies and asking us to do something to fill vacancies. Some weeks ago he got up and to defend the non-filling of vacancies he said it was nothing to do with him. Today in order to get us to do something he is saying that these vacancies are to be filled. He told us that the reason why they could not fill vacancies was the question of money; yet with vacancies under the same Civil Establishment he said they were nothing to do with him but with the Public Service Commission.

Let us say that the Public Service Commission has drawn this to the attention of Government. What are they asking? This is what the Addendum says:-

"The present maximum for passages expenses under the Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) Order are \$1,920 by sea and \$2,400 by air. These limits have been determined by the Governor-in-Executive Committee by the approval of the Legislature.

The amount allowed is usually sufficient to cover an officer's passage expenses on first appointment, but in a few instances a hardship is placed on the officer."

This is a case in which a hardship is being placed on an officer, but the man he spoke about was not a potential officer. How many cases have there been? What are we underwriting today? We are underwriting that there will be no more limit; the sky will be the limit and the question of "exceptional cases" might be those in which the present Government makes the interpretation. I have no idea of what they will regard as an exceptional case, but the case which the Premier has just mentioned is a fly in the ointment.

They always say in this House that we cannot get medical officers. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that a man in New Zealand or Australia on the basis of passage would turn down an appointment for the reason stated by the Premier? He would turn down the appointment anyhow, whether or not it was a question of passage. Some people have accepted appointments with all that you offer and then you get a reply turning them down. You can only be talking of cases in Africa because people in the Far and Near East do not like to come to the West Indies as such for that kind of appointment; so it is not a question of passage. Let us take the case of the Transport Board or the Housing Board. What are those people going to put down in the Estimates? What is the limit? There must be some limit. You cannot have something fixed from time to time to authorise exceptional circumstances, because if something happens at the Transport Board tomorrow and you have to recruit a man, what are you going to do? You would still have to ask the Governor-in-Executive Committee any time because you have no fixed amount. You do not know what the amount is going to be and yet it is to be approved by the Executive Committee.

8.20 p.m.

Well, Sir, it is not only people who work in the Civil Establishment that Leave Passages apply to; you have also the teachers in secondary schools. What are you going to put in the Estimates? In these exceptional cases,

would you say that it would be an exceptional case to recruit a doctor from New Zealand as against a teacher for a secondary school? What are you going to put in the advertisement? If the sky is the limit, well then, that is the situation.

In the Crown Colony days, you used to have plenty Orders-in-Council; but now that you have cabinet system of Government where you are evolving a different type of Government in which you should have what I regard as more legislative Government Acts because you do not have these different Boards any more to put people on, I find that you are running your Government in such a way that there is a gradual taking away from the Legislature of its powers to deal with these things. It seems to me as if you are saying that it is becoming a nuisance for you to come to the Legislature formally whenever you want it, and there is this gradual idea that you should not come to the Legislature whenever you need it. Therefore, when you bring down the Resolutions, you come and say, let the Legislature give you the authority to spend the money and initiate legislation as you think fit. Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. There is a great diminution of this authority of the Legislature and I have said earlier, Governments are not above it and a rapacious Government would soon find itself nearer to the prison doors (*Hon. R. G. MAPP made asides.*) The Hon. Minister is making those asides and jibes that apply to him most. If I say something Your Honour will hear me and take note of it; but when they say something that means nothing to you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said that if he said something that means something to me, but if other hon. members say something that does not mean anything to me. The hon. member can do much better than that. I have heard no asides. I am Speaker and I am concentrating on what the hon. member is saying more than anything else. As a matter of fact, I have to concentrate on the hon. member who is addressing the Chair, and when I am concentrating on him, it seems to me that he is not concentrating on me. If he says that if there are any asides I would not catch at it, I would like to let the hon. member know that he is entirely mistaken. Do not suggest that the Chair is going to hear what the hon. member is going to say and not what other hon. members say. This is not the first time the hon. member has said so and I would not stand for it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, I am the sort of man who does not make any fun when I am addressing the Chair. I stay here and the hon. member on the other side is making interruptions. It is immaterial to me if Your Honour hears what he has said.

To get back to what I was saying at first, I was saying that there is a gradual diminution of the authority of the Legislature, it being gradually transferred to the Executive Committee. Among the present members of the Government are many who do not now even know what the Executive Committee means because they do not know that the Governor has nothing to do with the Executive Committee. When it comes to the question of your going to determine what leave passages should be paid to officers coming here and you are saying that the Legislature should give you a limit of \$2,000 - - -

(The lights suddenly went out).

After an interval,

Mr. SPEAKER: In the present circumstances, there being no light nobody can see though they can be heard. I think that we should adjourn. The hon. member who is addressing the Chair now has the right to speak again on this subject. I, therefore, think that this is an occasion when the House should adjourn.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 12th May, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

8.25 p.m.