

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1960

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th May, 1960.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at twelve 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*); Mr. T. O. BRYAN, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. F. E. MILLER, (*Minister of Social Services*); Mr. E. St.A. HOLDER; Hon. D. D. GARNER, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mr. H. A. DOWDING, M.B.E.; Mr. C. B. SEARLES; Hon. L. St.A. THORNE, (*Minister of Education*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; and Mr. G. E. S. STRAUGHN.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the meeting of the 10th May, 1960, have been printed and circulated amongst hon. members and unless there be any objection these Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed.

There being no objection, these Minutes are now taken as read and confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

The Jurors (Remuneration and Allowances) Regulations, 1960.

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1959.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 31st March, 1960.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:-

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Resolution to place the sum of \$144,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive

Committee to supplement the Estimates 1960-61, Part II-Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1960-61 No. 4 which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to sanction the Regulations entitled "The Customs (Amendment) Regulations, 1960."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: A Bill to amend the Coroners Act, 1932.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Question No. 3/1960 asked by the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, regarding resignations from the Police Force and conditions of service of members of the Force, is now ready.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting to consider the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.
12.25 p.m.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following motion:-

That this House has no CONFIDENCE in the Policy of the Ministry of Communications as to its Administration of -

- (a) Public Passenger Transport, including its present attitude towards motor vans, known as 'pick-ups';
- (b) Seawell Airport; and
- (c) Generally.

QUESTIONS

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Will the Minister publish, in accordance with an undertaking previously given, the figures which would indicate both the Capital and current costs of a School Meals Service?

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

1. Will the Minister state what salary adjustments, if any, are made in respect of Teachers serving in Primary Schools who qualify at the Advanced Level of the General Certificate of Education?
2. Will the Minister further state the position in respect of Teachers in Secondary Modern Schools who possess similar qualifications?

3. If there is a difference in treatment, will the Minister state the reason for this difference and (a) whether he proposes to remedy it, and (b) how he proposes to do so?

To Enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

1. Is the Minister aware that pupils of at least two Primary Schools in St. Andrew are obliged, through want of seating space to lie on the floor in order to write?
2. Will the Minister give this matter priority attention and remedy this extraordinary state of affairs?

BILL READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Coroners Act, 1932, be now read a first time.

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

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

PROCEDURE RE POINT OF RULING

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House is proceeded with, I would just like to enquire from Your Honour what is the procedure to be followed if hon. members wish to consult upon a ruling given by Your Honour but which is not controversial enough as to warrant its being challenged by a substantive motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: That should be done privately in my Chambers; that is the only way to deal with it.

Mr. TUDOR: As Your Honour pleases.

ORDER POSTPONED

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 1 and that Order No. 2 be taken as the first Order of the Day.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1960-61 No. 3

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$13,635 under various Heads of the Estimates and, as usual, each Head will be taken separately.

HEAD VIII - LEGAL

Head VIII - Legal - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Head, hon. members, I think, will remember a recent case in which Richard Aubrey Williams and Juliette Marianne Williams were Plaintiffs - Appellants and Her Majesty's Attorney General for the Island of Barbados was the Defendant-Respondent. This case relates to a dispute as to whether certain goods imported by the Plaintiffs are dutiable or not. Counsel for the Crown took

a preliminary point of law that as a dispute has arisen as to the proper amount of money, and the plaintiff had referred the question to the Governor-in-Executive Committee, the Court had no jurisdiction to determine the matter. The Trial Judge decided this point in favour of the Crown, but on appeal to the Federal Supreme Court, that Court held that Section 165 of the Trade Act, 1910, could not operate so as to oust the jurisdiction of the Court. The matter as to whether the article is subject to duty or not, still had to be determined by the Court.

That is a short history of this case. The decision went against the Defendant-Respondent and five hundred dollars of the costs amounting to \$1,214.40 have already been paid from the provision in last year's Estimates. The rest of the money which is being asked for here is to pay the remainder of the costs. I beg to move that Head VIII stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question was put and agreed to.

12.35 p.m.

Head XIX - Ecclesiastical - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Head deals with Cost of Living to the Clergy which was inadvertently omitted from Resolution No. 42 of 1959.

I beg to move that Head XIX - Ecclesiastical - stand part.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take this opportunity of asking the Hon. Premier how far advanced have negotiations got between the Governor-in-Executive Committee and the Synod of the Anglican Church with respect to disestablishment and disendowment. It is about time, I think, that some announcement was made, as it is a matter of great public interest on all sides, and I am sure the Minister might like to take this opportunity of saying something, in consequence, particularly, of the Speech from the Throne which said that you could look forward to its being done this year.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I agree it is a matter of great interest generally, but it is also a matter of great interest that a new Bishop has been appointed, and it is felt that negotiations should be suspended awaiting the arrival of this new Bishop who, I think, is to come sometime next month. I think it is only fair that he should be allowed to get the background of the thing, and in consequence of that, we are awaiting his arrival.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. member's reply, but the question was how far have negotiations proceeded. I wonder if the hon. member can give any indication of that. We understand, of course, that when the new Bishop comes, he will have to be consulted and his views learnt, but at the same time negotiations must have gone to some distance and we are wondering whether the Premier can say how far.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I would say, in short, not very far.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution to pay a Cost of Living allowance to the people in connection with the Ecclesiastical affairs is something that is more or less a pledge. Though the answer which has been given by the Premier does not shed much light on this Head, it is a perfect indication that the Government has started something that they were not prepared for, because they started to deal with the Church and now we hear the Premier say that he is awaiting the new Bishop to hear what he has to say and to give him an opportunity of getting all the background.

Now to prepare the background information for the Bishop in itself would involve a year's work, and for Government not yet to know what it is going to do precisely

and in detail on an issue such as this shows that they started before they were ready. Do not take these big problems and deal with them in such a manner. Another instance to show that they have started before they were ready is this: I have no objection to the Clergy getting a Cost of Living allowance - they are entitled to it under the Act - but what has happened as a matter of equity is that there were some people who were included in the Church affairs, in the Vestries and otherwise, who would have received similar treatment had this been done to such servants as had been employed, and now you find the unfortunate situation where some of these servants who have been separated by the Act cannot now get the same help, assistance or privileges or be treated in an equal manner as part of the Clergy is going to be treated, because the Councils, whether District or City Councils, have been forced to separate by a block grant a certain amount that existed. They have been paid an amount of money that would have been paid had this not come into operation; therefore these people who are eligible on a basis of equity to a Cost of Living allowance, I understand, find themselves in the invidious position that they cannot get it because the City Council and the District Councils have been given an amount of money to take care of such contingencies.

I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, on a basis of equity that that is right. It is indefensible to have a group of people falling under the Head of the Church treated in a way by two different authorities; but one authority follows the other. The Vestry gave a Cost of Living allowance to such servants as they were responsible for, and the Government gave a Cost of Living allowance to such servants that they pay from the Treasury, and that has been the arrangement that went on for some time; and now you have a break. But you will give one because you have not broken with the one that you had to deal with, and under this Act, you or the Church is going to be different. There are some servants employed in a manner in which they cannot receive this treatment because the District Councils and the City Council have been informed by an Act that they have been given a lump sum which is equivalent to the amount which you paid before the coming into operation of the Act without provision for an increase of any sort. I do not think that it is right, because the Councils now are crying out that even the commitments they have incur a burden, and to ask them to increase this burden would be asking them to dispossess themselves.

Now that an election is coming on and this question has been raised, I hope it will be answered in an appropriate manner that such servants that would have been entitled to a Cost of Living allowance by the Vestries are entitled as a matter of equity to receive the Cost of Living allowance by the same token that you are introducing this Resolution to give the Clergy a Cost of Living allowance. There can be no question of treating an issue like that on a technicality because we know for a fact that the Church system has not changed. The people who were employed by the Church were given a Cost of Living allowance by the Government, and the Vestries gave one too. If they have not been given it, they should be given because it is not fair. It cannot be justified that you can increase the Clergy or people connected with the Church in the Island; the Clergy has been increased because everybody in the Civil Establishment has received an increase, therefore the Clergy came within the Civil Establishment.

I am not in any way denying them the increase, but that has absolutely nothing to do with the question of disendowment and disestablishment whatsoever. You agree that they should have it, and I am not disputing that; but I am also contending that no technicality whatsoever should preclude other servants who would have been treated in a manner like this from receiving this just treatment, and there can be no technicality to preclude them from getting it, because if you do it, it is something that you can see is a glaring inequity and should be regularised. I hope that any person can see that as a question of equity it is something that needs no beating around the bush, and there should be a clear cut issue as to who are entitled to these things which the others receive.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, I must admit that until the hon. member who has just sat down spoke, I did not quite appreciate that aspect of the matter, and arising, Sir, from what he said, two things spring to mind; one is that if Government is aware of the fact that the Law forbids the Local Government authorities from paying this Cost of Living allowance to Church officials, why does Government not pay the Cost of Living itself pending some financial arrangement with Synod about it? I agree with the hon. member that a moral obligation with the Central Government authorities to do something which the Local Government Authorities have been precluded from doing; but if Government wanted an alternative, it could make special arrangements whereby it could empower the Local Government authorities, for these particular reasons, to pay this Cost of Living allowance.

12.45 p.m.

The second point is this: and it arises out of this measure. It appears from what the Hon. Premier says that even when the Bishop comes it will take some time before these matters are set in train again. In answer to a question which I asked, the Hon. Premier said that the negotiations formerly did not proceed very far. That is a most disquieting admission to make and it would appear that if negotiations have to await the arrival of the Bishop perhaps the whole matter might have to be gone over again.

In view of that, I would like to ask the Hon. Premier to tell the Committee, if he wishes, at what point did the negotiations stop? Did, for instance, they reach the point in which the financial arrangements were beginning to be gone into, or did they reach the point where both sides were awaiting to hear the views of one another? Neither this Committee nor the Vicar-General would be able to say for certainty when we would see the end to this matter and I would like to draw to the Government's attention that the longer these negotiations continue, the greater will be the financial commitments which the Government will have to meet. With rising costs going up, anything amounting to \$1 million, say in 1956, would bound to run into \$1 1/2 million or \$1 1/4 million proportionately three or four years from now. As I have said just now, the Hon. Premier's statement is very disquieting because he has admitted that we have not got very far. That is the inference, because he hinted that when the new Bishop comes the whole matter might have to be started and that being the case, we can look forward to these negotiations dragging on for another two or three years. That is not satisfactory because while the negotiations are dragging on, the Anglican Church (Suspension) Act will be going on; and the longer that Act goes on, the longer the Anglican Church will have difficulty with respect to its staffing.

There is this point to be taken into consideration also. If this amount of \$4,320 is required to meet the cost of living allowance for the clergy, then the subordinate officers of the Church are also entitled to this cost of living and, as I see it, there are one or two ways to do it. Either it is that you will have to empower the Local Government to pay it, to be reimbursed from the Central Government or the Central Government will have to do it itself. I would like to hear the Hon. Premier's view on this matter because it is an urgent one; and unless the Government takes some direct and positive action, it would not be handled at all because there is nobody with the necessary authority but the Government to handle it.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, we have reached the stage where we are called upon to pay the piper and still cannot call the tune. We know that it is but fair that these clergymen should have their cost of living allowance in the same way as anyone else in the Service; therefore, we can do nothing else but pass this Resolution for it. But we should pass it with a mark of protest against some of the actions of some of these clergymen.

Imagine, Sir, that a sort of thing like this can happen in the Church. Not long ago, I had to attend one of these churches, and the behaviour of the clergyman in charge was very bad. So bad it was that he had that church in an uproar as if it were a fish market and it was only because

that clergyman felt that he could get into that church and say and do as he likes; and, in my opinion, not even the Bishop can ask him anything about it.

Sir, we as representatives of the people should be in the position to make these clergymen understand that it is the taxpayers' money which is keeping them alive and that they should not be their own bosses to do as they like. I was very much ashamed of the action of this clergyman; and as I was there, most of the people called on me as their representative and asked me what action am I going to take about the matter. I could not fool them; I had to tell them that I could do nothing about it because owing to the way in which the Anglican Church Act was written, not even the Bishop could do anything with these "Governors" of the Church after they were put in office.

Since then, I had to attend this church again and through spite this particular incumbent refused to take the corpse into the church; he took it directly from the funeral coach into the graveyard and over the grave. There he muttered a few words, only because he had to do so, and that was the end of it, so far as he was concerned. One of the men who attended the funeral had to call out a hymn to be sung. The particular priest walked off and asked the relatives to come with him and give him the necessary information for the registering of the death. It was at this point that the Reverend Gentleman took out a copy of the Anglican Church Act and read out for the people present the relevant section which stated that so long as one did not worship at the Church, the priest was not supposed to take the corpse into the Church. He went so far as to say knowing that I was present that if Mr. Smith was to die now, he would take me straightway to the grave because he knew that I was not a member of the Church. I am not against that. As a matter of fact, I feel that I would only be wasting my time to sit down in his Church and listen to him.

But, Sir, here it is that I have to be instrumental in voting money to pay this same chap, and soon we will be voting money to give to Synod so as to keep this same chap's body and soul alive and he is telling people that even if a representative of the people should die now, he is not going to take his corpse into the Church. I am saying that it is time that something should be done about the Anglican Church Act. I will not say, as the hon. junior member for St. James has said, that you should tear it up. I say that something should be done with it.

The Hon. Premier has said that they are waiting the arrival of the Bishop to do something; but I am appealing to you and to the Hon. Premier to try and do something as soon as possible, because the behaviour of some of these clergymen is of such that they will soon be shutting the church doors and opening them whenever they like and with some of them, the time that they have to spend in church is spent at some rumshop. It is not good enough for this country and for the Church and I say that an example must be made of somebody to show where they are going wrong. There must be some regard for the people who have to be responsible for voting money and who have to keep these people together.

Sir, you may have read in the newspapers recently of one of these gentlemen hurling the Northern District Council as well as the Synod before the Courts. These chaps do not care anything and we must make them care. 12.55 p.m.

Although this particular Incumbent takes it upon himself to sue the Northern Council, we cannot even take one penny off the vote as a mark of protest against his behaviour; we will still have to put the money there for him and for a lot of them to do as they like with it. Sir, that is not good enough. Whatever we are going to do with the people at these Churches—well, the Churches are all right, but the standards need to be raised; the standard of the Churches is deteriorating very rapidly. If you are awaiting the Bishop, then you must charge and warn him and give him the necessary powers to sack these people, to take the gown off them when they are not acting in a godly way or as leaders of the Church. These people are acting as vagabonds; I have heard that someone

began to choke the bell-ringer, the sexton began to pull him about and that sort of thing. That does not sound well for the Church; we must not stay here and encourage it by giving them the necessary funds so as to carry on this sort of behaviour. We must be in a position to withdraw or to refuse to vote this money or call upon the Bishop to have Mr. "A" or Mr. "B" sacked. They are of no use to the community when they behave in that way in the Church.

I do hope that the Premier will do all that lies in his power to bring back the Church to the place whence it began to fall. People believe in the Church and therefore we must do everything to keep up the standard of the Church; we can do that by sacking these boys if they behave badly. The behaviour of some of them is not at all in keeping with the Church.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, the disquieting disclosures made by the hon. member who has just sat down remind me of the mediaeval proverb to the effect that if you eat with the Devil, you must eat with a long spoon; and that must be more true if the meal of which you are partaking is curry (*Laughter*). We all deplore this state of affairs, but I do not think the hon. member should want to bring strictures over the whole body of the Clergy. I do not think that the hon. member means to do that either. We all deplore this state of affairs but I do not think that this Committee is necessarily the sort of forum in which these things should be aired. Of necessity, the criticisms have to be generalised, but it did strike me that there is even more urgency for the Government proceeding with this matter of disestablishment and disendowment. One advantage of disestablishment would be that it would enable the Church to tighten up and extend its own discipline on its members. The things complained of by the hon. member are breaches of discipline; if the Church were master in its own house, it might be able to put these things right; but as long as these things remain as they are and you have these people as Civil Servants, with rights and privileges of Civil Servants, and free agents on their own, so long you will have this scandalous conduct which the hon. member has related. One benefit which has come to us from the hon. member is to drive home, I hope, to the members of his Party and particularly the Minister responsible, how very urgent and necessary it is for the Church to be disestablished in the shortest possible time so that it may reinforce, where it does not now exist, and establish its own discipline over the Clergy.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, in this Resolution the note states that supplementary provision is required to meet the Cost of Living Allowance for the Clergy which was authorised by Resolution No. 42 of 1959 and which was omitted from the Approved Estimates 1960-61. That is the law and therefore we will have to provide this Cost of Living Allowance for these people. As to hon. members sitting here and asking the Government how to run the Church, I cannot see how we could do that. There is an amount which has been handed to the Clergy and they have to run their affairs. It is left to the congregation to accept the Minister, whoever or whatever he may be. Before the Minister was ordained, he was selected by the people of the parish; and after he has been ordained, if he gives them grass to eat they must eat it, and if he gives them water to drink they must drink it. That is up to them. There are two laws and there are two men who rule them and we have got to be very careful with them—one man is the clergyman and the other is the solicitor; one is the law of above and the other is the law of below. They are the two very difficult men with whom you have to deal; therefore I say that you have to be very careful how you deal with them.

As to this Cost of Living Allowance, we will have to grant it; the big man has to eat and the little man has to eat as well. The shepherd and the sheep have to be fed. I do not think that there is any further argument to be raised over this Resolution; I will vote for it one hundred per cent.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, lest my silence be taken as assent to the speech which I have just heard from

the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I want to make it quite clear that I think this attack on an individual and the Church as a whole is completely unparliamentary, unfair and uncalled for. This is not the place for this sort of thing; and the accusations which the hon. member has made are of such seriousness that I cannot look at them as disclosures, because I have not got the necessary evidence for investigation which would be needed for such statements to be made. I regret very much that these statements have been made in this honourable House and I completely dissociate myself from those remarks which I regard as being unparliamentary.

Mr. STRAUGHN: Mr. Chairman, the extension of this debate started off with the relevant point which was made by the hon. senior member for St. Peter in wondering whether the interim situation, as it now exists, would not for too long create a hardship on certain officers of the Church other than the Clergy.

1.05 p.m.

This particular Resolution, as we can see, is in place here because the Clergymen themselves draw their salaries out of the Treasury, and it would have been in place to have their Cost of Living allowances put forward even before.

Now the situation as it is now, Sir, in which any salaries or wages paid in the Church are governed by Interim Ecclesiastical Regulations which have been handed down to the Councils shows that if any addition in salary or in wages - and indirectly Cost of Living is to some extent an addition to salary - is to be given, it would have to come as the situation is now from the Church itself. The Regulations have been so written that the Councils are empowered and required to pay whatever salaries and wages there were when the Councils took over, and they did not take in any additional allowances in which category would fall the Cost of Living allowances.

Now two things face us there, Sir; either we are faced with an amendment to the existing Interim Regulations, or which appears more logical, the Church in as much as they are starting out on their own would be required in giving any addition to the regular wages to provide them from their own sources. That is how the Regulations stand at the moment. We do not like the situation, and I think it was a good point that was raised about the hardship being created on officers of the Church who are in a category below the Clergy. They certainly would be undergoing a hardship if they do not get their Cost of Living Allowance, but I do not see any other way in which that can be provided under the existing Regulations unless the Church itself provides these additional Cost of Living allowances.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if there is an official record that every Vestry at all times also gave Cost of Living allowances to their officers; some may have done and others may not have done so; but in this present situation, it looks as if the onus is on the Church to provide any additional salaries that may be offered.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the hon. member say that, but the marked difference is not only on the Cost of Living, and an examination of the Act would show that whether or not the Government or the Vestry pay Church officers, the Interim Legislation is that the Central Government will continue to pay the salaries to the Clergy, while under the Interim Regulations, the Councils were given a lump sum of money to pay other officers of the Church. This present situation is a question of equity. If in 1960, as a result of something you did in 1959, you are giving a Cost of Living allowance to somebody that you gave in 1959, but if as a matter of principle you gave all the public service, whether Civil Servants or on the Civil Establishment, the right to have this Cost of Living allowance, you have cut off the Church. You are giving the Clergy now, but the other people you gave a lump sum with the stipulation that they shall not have any increase other than what the Church provides, and yet you have not provided the Church with something that is more or less a *post facto* agreement, because since you have passed the legislation and put it into operation with the

Church, you have passed subsequent legislation stating that a Cost of Living allowance shall be paid to everybody and now you include the Clergy as a matter of equity. How can you do that? These people are as much entitled to it as anybody else, and not even on moral grounds; and even on that there are no stronger laws than morality. You do not pass laws on sputniks. If the Holy Law say that you shall only have one wife, therefore if a man has two wives he shall pay for it; and that is not even on grounds of morality but on grounds of Christianity which is the concept in which we live in this part of the world.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. senior member for St. Peter to keep on addressing the Chair and not listen to asides.

Mr. WALCOTT: I was not dealing with the asides at all. You might have heard asides which appeared to have been over my voice, but it was not my voice, because I was making it clear that I regard it was a matter of equity that these people should be paid this Cost of Living allowance. We have grown in this Island to a point where it suits people - and I am not making this reference to the hon. junior member for St. Joseph - in this House at times to draw legal red herrings across the trail, just as the former Premier said that Combermere School is a private school but is still getting public funds. Now you draw the distinction of saying that you pass a Law that the Church shall pay these people a Cost of Living allowance, but the Premier comes back today and says that in so far as the whole question of the disendowment and disestablishment of the Church is concerned, that is something he is going to put before the Bishop, so that nothing officially has been decided; and when asked how far negotiations had got, he said "not too far"; so the net result of your consultations with the Church is still an unknown quantity. The Premier cannot tell us today that it will cost, say, \$2 million, \$3 million or \$10 million payable at the rate of so much per annum to the Churches and this is what Government is going to do, but you pass a bit of Interim Legislation that precludes somebody that is right down at the bottom, and the following year you bring in a Resolution to give the Clergy, because, you say, technically speaking, Clergymen come under the Civil Establishment and are therefore entitled to this Cost of Living. But there is no Law that says so; that is Statute Legislation. The idea of a Cost of Living allowance is a matter for this House of Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, I am not voicing any secret when I say that there was a time when the Premier was not in favour of the Clergy getting an increase at all. I am a believer in disendowment of the Church, not on the narrow basis of what they get, but as a matter of general principle. I feel that the necessity for having the Church endowed cannot be compared with 200 years ago when you had an endowed Church as an adjunct of slavery. I have radical views about why the Church should be disendowed; so it is not on any sentimental basis of the Christian concept either, because it was done purely as a matter of convenience. They do not exist today and the people who go to church should be called upon to support the Church, whether or not the hon. junior member for St. Joseph says so. If you have a dead body to bury and you want it done with all the paraphernalia of the Church, you have to pay for it, just as some people like a big casket and have to pay for it, because the undertaker does not spare them. If you want the Choir to sing to send the dead to the celestial with style, you have to pay for it; but if you want to give him a simple funeral on to paradise, you do not have to pay so much.

1.15 p.m.

The more service you want, the more you pay.

I am a believer in disendowment and I say that the people who go to the Church ought to be prepared to pay for its upkeep. However, that does not square off with the situation as to conditions of employment. You have two sides. You have the servants of the Church drawing their salary from two different bodies. Since the Government is giving a cost of living to these clergymen, I feel that the organists, the bell-ringers, the sextons, and what not should also have a cost of living allowance. You tell them

now that you cannot give them that; you say that the Church must pay for that, yet you have not settled the affairs of the Church. I am not defending the Church; but when you come and say that this is your arrangement in which you say that the Council can only pay out this amount of money to the Church, then I think that you must pay for this.

I do not know if we have reached the point of responsibility in this island for the upkeep of the Church. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph made a criticism just now as regards the reverend gentleman doing what he likes, but I do not know if the Church has taken up the question of laying down a condition of people using the Church. I wonder what it would be if a Minister were to say to every member that for a wedding, a christening, or a funeral, you must pay so much for it. We know what would happen at the present moment, thinking in terms of the church-going population of Barbados; these people would not be in a position to give a cost of living allowance to their subordinates if these things are placed before them. Therefore, I say, as a matter of equity, the Government in this case should give the respective Councils a vote commensurate to this because there is no law to vote this equivalent to the amount of money that would be equal to the allowance which the Government has already consolidated for everybody in the service of the island. I say that you should put everybody on the same basis. I do not think it is fair that these people should not get it when everybody else is getting it. Everybody knows that the Church is now carrying out negotiations with the Government and these negotiations were going on prior to 1959; so it is no question of your saying to these people: "Oh no, you cannot have it." I will go further and say that when the Act was being dealt with in so far as precluding these people in the Church from getting more salary the Civil Servants were asking for increases. I have no grounds to support me, but I know that had it not been that it is considered that the political forces of these people in the Church are relatively small the Government could not dare to have done this to them. Government would have done to them what it has done to everybody else. Were it not that this particular section of people, being as it is, is without much political power, the Government could not dare do it. The Government could not dare to do this to agricultural workers. They could do it but they know that if they did it that they would not occupy the seats which they are occupying now.

Not too long ago, the Hon. Premier enunciated on a platform that he will change the Local Government Act to do this. This is positively unfair and it has been drawn to the Government's attention already that it has no right to lay back on its own oars and say that you know that this has been done under the Act. Who is responsible for the Act? Trinidad, the Colonial Office or Mr. MacLeod? I repeat that as a matter of equity and principle these Church officers should be given a cost of living allowance just as the Government is now giving it to the clergymen. They are entitled to it. If it means a question of increasing the block amount given to the various Councils in order that the allowance should be given to these people, you should do so. I think I have made that crystal clear.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am in entire agreement with this cost of living allowance for these clergymen. There is a tremendous lot in what the hon. member who has just sat down has said. As a matter of fact, when I first saw this Resolution I thought that I should get in touch with the Minister in charge and point out certain things to him. I do agree that this is the correct thing to do. On the other hand, I would like to remind the Hon. Premier of the present situation. As regards the Act relating to the Local Government and the severing of the Church and so on, I would say that you have got ramifications which I suppose the Premier and even his Secretary have not kept abreast of, and I am sure that when I would have finished speaking, he is bound to be advised to bring down a Resolution for these other officers too, that is, the sexton, the bell-ringer, organist and so on. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter has just said, all these people were not, so to speak, paid from Local Government. Some were paid and others were not. I will put it this way. In the parish of St. Michael only the Cathedral employees were paid by the Vestry. In

the parishes other than St. Michael, all of them, so to speak, who are at the Chapels or at the parish Churches - with the exception of one or two in Christ Church whose employees went to the Parochial Treasurer and drew the salary - actually took the lump sum which was paid by the Vestry to the Vicar or the Rector as the case may be.

Besides that, I want to tell the Hon. Premier that you have said to the Local Government Councils that you are cutting away yourself from the Church, therefore, you cannot give them any cost of living allowance; but I think that it is but fair that if you feel that the higher paid people - that is to say, the clergymen - should be given a cost of living allowance, then the lower paid people such as the organist, sexton, bell-ringer, and so on, should also be given a cost of living allowance.

I am absolutely certain that the Hon. Premier must give consideration to them and will bring something for them. You still have them under your charge. The Church is not disendowed yet; therefore, you have to give it to them; and if we on this side agree to your doing so, then the Hon. Premier is bound to come and say that seven-eighth or more of the subordinate officers connected with the Anglican Church are denied by statute the right to get a cost of living allowance, and therefore he is bound to come in with something for them. I say that you are bound to give it to them and for this reason. Although you have not actually said it, you have implied in the various parishes to the particular Local Government Councils in the case where the Clergy had to rent a house that the Council should lay a rate to pay taxes for them or give money to them to pay the rent.

1.25 p.m.

You can lay a rate on people to give it to them for them to pay it back in taxes lest they be out of pocket. They have to provide at every possible angle for these people and the easiest thing for them to do is to admit and say that this is an oversight. Can an individual come down here in respect of better paid servants of the Church, for a cost of living allowance, and say that the subordinates are not entitled to it? I cannot imagine your saying that. I want to say that actions speak louder than words and I am sure that you will come down with this cost of living Allowance for the subordinate later on. I do not think I need say anything more on that. You have done this thing for the Clergymen and you must realise that the institution of the Church as it stands could not be carried on only with the incumbent and not also with the congregation. A man might be a very bad person but if you have good music you can attract a lot of people to the Church.

This brings me to the point where I make reference to His Honour the Deputy Speaker who was courageous enough to express the views with which I agree, and I believe that I am expressing the consensus of opinion of nearly all the Clergy, never mind who they are and to what they belong, that there is one man for whom we are voting money here today, that is, the Rector of the parish of St. Thomas; but rather than ministering to people, he should be inside the Prison being ministered to. That is my considered opinion about this gentleman. Although we are voting this cost of living bonus for him today, it is common knowledge that this gentleman feels or sees that there is no reason why the salary of the Headmaster of his school should be more than his. Deep down in his heart

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. member the fact that there is a case in the Court involving this gentleman who is one of those persons for whom we are now voting this Cost of Living Allowance. In-as-much as this case is still before the Law Court, I do not think we should deal with it while it is engaging the attention of the Court.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect to Your Honour, I should like to say that I am not serving on any jury in this case, I am still a member of this House and there is nothing to say that I cannot deal with a burning shame whether a case is *sub judice* or not. I see that there is a Resolution before me for a Cost of Living Allowance

to Clergymen and this gentleman is a member of the clergy. Nothing we say in here - as a matter of fact, I say that from the Bishop down to the humblest employee of the Anglican Church is entitled to this allowance. I say that this particular gentleman should be asked to stop getting on in the way in which he is getting on, and I repeat that instead of ministering to people he should be in the Prison being ministered to.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say much more on this matter; I have drawn the attention of the Hon. Premier to what is the true position for every Clergyman. If you vote this Cost of Living Allowance for people whose salaries are around \$220 a month, that is the policy given to this House and it is also the policy by statute recently passed, that the Local Government Council is compelled to lay a rate to provide money for the house in which the Clergyman lives. That is the position for everyone of those who are attached to Cures; there are persons who draw less than one half of a salary of \$220 and there should be no argument that between the Government's decision to give persons a Cost of Living Bonus and the coming into being of the Local Government Act which prohibits the Local Government Council from giving this allowance to the subordinates - there could be no justifiable argument in a Socialist or so-called Socialist Government saying that the subordinate staff who get less than one half of the salary of their superior officers are not entitled to this Cost of Living Allowance. There are some things which you have to admit you are beaten on, and this is one of them.

If the Premier were to say: "I saw this and I knew that when we brought down this Cost of Living Allowance we were giving this Allowance to seventy or eighty Ministers and denying it to twice as many subordinate employees, I would say that I would be very much disappointed. I repeat that this is one of those things on which you are beaten. You did not know and you did not see; you should look and see other things which you give to these people. I am confident that outside of the reverend gentleman at St. Thomas, every incumbent of a Cure would be only too pleased to know that the subordinate employees such as the bellringers, organ blowers, sextons and people who keep up the graveyards and so on, would be given this Cost of Living Allowance. I appeal to the Premier if he is going to say "I will wait until the Bishop comes to go to him about it," to see that there would be no continuing to give leave passages or to pass any Resolution granting any Cost of Living Bonus. Let us wait until the Bishop comes; but if you can wait until the Bishop comes then every sexton, every organist, bellringer and other employees would have to wait until the Bishop comes in order to have these other things dealt with.

1.35 p.m.

I support wholeheartedly the Resolution which the Government has brought today, but I suggest that you bring one dating back as this will date back for the subordinates.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I was not in the House when the hon. senior member for St. George was replying, as I have heard, to my speech and saying that it was unwarranted and an unfair attack. I am wondering if the hon. senior member for St. George is in the House now and has heard his colleague with his attack. Now, Sir, I have not attacked any person or the Church in an unwarranted manner; I simply brought to the notice of the House and to the Premier the behaviour of some of the incumbents of some of these churches, because we expect that these Clergymen should be a light to the congregation and to the Church, and should do all that lie in their power to keep the devil out of the people; but in this case, some of them are devils themselves; so they cannot keep them out. I am nothing to do with what the hon. senior member for St. George may say; I would like to know how the hon. senior member for St. George would take it if he heard one of his managers say when he passed in the morning in his own place that he is going to introduce him to where he sits down. He would he feel about it, and how would he take it?

We are, I should say, the masters; we pass the money and these people should be made to understand that they should respect us rather than say these unfair things, be-

cause what some of them are supposed to be getting on with is unfair. How can this particular priest chastise any of his congregation if any of them wanted to put somebody in Court? Could he get into the pulpit and say it is unfair or not right? Could he tell them that it is not good and that they should settle the matter at home or come to him, put their case before him, and see if he could settle it? No. He is telling them straight off that he is going to put Synod and the Council in Court and they can do as they like. My reply to the hon. senior member for St. George is that birds of a feather flock together.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Chairman, it is entirely regrettable that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph should go further and bring personalities of individual hon. members of this House into his own mess at home. I knew nothing about the particular person and I would never have known who the person was until the hon. senior member for the City got to his feet and said who he was. We did not hear from the hon. senior member for St. Joseph specifically who the person was. I deplore attacks of this sort in this House of Assembly and I will always deplore them; they are unnecessary and it is not the way we should conduct ourselves in this House. I would not take him on about my personal business with managers. I can handle those well enough and better than he can come and handle my business. This matter of the Reverend Curry, I submit to you, is completely *ultra vires* to what we are debating in this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY: (To the Premier: Sit down).

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has no right to tell me sit down.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sit down, Mr. Premier; stand up, Mr. Premier.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There are two hon. members on the floor; will both take their seats?

Both hon. members took their seats.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thought I made that remark as a joke, but I did not know that the Premier would take umbrage at that. I have not even warmed up yet in the House. If I say: "Sit down," it is my mouth. It is true that the hon. senior member is a medical man and if I were near enough he would know what to do to stop me from saying: "Sit down," but I am not near enough.

I do not agree with the hon. senior member for St. George that if you are voting money in this House, you should not talk about things in connection with it. I do not want to make any special generalities about people, but I have gone through debates of this Chamber when Mr. H. Graham Yearwood was here and launched an attack on a recalcitrant priest on the floor of this House in my time. I remember, when Mr. Dudley Sargeant was here as a member for Christ Church, an attack was launched on the Vicar of St. Bartholomew, the only difference being that they said at that time that he should be in the Mental Hospital; but everybody knew what was happening, and everybody knew that if you had to attack someone, you just attacked him. After all what would be the point in getting up here (Mr. T. W. MILLER: Lime Leaves) That actually happened on the floor of this House. What would be the point in getting up here because we are voting money for the Anglican Church and talking about somebody from the Pilgrim Holiness? I do not know what the member for St. Joseph did, but I got up and said what I felt because I am very close to the Church in this country and Synod, and I know myself how Ministers of religion of the same persuasion as this gentleman persuaded him to stop this nonsense and the way he has been going on. I want to say something now whether or not the member likes; the man is an absolute idiot; he cannot spell Ada correctly. If he were one of those people who had something to offer to the community other than "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild", you could even nod at it. I do not care how far I go, because I pay taxes in this country. If he were one of those persons

who could contribute something to the community, it would be different, but he is getting on with this stupid nonsense when he is one of those people who would shout through a window at Codrington College and ask you how you spell "though". As far as I am concerned, it does not matter; if he needs attacking, he will be attacked. You find his attitude among persons of his mentality; he is neither fish, fowl nor good red herring. That is the sort of thing you find among people like him, and as soon as he knows that the better. He made the same trouble in Christ Church. I would not make any generalities, but I got up and called the priest's name and he deserved it.

For the benefit of hon. members, this thing has only come out in the Press since people have seen it going on in the Law Courts, but it has been going on for some time in the Parish of St. Thomas.
1.45 p.m.

I remember discussing that with Mr. Sandiford who was the Churchwarden and it is regrettable that that parson has been included in this. The Hon. Premier must know as much about it as a representative of St. Thomas as I do. This particular parson has called upon Sergeants of the Police Force to put people out of St. Thomas Church. How long does he own a church? He should have had me in St. Thomas to deal with. He surely would be preaching outside the church, I am sure he would not be doing this if he had me in St. Thomas to deal with. He wants putting outside the church and dealing with as you would deal with an ordinary criminal.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the longer this debate goes on on this particular point, the more amused I become. In the efforts by some hon. members to place this question squarely, as they say at the door of the Government, they actually are forgetting all about the law and custom. I think the hon. senior member for St. Peter said a little while ago that at one time I said that these Reverend gentlemen should not get a penny. I want to tell the hon. member that I still feel so now. But to go back to the question, the Government never paid the subordinate staff of any of these churches and that is well known. I want to tell you now who is the person to blame for this and I am quite sure that the hon. senior member for the City will agree with me. The hon. senior member for the City, his Council and the other Councils as well, are responsible for it. They are so anxious to let it be known that the Government should be blamed for it that they are forgetting that. The Government passed legislation saying what the Councils should do and what they should not do and included in that legislation was provision for the same subordinate staff. The hon. senior member for the City knows that as much as I do.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I object to that very strongly. The Hon. Premier does not know what he is talking about when he says that provision is made for the subordinate staff. That is absolutely an untruth. He is misleading the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to appeal to hon. members to avoid making personal references during these debates. The hon. senior member for the City rose on a point of order and made a correction by saying that the statement "included in the Regulations" were not correct. Please avoid personal references to members individually such as calling them idiots and what not.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Ask the hon. member if the Local Government Act does not provide for Councils paying into Synod or whoever it may be a certain amount of money to pay the subordinate staff. I want to know if that is so or not.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Premier asked the question and I suppose he wants me to answer it. I want to know what Order has been made for that. The law provides that the Local Government shall pay into Synod a sum of money for this purpose but not for giving a cost of living allowance. For his information that only provides if they

are retiring at that. Where they are not retiring, no such provision is made. Where the people have elected to continue in their service, nothing can be done about it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I thought the hon. member knew the Act, but apparently, he does not. Anyhow, for his information, I will tell him that provision is made under the Local Government Act for money to be paid into Synod by the Local Government to pay some of the subordinate staff; and if it had occurred to him that these people should get a cost of living allowance, what prevents him from approaching the Government for permission to add a certain sum of money in their estimates to pay cost of living allowances to these same people?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I must say again to the Hon. Premier that sometimes I wonder if he is wilfully misleading. Let me tell this Committee that the actual sum to be paid into Synod has been set out. The Governor-in-Executive Committee has decided how much should be paid into Synod and they have arrived at the amount from the salary which these people got in 1959. The Hon. Premier is now taking refuge and asking "Why not approach us to do something about it" when they know that they should do it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Government has not got to do it. If it occurs to them that this subordinate staff should get a cost of living allowance, they have every right to approach the Government and draw their attention to it. The Government was concerned where Government servants were concerned; and if this staff which the hon. member is talking about is part of the Local Government, if they realise that these people are their servants more or less, if they are paid from Local Government Funds, then the Local Government Councils have every right to come to the Central Government and draw Government's attention to it. But, of course, the hon. member thought that it would be better to get up here today and lambast the Government about it. This Government has been paying and will continue to pay the Clergy until disendowment takes place. The Government is not concerned and was never concerned with the subordinate staff. I have had thirteen years as a Vestryman and I know that these people have always been paid by the Vestry. What have we heard today? We have heard that the Government should take this staff into consideration and that it is for us to do it.

The hon. senior member for St. Peter raised this question and it has been aired; but I still maintain that it is for the Local Councils to consider this; and I will say further that if they put this matter to this Government and say that they have given it careful consideration and feel that it should be given to them, I will say this on the floor of the House, if they do that, the Government will consider it.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had made myself perfectly clear on this matter. This was a question which I posed on the basis of equity.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I did not mean to infer that the hon. member meant to put it at Government's feet, but somebody else meant to put it there.
1.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: I said that I was away when the Act was passed. These sextons came to me, and this was one of the difficulties which the Councils faced, one of the things which they cannot do, that is, make any increase. That was the plight with these men and that is why I say that there is nothing to prevent the Government - as a matter of fact, the only person who could act in these circumstances would be the Government. I understand that the grant comes in a lump sum, and that if the salary of the bell-ringer or organist is going to be \$10.00 a month, the Government will give a grant equivalent to that amount. The only person who can really raise that pay is the Church; they are quite free to do it, but I have pointed out that it is impossible in these circumstances for the Church to

undertake this task because the Church does not know where it stands and it would be difficult to ask it to give a cost of living unless it makes charges for funerals, weddings, birthdays, christenings and the like. If the various Councils will take up the matter with the Premier, he says he will consider it. It was unfortunate that the Chairman of the Northern District Council did not take up the matter with the Premier. In my view, the matter is important from a general point of view, because it is a matter of these servants who feel that they are left in the cold and the Councils tell them that they know nothing about it; therefore they have not got the representation which they should have. The Government should be willing to make up matters in this particular case because I doubt very much that the question of a cost of living allowance will arise again before this Act is passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is....

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I should just like to say that as far as I am concerned, and as far as the law is concerned, this matter applies to the Municipality only as far as the Cathedral is concerned. What the hon. member who has just sat down has said is correct; this matter really applies to the Northern and Southern Districts.

At this stage, it being now 2 p.m., of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m. of the clock, this sitting now stands suspended until 2.30 p.m., of the clock. This Sitting now stands suspended.

On re-assembling,

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention that there is no quorum present, and I ask that the Bell be rung.

On the Bell being rung, a quorum was obtained.

MEETING OF SELECT COMMITTEES DURING SITTING OF THE HOUSE

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before we go on to Question Time, I am asking permission for a meeting of the Select Committee, which has been appointed to consider and report on the Bill to authorise the sale of Glebe lands and the parsonage house of St. Michael, to take place during this sitting of the House. I am told that I have to seek the permission of the House before the Committee can sit. I do not believe that it will take more than five minutes.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask permission for a meeting of the Select Committee, which has been appointed to consider and report on the Bill to incorporate the United Holy Church of America (Barbados District), to take place during this sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Social Services has asked leave of the House for the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill of which he is in charge to sit during this session of the House. Unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the Hon. Minister. Is there any objection? *(After a pause)*. There being no objection, such leave is granted. The hon. junior member for St. Michael has also asked leave of the House for the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Bill of which he is in charge to sit during this session of the House. Unless there be any objection, leave will be granted the hon. member. Is there any objection? *(After a pause)*. There being no objection, such leave is also granted.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. Question No. 29 stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy. 2.35 p.m.

Question No. 29 was called.

INCREASED PREMIUMS ON MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

"To enquire of the appropriate Minister:-

Is Government aware that insurers of motor vehicles in this colony have announced further substantial increases in rates of premiums?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government institute this year its own insurance scheme for motor vehicles operated locally, so as to provide thereby a less extravagant rate of premium than is now charged by foreign companies currently in business here?"

Mr. Speaker, I can sympathise with the Hon. Premier if he cannot find the answers. As a matter of fact, they have never come to light as far as I am concerned, and if they might be put a little later with less inconvenience to him and more convenience to myself, I would suggest that that matter be delayed or deferred if the Hon. Premier concurs in the suggestion that the answers be deferred.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I will agree to that, Sir. *Question No. 28 was called.*

SURGERY TECHNICIANS AT THE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, the Question is as follows:-

"To enquire of the Minister of Health:-

Will the Minister state whether there are any surgery technicians employed in the General Hospital?

2. Will he further state their numbers, the nature of their duties, and describe the training which they have received?

3. Will he also disclose what rate of salary they receive, and if this represents a special emolument for such responsible work?"

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows:-

"There are no surgery technicians employed in the Barbados General Hospital.

2 and 3 do not arise."

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, the Minister has said there are none employed. Are we to understand that no person bearing that designation have ever been employed?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I think I am correct in saying "no".

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister whether any persons have been employed in the surgery who normally would not be there, apart from the surgeons themselves and the nurses who do surgery duty. Have there been any other categories of persons employed in the surgery who normally should not be there at any time?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: I know off hand that there are no other persons apart from the doctors and nurses that are employed in the surgery as such. I am not sure if the hon. member is concerned about the Orderlies who more or less serve in the surgery, but they are not attached to the surgery. The Medical Superintendent has agreed to send these Orderlies to work in the surgery as they do all over the Hospital, but they are by no means regarded as surgery technicians.

Mr. TUDOR: Will the Minister state then what these Orderlies do on such occasions when they are employed in the surgery?

Hon. F. E. MILLER: They work in the surgery as in any other Ward in the Hospital; they are employed to bring patients on the stretchers to and from surgery as they are expected to do, so far as the service in the in-patients Department is concerned.

Question No. 12 was called.

TELEPHONE AND PIANOS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the question is as follows:-

"To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:-

Will the Minister state who pays for the telephones which are installed in some of the Primary Schools of this Island?

Will the Minister state whether those Pianos which are installed in some Schools are the property of the Government?

If they are not, will he disclose what rent is paid to the owners of these instruments?"

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, the replies to the questions are as follows:-

"Telephones are installed and subscribed for by the Head Teacher and staff.

Pianos in schools are usually bought from funds obtained by the staff from public subscriptions or entertainments together with an allocation from Government. They are Government property.

No rent is payable."

Mr. TUDOR: Arising, Mr. Speaker, out of the first part of the Hon. Minister's answer, is he satisfied with a policy which enforces, so to speak, on the Head Teacher and staff the responsibility of paying for the telephones used in Government Schools?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that where telephones exist in schools, they are there as a result of the persons putting them in. As far as satisfaction is concerned, I think it is true to say that hon. members of this Assembly are all aware that I am not satisfied about anything. Everything I know is necessary I would be prepared to give if funds would permit, and therefore this is just a question of some individual or individuals being possessed of a spirit of go ahead, and they are prepared to make the sacrifices being made.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if these telephones which are installed and subscribed for by the Head Teachers and staff are used for official business connected with the schools, or if they are only there for the private, personal convenience of the persons installing them.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say what goes on or transpires in so far as the use of those telephones is concerned.

Mr. TUDOR: Will the Minister then undertake to recommend to Government to refund to the Head Teachers and staff of these schools the monthly subscription for the telephones?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made myself abundantly clear that the telephones which exist in schools are there purely as a result of certain individuals being prepared to make some sacrifice. Why should I then try to prevent somebody from trying to help himself?

Mr. TUDOR: Are we to understand from the Minister, Mr. Speaker, that until such time as other Head Teachers and staff in other schools follow suit a telephone will not be installed at other schools?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I am not prepared to say that, Mr. Speaker.
2.45 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Does the hon. member agree in principle that in every institution, such as public elementary schools, it is necessary in these modern days and it is desirable and, in fact, beneficial that there should be a telephone installed; and if the answer is in the affirmative, that the cost thereof should be borne by the Public Treasury?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: In reply to that question, I am prepared to say that not everything that is desirable is possible. And that being so, we have got to apply everything to the circumstances.

Mr. BRANCKER: Did I understand the hon. member to say that it is not possible although he by implication thought that it is desirable to have telephones installed in all the public elementary schools in the island?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: That is another question to be put, but I would say this: that where our funds or financial resources are able to meet the cost of providing essentials, I feel quite sure that we should pursue that course.

NEW PUPILS ADMITTED INTO PRIMARY AND SECONDARY MODERN SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 13 asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Education:

Will the Minister state how many new pupils have been admitted into Primary and Secondary Modern Schools of St. Michael area since January last year?

(2) Will the Minister give the number for each school separately?

(3) Will he further state which Headteachers, if any, are entitled to an increase of salary in consequence of the increase in numbers on the rolls of their respective schools?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Minister answer that question?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: That has been answered already.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Clerk assures me that it has not been answered. I too thought that it had been answered.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: (After looking through his files) I want to confirm your impression that I too think that that question has been answered already.

Mr. SPEAKER: But it is still on the Order Paper.

Mr. TUDOR: I would just like to say that it is possible that when this question was asked two weeks ago, it was thought to be answered. There appeared in one of the daily newspapers some answers purporting to be given to this question; the point is that I do not remember having been given the answer to the question but I think the printed answer was published.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take no cognisance of what appears in the Press.

Mr. TUDOR: The Minister apparently is sure that the question was answered.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I say this humbly and respectfully. The questions asked by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy are so much alike that it is always possible for you to think that they were answered; but this particular question was really not answered, as I have now found out.

In reply to Part I of that question there were 6,188 pupils admitted into the Primary and Secondary Modern Schools in St. Michael during the period January 1959 to February 29th, 1960.

The number for each school is as follows:- Bay Primary 318, Belmont Girls 223, Buxton Boys 87, Carrington Primary 166, Eagle Hall Infants 294, Edghill Memorial Girls 150, Erdiston Model 57, Grace Hill Primary 178, Hindsbury Primary 198, Montgomery Boys 116, Pine Primary 219, Roebuck Primary 106, St. Ambrose Girls' 119, St. Giles' Boys' 260, St. Giles Girls' 260, St. Mary's Junior 156, St. Mary's Infants 168, St. Matthew's Mixed 133, St. Paul's Girls' 277, St. Stephen's Junior 232, St. Stephen's Infants 223, Wesley Hall Primary 378, Wesley Hall Infants 377, Westbury Junior 310, Westbury Infants 266, St. Leonard's Secondary Modern School (Boys) 407, St. Leonard's Secondary Girls' School 510, Total 6,188.

In so far as Part II concerning the increase of salaries for Heads, in accordance with normal practice, four Headteachers of schools in the St. Michael area will receive increases in salary with effect from 1st April 1960 consequent upon the increase in the average attendance of their schools during the school year September 1958 to July 1959.

The list of such Headteachers is as follows:-

Pine Primary, Bay Primary, Eagle Hall Infants, Grace Hill Primary.

Mr. TUDOR: I am rising now to ask a supplementary to the second part of the answers by the Hon. Minister. Can the Minister say what percentage of the number of these new entrants were pupils who could have come from the St. Patrick's Roman Catholic School, owing to that school being closed last year?

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say that. That is something which you will have to delve into and it is not to be expected that I can give that information offhand.

2.55 p.m.

If the hon. member so desires, I would be quite willing to get that information for him.

REGISTRATION OF "BAJAN GIRL"

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. senior member for St. Lucy desire to ask any supplementary question in respect of Question No. 8 which was being dealt with on the last occasion?

Mr. TUDOR: If the Hon. Minister could just read over the answer to the Question I would be able to frame supplementary questions.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The answer to the hon. member's question is as follows:-

1. No the Minister is aware of a vessel of U.S. registration flying an American flag and registered as BAJAN GAL III. It is understood that the owner hires out the vessel by charter for sports fishing with rod and reel.
2. If the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is satisfied that the fishing carried on constitutes a trade, the profits thereof are liable to local taxation.
3. The Government has been advised that this is not a matter with which International Law concerns itself.

Mr. TUDOR: The first supplementary I would like to put to the Minister is this: to whom does the owner of this vessel hire it out for charter service?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I understand that the owner hires it out to tourists who come to this island.

Mr. TUDOR: I take it then that the Minister- or rather I should ask if this hiring of the vessel is carried out throughout the entire tourist season.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that; I do not know.

Mr. TUDOR: I understand the Minister to say that if the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is satisfied that the fishing constitutes a trade, the Department would take steps to collect the taxes accordingly. I would like to ask what machinery exists in such a case for the satisfying of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue? Has the Fisheries Officer any machinery by which he could know what trade this boat carries on with tourists?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I have no knowledge as to the information for which the hon. member has asked.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the Minister like to state what is the general policy towards matters of this sort? Would the Minister say if foreign ships operating under foreign flags would enjoy these facilities - to come here and trade with tourists and not be liable to Income Tax?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, this matter does not really come under my Ministry. My Ministry deals with the Fisheries Department and it knows nothing about the income tax side of the matter. I do not know if this vessel is hired by the week or by the month or throughout the year or what. As I say, it does not really come under my Ministry.

Mr. TUDOR: But the Minister would know what policy his Department would pursue if, say, one hundred such vessels were to ply during the tourist season.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that question has been properly put to the Minister.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the licence is given by the Fisheries Department and it is for that reason that I am asking the Minister about the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The supplementary question involves a question dealing with taxation and that does not come properly under the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries.

ARREARS OF PAYMENTS TO THE FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 9 also stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TUDOR: The question is as follows:-

To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:

Will the Minister state how many boat owners, if any, are in arrears with their payments to the Fisheries Department?

(2) Will the Minister further state whether this defaulting is due to dishonesty or financial embarrassment?

(3) Will the Minister further state what steps will Government take to deal with the situation?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The Reply is as follows:-

1. Up to the 31st January, 1960, there were 134 boat-owners in arrears with the payments to the Fisheries Department.

2. No information is available as to whether or not defaulting is due to dishonesty or to financial embarrassment.

3. Each individual case is dealt with on its merits. On the general question, the Government proposes -

- (a) to organise the marketing arrangements including the provision of cold storage facilities, which will provide an incentive for greater catches and afford better security in the matter of price;

- (b) to examine its loan policy in relation to the earning capacity and the expenses of acquiring and maintaining a fishing boat;
- (c) to examine the economics of the industry with a view to determining the suitability of the existing craft for an expanded programme of fisheries development to commence as soon as the market has been organised. Discussions have been held with various experts on these matters.

Mr. TUDOR: The first supplementary question is this: The Hon. Minister has given a very long answer to the question and I cannot remember off-hand everything he has said; but of the 134 boat owners who are in arrears with their payments up to the 31st January, 1960, of how many can it be said that they have used the money to make good other commitments?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I have no information on that point. I know that there are one hundred and thirty four defaulters so far who have not paid their instalments, but in what category they fall I cannot say.

Mr. TUDOR: Have any of them been prosecuted or have any legal steps been taken for the recovery of the loans?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Speaking under correction, I do not think so.

Mr. TUDOR: Can the Minister say -- if he has figures there, otherwise he can get them from the Department --- how much does it take to keep a fishing-boat running per year, including insurance, the payment of the annual instalment to the Government, painting of the hull, machinery and what not on an average?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I have no average about that; it all depends upon the person. One fellow might paint his boat once every two years. I do not know that you can get any real statistics on this matter; if the boats were Government boats, then we could get that information; but here, the position is very wide. There are too many people who have to do with this matter, and they vary from person to person.
3.05 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Do I understand from the Minister that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to keep a check on this matter so as to know what the average fishing boat owner can spend or does spend so that you would be able to advise him on how much improvement he can make? Presumably the Fisheries Department must be able to get at that sort of figure. Has the Minister got any method whereby he can select, say, a certain type of boat from a certain area according to its size and cost of its engine, watch it carefully and see what its expenses are? Would the Department think that worthwhile?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, earlier to this same question, I told the hon. member that we intend to have a statistical survey, and when that is done we might be able to follow on with these cases; but as it is now, it would be a very hard task and I doubt if it would prove anything.

Mr. TUDOR: Do I understand then, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister that Government has embarked on the loan policy without, so to speak, knowing what it would do with defaulters, if there were such, or without knowing what the people can pay within a certain given time?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, we have Regulations and they are required to pay so much each year; but then there is the human element and many other aspects of it. If a man comes in and says he is unable to pay his instalments which is due in April, we extend his time. Sometimes it is not due to bad catches, but we do not go into those technicalities. If he says he is unable to pay, we deal with him as a Barbadian and give an extension of time. So far as the loan is concerned, he has signed an agreement to repay Government the money; but if for some reason or

other he has a genuine case, certainly we give him extended time; but so far as Government going into the matter without knowing how they would repay it and all that, even an ordinary citizen, if he has a piece of land, goes into a Commercial Bank to borrow money; so you have got to trust people. They are good before you prove them bad and that is what Government is doing - they are helping the industry. If there are those who refuse to pay, we do not know them; but I do know that if they come into the Ministry and can put up a reasonable case, they are given extended time.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, did not the Minister - he will correct me if I am wrong, - in answer to a Supplementary question on this matter last week say that some of the boat owners used the revenue to settle other debts?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: Certainly.

Mr. TUDOR: Would the three Departments keep a record of these people and watch them carefully?

Hon. D. D. GARNER: I can agree with the hon. member that we are watching these persons, but that reaches the very last stage. We have a system whereby if he does not pay the first month, he is notified from the Fisheries Department, the second month he does not pay he is notified by the Fisheries Officer, and the third month by the Ministry, and then he is asked to come in and we will hear what is the real story.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, in two or three answers before this one, the Minister said something about an inquiry into the economics of the industry which his Department would set up. Would he just repeat that answer? I did not hear it quite clearly because I was concentrating on something else. The answer was to the effect that the Government was going to institute an inquiry into the economics of the industry. I believe the Minister said that the Department would go into the economics of the industry in addition to expanding the cold storage facilities as well as revising the loan policy, and then he said something about investigating or inquiring into the economics of the industry. That is the part I did not hear and if he would be kind enough to repeat it, I would be very glad.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it was an answer to a supplementary question, it would not be written out.

Mr. TUDOR: It was in the main answer, I believe, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That does not appear to be in answer to one of the main questions.

Mr. TUDOR: I believe it was in answer to Question No. 9. In the main answer, before I put the supplementaries, the Minister said, as far as I remember, that Government was expanding the cold storage facilities.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Would it be in answer to Question No. 3?

Mr. TUDOR: No, Sir. Question No. 9 begins as follows:-

"Will the Minister state how many boat owners, if any, are in arrears with their payments to the Fisheries Department?"

The Minister answered that part of the question and then went on to say that Government was hoping to expand the cold storage facilities and revise the loan policy, and then at the same time he said something about an investigation into the economics of the industry. That part I did not hear and I am asking him if he would repeat it.

Hon. D. D. GARNER: The hon. member is quoting correctly and I will repeat it for him. "On the general question, the Government proposes to examine the economics of the industry with a view to determining the suitability of the existing craft for an expanded programme of fisheries development to commence as soon as the market has been organised. Discussions have been held with various experts on these matters."

Mr. TUDOR: Thank you.

Question No. 10 was called.

EXPENSES OF "INVESTIGATOR"

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:-

"To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries:

Will the Minister state whether emergency rations are kept on board the Government experimental craft "Investigator"?"

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the hon. member that the time for "Question Time" has expired.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, can these be left over until next Tuesday?

Mr. SPEAKER: Automatically.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Private Members' Business was called.

PRESENTATION BROTHERS INCORPORATION ACT, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the hon. junior member for St. Lucy: to move the second reading of a Bill to incorporate the Trustees of the Congregation of the Presentation Brothers in the Island of Barbados.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which will normally be regarded as non-controversial, and according to our procedure it will have to be referred to a Select Committee of this House if this Chamber so wills.
3.15 p.m.

The purpose of it is to ensure that the petitioners who are members of the Community known as the Congregation of the Presentation Brothers and who are carrying on religious and teaching works under the name of the Presentation College? Barbados, and who, Mr. Speaker, are the owners of the messuage or dwellinghouse called "Verdun" in the parish of St. John with land attached containing by admeasurement thirteen acres twelve perches should carry on at the said premises a school known as the Presentation College, Barbados for the education of children of all classes, colour and creed.

Mr. Speaker, this College at the moment has after two years' service about 100 pupils and, as I have said, they are of all colours, and certainly of many denominations. I believe I am correct in saying that there are more members of the Anglican persuasion where the pupils of that school are concerned than of the other.

They have been advised that it is desirable for the carrying out of their work that they should be formed into a corporate body and they are further advised that the correct procedure in order to achieve that is to present a petition such as this to the Legislature praying that they be incorporated and the name which they have chosen is the Incorporated Trustees of the Presentation Brothers in Barbados.

These Brothers have done excellent work in the teaching field of the various unit territories of the Caribbean and I have no hesitation in saying that the work which they are doing in Barbados at their Secondary Boys' School is up to the same standard as what they are doing in other parts of the West Indies, such as in San Fernando and St. Lucia where they have been running these Boys' schools.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that there is anything which I need to add except to commend to this Cham-

ber the second reading of this Bill for the purpose of incorporating the Trustees of the Congregation of the Presentation Brothers in the island of Barbados and I beg now formally to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to appoint the following hon. members to serve as a Select Committee to take charge of this Bill:-

The hon. senior member for St. John (Hon. L. St. A. Thorne); the hon. junior member for St. John (Mr. Barrow); the hon. senior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Tudor); the hon. junior member for St. Michael (Mr. Bryan); the hon. junior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Straughn); and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker).

Mr. SPEAKER called the remaining orders of Private Members' Business and no hon. member expressed his willingness to carry on with them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House now reverts to Government Business.

HOUSE RESUMES COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On the suspension, the hon. senior member for the City was speaking on Head XIX. He is not now in his seat.

The question that Head XIX, Ecclesiastical, stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXVIII - SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Head XXVIII - Subsidies and Grants - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: This amount of \$2,400 under this Head is to be paid to the Resident Tutor of the U. C.W.I. so as to provide a grant-in-aid in respect of the Department's local class programme for 1960-61. It is to enable certain students to study advanced subjects which are not ordinarily taught at the Evening Institute. These students are doing advanced studies leading to degrees and the subjects which they are taking are accountancy, bookkeeping and other such subjects of general commercial knowledge and having something to do with mercantile law. Then there is another group who are preparing themselves through postal tuition courses for the LLB and B.Sc. (Econ.) external examinations of the London University and the final examinations of the Association of Certified and Corporate Accountants or comparable professional bodies in accountancy and the law of contract, constitutional law and parliamentary procedure, French Conversation and Spanish Conversation.

Apparently, some of these gentlemen have already taken courses by postal tuition from London University and they need some assistance. The Resident Tutor of the Extra Mural Department of the U.C.W.I. has kindly consented to give the necessary instruction in these courses and this \$2,400 is to meet the cost of the fees involved. As I have said, these courses are not ordinarily taught at the Evening Institute and in order to assist the persons concerned, this gentleman is asked to undertake to give the necessary assistance.

I beg to move that Head XXVIII stand part.

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

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

HEAD XXIX - MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

Head XXIX - Miscellaneous Services - was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$6,200 under this Head is a revote. Hon. members will remember that this amount was voted in 1959 in order to assist in the publication of the text book "Barbados, Our Island Home", written by Mr. F. A. Hoyos. I believe that the books are in the island or will be here in a matter of days. This amount is asked to be revoted so that it will be ready to meet the cost.

I beg to move that Head XXIX stand part.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when this matter was last before the Committee I do not think I was in my place and there were one or two comments which I hoped to make on it but which could not be made then and I now take this opportunity to do so.
3.25 p.m.

I should like to say at the outset that I support this Resolution wholeheartedly and give unqualified support to the idea that the Government should procure copies of this textbook for their schools. It is a good thing which is being done for more reasons than one. The book itself has great intrinsic merit, in the first place, and, secondly, we ought to encourage the efforts of our own scholars. The more of that we can do, the better it will be for everyone concerned. But this is what I am upset about: why should the Government procure only 5,000 copies of this book? And for whom are these copies meant? I ask these two questions for this reason. One of the great difficulties in schools, particularly the Primary and Secondary Modern schools, is the shortage of textbooks of all sorts. I know that a little of the backwardness which is experienced in pupils nowadays is due to the fact that there is a textbook shortage, and more than three children - sometimes four or five - have to share the same book. I think that if that could be remedied, it would be very advantageous to the children. It seems to me that if you only purchase five thousand copies of this book to spread over a hundred and twenty-five schools and over at least thirty-five thousand school children, you are perpetuating the same system about which we are complaining and which is creating a hardship. I think that the Government should be more generous and spread itself out more expansively. I am not saying that it is not necessary to purchase these textbooks for children, but for the kind of book this is, and with this intrinsic merit or value, at least 15,000 copies should be available to the Government. This book would still be useful ten years from now because the subjects are basically necessary for the understanding of Barbados and its history. If you spend the necessary money in procuring 15,000 or 20,000 copies of this book, the book would still be of use ten years from now.

I am saying that the Department should be a bit more expansive in this matter and order more of these text books. The shortage of books is perhaps the most serious thing which faces the pupils in the schools of this island. It is not only because it is difficult for children to learn properly if they have not got books, but because of the fact that if you force three or four children to read out of one book, you are preventing at least one of them from reading properly and you are also assisting in damaging the eyesight of three or four others. It will cost you more in the end than in the initial outlay in providing nearly every child with a textbook. I should like to say that 5,000 copies of this book cannot meet the requirements of the children unless the number ordered has been deliberately kept down to five thousand copies in order to give expression to the policy of the Minister that parents should assist in buying textbooks. It may be that you have deliberately kept down

the numbers to five thousand because you want to encourage the parents of children to buy the others which are needed. I hope that that is not the reason, but I am quite certain that the numbers which you contemplate buying are totally inadequate.

There is another aspect of this matter, although it does not concern the children as such. I happen to feel that this book is so good that it ought to be made compulsory reading for every child of school age in this island. If the Government is alert to its duties and shares the common conviction that young people ought to know as much as they should of their own home, then a clear case has been made out for increasing the number of books which it is proposed to buy. The Government is not being truly disposed to the author of this book, Mr. Hoyos, who is one of our leading historians, if you restrict the number of books you are prepared to distribute in the schools to five thousand copies. Both the work itself and the author have sufficient merit so that the book should be more widely read. I would like the Minister to explain if he thinks that five thousand copies of this book are enough; I would like him to tell me what has caused them to recommend that five thousand copies would be enough. In purchasing the book "Barbados, Our Island Home", you are not really doing Mr. Hoyos any favour because, with good publicity, this book will be sold anywhere. You are supposed to be conferring a benefit and a great favour on the children by bringing within their knowledge the story of their own country. That is why we like all of the children to have the book so that they can learn the story. If you distribute 5,000 copies of this book you will have to buy 5,000 more copies because the continual use of the books will cause them to deteriorate more quickly than if each school had its own quota or adequate and sufficient number. This sort of niggardliness does not pay and it cannot pay. I think that the Minister would have to argue very convincingly in order to win over the Committee to the point of view that 5,000 copies would meet the requirements of the school children.
3.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, all the things in this Resolution are things I would like to speak on, so if I speak on the one that has already been passed, you will forgive me. I do not plead for a recommitment, but as it is a money Resolution, I can speak on the whole Head because we are really passing \$13,635.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid if you want to deal with it that way, you will have to wait until it gets back to the House. If you want to go back to the Head dealt with already, you will have to ask for a recommitment.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not taking any vote against it. Under the Heads "Subsidies and Grants" and "Miscellaneous Services", one amount is for the University College of the West Indies and one is for text books.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not think the House would object to a recommitment.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to deal with Head XIX, but I said it would bring in what Head XXVIII seeks to do, because you are talking about these text books. What I would say in support of what the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said is that I take it that if you are buying 5,000 copies, you have established for yourself that it is not a token amount you are getting, because you would not need 5,000 copies as a token, but that you are satisfied the book is a good one and should be bought. What the hon. senior member for St. Lucy has said is irrefutable. My view normally would have been that you should acquire a few sample copies and see how this book will come off, but you would not need 5,000 copies; therefore if you are buying 5,000 copies, you have satisfied your mind that you want to introduce it, because it has passed the stage of exploration.

There are 125 elementary schools, and I take it that these books are going to be used in these schools. (Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: It is for the 11+ children.) If this book is to be used by the 11+ children, then you will know what

the policy is, and if the school population of 11+ children is 15,000 or 20,000 in ages that should be in school as distinct from those not in school, then you may say that 5,000 copies are a conservative amount. I feel that if it is a token or experiment, 5,000 copies are too many to experiment with. If on the other hand it has passed the experimental stage, then I feel that you should buy a quantity that will satisfy the needs of the schools. I do not take the view that the publisher or the author would benefit from a single purchaser like the Government which is buying large numbers; yet if the quality of the book merits purchasing, then I would say that to spend twice or three times the amount of money, \$15,000 or \$16,000, is a trickle in your educational vote or educational needs; it is no more than a mosquito on the rump of a rhinoceros in the context of the money which we spend. We would not be against spending that sort of money, and that is why I feel that the Minister should be able to state whether 5,000 copies are enough, based on the number of children in the schools. If, as the hon. senior member for St. Lucy says, you are going to hand this book from child to child, and if it is going to be one of your history books, then you should make a survey to see whether this would satisfy your needs, because the amount you are spending here in your educational vote is nothing you would have to bleat about.

Mr. Chairman, all I wanted to say on what has been passed is that I was happy that the time had come that the Government in supporting the Extra-Mural Department would see to it that they built an institute for the Extra-Mural Department's functioning, and ask these voluntary bodies that make use of the Department and such facilities to make a contribution towards such things for the students who have to make use of it. I think that in Barbados enough voluntary organisations are not made to bear some of the weight of some of these things as they should do.

Coming back to the question of the text books which have been ordered, if it has been agreed by the experts that it is an excellent text book for the schools, then I would say that 5,000 copies are an extremely conservative number within the school population which we know exists in Barbados.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I find it extremely difficult to restrain myself in answering the questions which have been put by hon. members, difficult in that, first of all, this matter which we are now discussing is just a revote. This is something that has been dealt with previously by this House, and therefore the circumstances should be known to one and all. I can only say that the first hon. member who spoke, the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, allowed his aspirations to get the better of his good judgment, in that I could only get the idea that the hon. member ----- I hate to speak behind any man's back, and in as much as he is not in his seat, I will refrain from saying anything behind his back.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order, may I explain that my colleague is attending a Select Committee of this House on these premises, and perhaps if the Hon. Minister talks long enough, he will be back here in time? Meanwhile I will make a careful note of what the Hon. Minister says; so he will not be talking behind the back of my colleague.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I thank the hon. junior member for St. Lucy, but I believe first-hand news is the best news, and in as much as the hon. member is not in his seat, I will not pursue the course which I would pursue if he were here.

Let us look at the story of this text book. This is a book that is not yet on the market; the manuscript was handed to me shortly after I went into the Ministry, and I discovered that it was an extremely good book and I set about to get it into circulation. The publishers with whom the author had been negotiating for some time raised a proposition which in itself was rather difficult from the author's point of view. They were saying that they were not prepared to undertake the publication of the book unless they could be guaranteed the sale of 5,000 copies at so

much per copy. The author was not in position to give that guarantee, and with a view to getting this publication on the market, I made the necessary approach to the Government and was able to get them to back the proposals which were put up by the publishers, that is to say, the guaranteed sale for 5,000 copies of the book.
3.45 p.m.

As a result of having given that guarantee, we are in hope of getting the book into circulation. I am wondering if hon. members are of the opinion that only 5,000 copies of this book will only be published. I am wondering if hon. members are saying that Government must buy all the textbooks which it needs at one time. I am wondering if hon. members are thinking that the textbook "Barbados Our Island Home" is the only text book which we need in the island and I am wondering if hon. members think that our resources are limitless. I have never heard more unfair treatment than that by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. He has tried to give the House the impression that the Government is only able to spend this \$6,200 for textbooks, forgetting that in the Estimates, copies of which are in the House, you will see that two different sums of money are already voted for this purpose.

This Government, I think, speaking under correction, besides spending this amount now has voted \$20,000 or \$30,000 for text books. How is it that you are saying that this Government is not being able to prepare enough textbooks when this is only a pioneer venture? This is a venture which has as its object the introduction of a textbook which we hope would be so popular that it would enable us to order so many more thousand to be printed. That is the history of this matter and I fail to see how hon. members have allowed their thoughts to run away in this ridiculous manner.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister has given an explanation now to this matter which is really different, and he is also saying that he fails to see how hon. members can allow their thoughts to run away in this ridiculous manner. Now examine what the Hon. Minister has said. He has said that so far as Government is concerned, you are not undertaking to purchase a textbook; you are undertaking to underwrite the publication of a textbook which might not be accepted as a good textbook in these parts.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: I rise on a point of order. I said nothing of the sort. There is no "if", in respect of the quality of this book; this is a first-class book. If the quality was not up to standard, I would never have advocated the publication of it. As far as this venture is concerned, it is proposed that the actual issue in these schools will be boosted owing to the fact that this publication would be soon obtainable and that teachers are expected to have as much of these books on their book racks as they can by the spending of as much money as they can out of the vote given them towards the purchase of this book. In addition, we are responsible for the distribution of the copies of this book. A proposal is to give out a free copy for every copy purchased by the school, that is to say, if the cost of a copy is four shillings and a school buys six books which amounts to 24 shillings, the school will be given 24 shillings to purchase six more books. That is a means of trying to double the circulation of the book and we are positively sure that this work will catch on and that schools in the future will see fit to allocate as much money as they can of their grants towards the purchase of copies of this book.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am analysing the arguments of the Hon. Minister but so far as the history of this book is concerned, you can treat that separately. We advanced from this side that in your purchasing these textbooks, if you are satisfied that it is an excellent textbook and should be used in the schools of this island, the 5,000 copies which you say you are getting *into* cannot meet your needs in the schools. That is our argument. The Hon. Minister's argument is that we have this thing wrong. The whole idea is that the publishers did not intend to publish this book unless the author could state to them that as initial outlay

he will order 5,000 copies and from there anything else could happen. The Government says that it undertook to purchase these 5,000 copies; therefore, my argument is that the Government undertook to underwrite the publication of the book.

Now, what you have to ask yourself is this. Is it the publication of the book which you are underwriting or is it that the Government is seeking the acquisition of the textbook for the schools? Those are the two things which you have to decide.

The other argument in which the Hon. Minister talked about the availability of the money is the cause of the argument that people have been advancing in Barbados that the Government does not want to educate all the children in Barbados because if all the children are to be educated, it means that you will have to provide enough schools and equipment for them; but you are not therefore you are condemning for life the fact that all of the children born in Barbados have an inherent right to be educated.

If you undertook the publication of that book as a business venture - that is to say, you will underwrite the publication of it - I say that if Mr. Hoyos was not in doubt that this textbook was a good textbook, then if he, Mr. Hoyos, could not undertake to underwrite the publication of it, somebody other than he could have done it, and, if that is so, all that you need to say is that it is a good textbook. May I say this to the Hon. Minister quite humbly. Any man writing a first class textbook within the confines of Barbados would have absolutely no difficulty, if he too is a first-class man, in selling that book. The Hon. Minister says that he is not underwriting the publication, but he is going to guarantee the putting of it on the market by taking 5,000 copies at cost.

Now, it is a different thing if the Government knows of the worth of the book and says: "O.K., this is something of a historical interest; therefore, we are going to be the first people in it; we are going to purchase these books and get a rebate for purchasing these books." I do not know what is the sale price of these books, but from what is set out here, it seems that the price of a copy will be more than \$1.00. Whatever the price of a copy of a book is, the Government has guaranteed the amount of \$6,200 for the publication of this book. What I am saying, now, if the Hon. Minister is purchasing this textbook for the schools, is it the policy of the Minister only to put it on the market as a textbook? He says that it is going to be used in the senior schools. Senior schools mean schools like Harrison College. (Hon. L. S. A. THORNE: Oh no.) When you tell me at eleven plus, I take it that you mean boys attending schools like Harrison College. 3.55 p.m.

If you mean Elementary Schools or Secondary Modern Schools, with your 5,000 copies, you will have to be prepared to come for more of these books so as to make the reading available. The Minister hinted in here some time ago something about the question of people purchasing textbooks. I will tell the Minister that to insist on such purchase of textbooks in these schools, with our economy as it is, is just like asking a boy, who is an apprentice, to buy his tools. He is not a master-workman yet, but you are asking him to buy his tools before he starts to work. A part of the contribution which the Government has to make and for which they tax people, is to provide education in the way in which people cannot provide it, because the average income level of the average working man is still far below the standard. With a careful examination of the children who are educated in the main above the elementary school, you will find that income is finding its way elsewhere than in Barbados; it is either in America or going to America or it is going somewhere else. That is an indigenous economy. The average working class man cannot keep his boy at Harrison College on the salary which he is receiving. We say that your analysis of the situation is an analysis to show that you are underwriting

the publication of "Our Island Home". If that is your plan, that is all right, but we do not want you to give the impression that you are introducing a text book into the schools by purchasing these books for the school; there is a clear distinction. You are underwriting the publication of these textbooks and you are purchasing the first amount which would permit the author to have these books published. That is what the Minister has said and that might have suited the author of the book.

The Government has met the author in a dilemma; he wrote the book and did not get it published because he did not have the money for doing so. The publisher must undertake to have five thousand copies sold at an initial stage, the author could not have given that undertaking and so the Government accepted it. You therefore undertook to underwrite the publication of the book by accepting the first five thousand copies, because the book is not on the market altogether. It does not matter to you whether the book takes to the public or not because you have the five thousand copies which you want, and if you are satisfied with this book you will purchase more copies of it. What the publisher has done is nothing new; Dr. Eric Williams had to give a similar undertaking in order to get his work "Capitalism and Slavery" published. However, I do not think it is fair for the Minister to say or to imply that enough consideration has not been given to the amount of money which the Government has to spend but that you are debating this matter in its own context. If there are other textbooks which you use, there is no need for underwriting these five thousand copies; you must utilise the textbook which is given. Education is in such progress that you use this textbook now and then you will change it. I should like to say that even the Bible you have to revise because we cannot subscribe to some of the ideas which are in the Bible; we do not get the idea that one man wrote the Bible; that he came down from the mountain and wrote his ideas and they cannot be changed. I do not subscribe to the view that you cannot change the textbooks; even when you come to mathematics, the books have been changed so as to give a new approach to the children. The Russians must have a way of teaching people science but nobody knows what they are doing; they must have been doing very well so as to make the success they have made in the field in which they are doing these things.

What we are saying here is that if you have agreed to underwrite the publication, then say so; but we would have taken it that this was a textbook which you wanted to introduce into the schools which you have. As to the other schools, it would be a matter for the other teachers to introduce this textbook. What the Hon. Minister has to bear in mind is that he has no control over the purchase of text books by schools other than the Government schools because his policy for education does not have any influence whatever over private schools.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, when I initiated the debate on this particular part of the Resolution which is now under discussion by this Committee, my contribution was dictated solely in the interest of the educational system of this country and by a desire to see that those who are benefiting from it should benefit to the highest degree. I little thought that anything which I said would arouse the ire of the Minister to such an extent that he would seize upon the opportunity when I was attending to my duties in the House elsewhere, to attack me behind my back. 4.05 p.m.

I understand that no sooner had he got up to speak than he allowed himself to say that in his view my aspirations seemed to have got the better of my good judgment. Now I am genuinely sorry that the Minister made that attack upon me, sorry for a lot of reasons. Hitherto if there were two people on opposite sides of the House who had enjoyed the best relationship with one another, I believe it was the Hon. Minister of Education and myself. We have shown one another unfailing good courtesy on several previous occasions and we have never until now, Mr. Chairman, had any reason to be dissatisfied with our treatment of one another. Why he should therefore on a matter which the entire Committee is entitled to debate and on which you can have several opinions, single me

out on this particular occasion to make a personal attack on me, I do not know, on the suppositious grounds that unfair treatment had been meted out to him. There was nothing unfair in what I said; I merely said it was a waste of time and money to put 5,000 text books in the schools of this island knowing the book shortage that already exists, and it was agreed that soon from now, the Minister would have to replace the very 5,000 copies he is contemplating purchasing.

Mr. Chairman, I never knew at the time of speaking that this came about in consequence of perhaps a request made to Government by Mr. Hoyos or a stipulation made by the publishers, MacMillan to Mr. Hoyos. I never even knew the circumstances which the Committee now knows under which this scheme came to be considered. I thought myself that the Government had by some means become aware of the excellence of this particular book, and had in accordance with its own policy decided to introduce it into the schools. That was what I thought and I said then that if you are going to introduce it, do the handsome thing and make as many copies available; and because I took that attitude it pleases the Minister to criticise me on the ground that my aspirations are getting the better of my good judgement. I am very sorry he has done that. I do not want to take the matter any further, and I do not propose to answer him on that point, because I really respect him too much and I feel that something must have gone wrong and there must have been some misunderstanding, because we have been going too well for that to happen; but in future, if he should feel it incumbent upon himself to play the political game as his colleagues sometimes play it, naturally I should certainly, although with regret, answer him accordingly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this: now that we know why this matter is before the Committee, there are two aspects of it which would have to be considered very carefully. One aspect is this: the Minister may have had one very good reason for limiting the purchase of this book to 5,000, and that very good reason would have been the stipulation which the publishers made; but the matter cannot just rest there, because in addition to that consideration the book itself is good. I myself had the honour of seeing that book and reading it in manuscript when I believe no more than three or four people knew of its existence; so it is not now that I am speaking in public that I can testify to its excellence, and I have long desired privately to see the book in use in the elementary and secondary schools of this Island.

The second point is this: if you are introducing a text book into a school, this is what you have to safeguard: you have to safeguard the idea that there should be an even uniform acquisition of knowledge; that is to say, that the most good will come from the production of a new text book, when as many children of the same age as possible begin to study from it at the same time. In other words, you encourage an entirely new generation in an entirely new approach. My fear is with only 5,000 textbooks available, you will have a situation in which a considerable portion of the children of this Island will not be familiar with this new knowledge which this new book imparts, and then if that should happen, there will be a lack of uniformity in the knowledge and the studies of the children. It is to safeguard that group that more text books should be bought. It is not now a question of subsidising the book or even guaranteeing the sales of the publishers; it will be a question of doing something which is manifestly good for its own sake, and that is why I implored the Minister not to set his mind on this round figure of 5,000.

Mr. Chairman, if at this stage the Minister feels I am misinterpreting him, I was not here when he replied, so he will have an opportunity to make himself clear; but I am appealing to him not to close his mind on the concept of 5,000 copies and to wait until these 5,000 become unusable to get more, so that more and more persons would be able at the same time to make use of the book and to get the knowledge which the book imparts.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Chairman, from this Resolution I see that the Minister has made an agreement for these

books; the hon. senior member for St. Lucy said that he has read the book and has seen for himself that it is a good book, and as the Minister has informed us, these books are soon expected. I do not see that there can be any opposition at all to this Resolution. What I would suggest is that this book should be circulated not only to Government schools, but also to some of the private schools so that both sets of children may be enlightened. At the present time Government does not have enough room or accommodation for all the children that are learning today; so we should try to help the private schools with this valuable book. I trust when these books reach here that they will be distributed both to the Government schools and to private schools as well. This Resolution, Sir, does not need so much comment and I am willing to support it.

Hon. L. S. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to find that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy should become annoyed as a result of my having said that his aspirations on this occasion got the better of his good judgment. Now there is nothing at all in that which is intended to be personal.

4.15 p.m.

What I really mean is that I am convinced that he is deeply interested to the subject, education, and that he would like to see the very best, just as I would like to see the very best, but he did not allow himself sufficient time to think on the matter. Why did he allow himself to think that I only wanted 5,000 copies of this book? I am positively sure that if he had asked of me a question, I would be willing to answer him. The fact of the matter is that the people of the West Indies, especially the people of Barbados, have been quite for a long time awaiting the publication of such a book owing to the fact that our children were not privileged to study textbooks which were written of their home setting and owing to the fact that the textbooks which we have been using were all textbooks suited for people in other climes. Now, we are thinking of offering the necessary knowledge which they should have of our island.

I am a bit surprised that hon. members are not more acquainted of the circumstances which surround the birth of this textbook, "Barbados Our Island Home". The Barbados Elementary School Teachers' Association together with other persons interested in education appealed to Mr. Hoyos and some other intellectuals to undertake the task of writing textbooks which would be suitable for our children in Barbados and children in the West Indies as a whole. Mr. Hoyos responded and together with other co-workers produced the manuscript for this book. When it came to the matter of publishing its text, as I have said before, certain difficulties arose, one of which was that the publishers were not prepared to take the risk of publishing the book in that they were not quite sure that the sales would have compensated. We, knowing the value of the book did the necessary, mainly with a view of getting it published because we know very well that when the book is published we would be in a position to get some more. We would be getting as many thousands more of this book as would be necessary and that is such a simple matter to me that I cannot understand why is it that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy should have seen fit to refer to the terms of Government being niggardly. He does not know as well as I how many will suffice.

Mr. TUDOR: If the hon. member would give way, he should tell us what number will suffice.

Hon. L. S. A. THORNE: Well, this is the number which would suffice for the present.

I want to assure the hon. member that I have no hard feelings. I do not think there is the necessity for us to argue this matter any more.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on this matter, the Hon. Minister of Education being so affable in his reply, I can hardly risk the attack which I had in mind. Even at the risk of being considered out of order while we are dealing with this matter, I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister can answer this question in respect of a shortage of money at the Coleridge-Parry School. It has something to do with the

question of textbooks. I am wondering if the Hon. Minister would be prepared to tell us anything about it or whether it is that the Government is considering the matter. I have heard that it is a matter of something like \$2,000 of the taxpayers' money which is short in respect of Government textbooks. Can the Hon. Minister tell us something about it?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the Hon. Minister that when I am debating a matter I am not concerned with a Minister's affability. It is true that if he were uncouth it would give rise to acrimony, but affability of a Minister is no reply to argument; and I want to tell the Hon. Minister now that he has not satisfied me yet, apart from your stating that the purchase of 5,000 copies of this book is purely and simply the underwriting of the publication of this book.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: I should like to know exactly what the hon. senior member for St. Peter would like me to answer.

Mr. WALCOTT: You are at pains to state that the book would never have been published were it not that you ordered 5,000 copies. That was the lowest number which the publishers would accept. It is a peculiar coincidence that that same number is the number which would suffice your needs. I say that because you do not have these happy coincidences.

What I ought to say is this. From my knowledge of children in Barbados, I cannot see the distribution of this textbook in these schools would be adequate if you propose to distribute only 5,000. If that is so, then the subject which you propose to introduce through the teaching of this textbook cannot be properly taught. You say that for the time being that number will suffice. When a boy passes through a school, that means that his time at that school is out. Your further education is going to be on a different basis. If you are going to educate a boy for the time being, and if you are going to mess around with eight different types of textbooks, how are you going to enable him to sit an examination on that basis? I agree with the Hon. Minister on this score that the textbooks which we have been putting before them have been written elsewhere and that is one reason why we are the products we are; that is to say, we are neither fish, fowl or red herring. You have no national aspiration. All that we have been reading about is of a nationalism which is not ours. So far as I am concerned, I have no doubt that if a man in Barbados would write a textbook on the history of Barbados, I would prefer to have that than to have another written by someone of another country. However, do not tell us that this number of 5,000 would suffice our needs because it happens to be the number which would satisfy the publishers. I am not concerned with the author or anybody; I am concerned with if the book is well written, and if it is a good book, and that you should purchase such number as is necessary, and not such number as is adequate for the publishers to print to put on the market. The Hon. Minister has given us the impression that the number of 5,000 copies is the number which would satisfy the publishers.

Hon. L. St.A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, I have always admired the hon. senior member for St. Peter who in his usual frank manner puts over what he has to say, but there is this one point which he does not see. He seems to be a bit worried when I say that 5,000 copies would satisfy our needs but he does not know what we need. If I explain now what my need is, I hope I would be able to satisfy him. The schools of this Island just around this time are given an amount of money with which they are expected to buy themselves certain equipment including textbooks.

4.25 p.m.

That means that each school in the island would have a book rack which it is able to use for the purchase of books. However, I have got these copies because I am positively sure that this book is worthwhile. My idea really is to get these books for the Heads of Schools to see them, and I know they will appreciate them and they will be able to purchase as many of the books from their regular book rack as they need to have at the moment. That is how I would have to work it; but as far as the idea that it is my policy to have

the parents buy these textbooks is concerned, I am completely at a loss to understand how hon. members could have got such an erroneous idea. If I use my own money, and have been using it from the time I have been in the teaching service, to provide the necessary things for schools, I wonder if hon. members would believe that I would indulge in any cheeseparing methods or policy if I had the money at my disposal.

Mr. Chairman, I have never said anything which would give rise to the idea in any hon. member's mind that I want people to buy textbooks and I do not want money to be spent on education. I believe that our best investment today is in education and everything else comes after that. I am not prepared to indulge in electioneering stunts and to talk all sorts of nonsense when I know what the situation is. I do not want to handicap people or anything like that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I want to be precise; I do not deal with personalities, and when I ask a question, the Minister has not got to tell me about electioneering. I want to say that I electioneer every day; I am electioneering personified. The day on which I express a view with which the public do not agree, I can concede to them. Anyone who is thinking must ask questions. You are not distributing these books; you are purchasing books to be handed to Headteachers for them to see them. You have purchased 5,000 copies of this book on the basis of what you have said, and that is why I asked if that is the amount which you want the teachers to know about or the amount you want introduced into the schools. You are introducing a textbook in the schools to be used and you are asking the teachers if that is the amount which they require. The amount they want is based on convenience, not on quantum. It may be that the hon. senior member for St. Lucy, who knows more about how children are being taught in schools than some of us, can speak about how the children are taught. I give careful consideration every day of my life to the spending of money. The reference I made is what was reported to me as to what the Minister has said in so far as making a token purchase of books is concerned. I read that somewhere in the newspapers. It is a question of getting a clear and distinct answer on this question; it is not a matter of electioneering.

The Minister says that when they purchase these five thousand copies of these books they will distribute them based on the need for them, and subsequently an order will be made by the Headteachers based on their needs from time to time. If these books are available, and the hon. member tried to introduce the buying of books which is a scandal (Mr. MOTTLEY: Which hon. member?) When the scandal is exposed, somebody should go to prison. The hon. member has to be very careful; there are some people in this community whom you cannot allow to get a certain amount of money to spend whether it is on behalf of the Government or on behalf of the Almighty, because they will see what they can get for themselves. There are certain people who are pussyfooting in this island when it comes to the use of Government funds. With all due respect to the Headteachers, the administration of money must be done in such a manner that it must be above any question of suspicion. I do not believe in your saying to somebody else: "I am giving you so many thousand dollars to buy books"; you obtain these 5,000 copies of these books and distribute them to the schools. It will surprise some hon. members as to what is going to come out of some of the things which are taking place. If I give you \$1,000 to spend on 5,000 books, you can spend \$1,000 but having 5,000 books is quite another matter.

Mr. Chairman, I have enough experience in my lifetime to know what I am talking about. I know how men and money play. I am not asking anybody to tell me. Let us not get the idea that anybody is above this or that. There are some people whom you think are above doing things, but who will give you the greatest shock in your life.

4.35 p.m.

Poverty is a hard schoolmaster; it can give you some steady bites, and to get away from these bites many people are forced to give a foul blow. That is why I told the Minister that if 5,000 books are required he should get them;

if you need 10,000, I say: get them, even if they are going to cost \$12,000. If you feel it is a good book to put over to the children, I agree that you should get them. I am not telling you that you do not need 5,000, but the Minister said this would serve their needs. A man needs a pants and a shirt, but if he cannot get a pants and shirt, he cannot say that a pants will serve his needs. I can appreciate your position. You are Minister of Education and in a Cabinet system you have to fight for your Department. You go to the Cabinet with a proposal to get this book which you regard as good, and I agree that you may not be able to get every member of the Government to agree to give you 10,000; so you go as far as 5,000 and make that serve your needs; but so far as I am concerned, I was not dealing with it in that light. I was dealing with it in the light that as with your technical equipment, things like blackboards and chalk, if the text book is part of your technical equipment in a new form of teaching history, all I say is that you should get as many of the text books as would serve your needs.

Mr. Chairman, maybe you will introduce it to certain classes this year, and then a few more next year, and more as the years may go; but the Minister must understand that if he is introducing these books into the schools, he must acquire the number that is likely to cover all the schools. Maybe that would be too much of a breakdown for him. When I say that, I mean it would be too much of a breakdown to give an *ad hoc* reply on the subject; it may be a concern which involved further detailed examination and my suggestion to the Minister was not one of opposition. I am not opposed to doing this; I am in favour of it, but I am not in favour of spending more money than you have. All I wanted to get clear in my mind is whether you are purchasing this book from the point of view of the needs of the schools or from the point of view of underwriting them for the publisher. I am satisfied that it serves both purposes; it fits in with the publication of the book and your needs, and therefore you accepted it. All I say is if you feel that 5,000 will be adequate, the blame is not my own, but yours. I only say that I did not get the information I required, but I will not press for it. I take what you have said from you as a gentleman, and if you are satisfied that 5,000 copies are adequate for your needs, I accept that reply.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies, I just rise to draw to Your Honour's attention, though I do not want to stifle debate, that I think it is unfair for this debate to continue in the strain that it has gone. Rule 26(4) of the Standing Orders read as follows:-

"It shall be out of order to reflect on any vote of the House or attempt to reconsider any specific question upon which the House has come to a conclusion during the current session except upon a substantive motion for rescission."

This matter, with great respect, Sir, has been discussed in this House and passed long ago, and this is only a revote now. (Mr. MOTTLEY: In another Session.) Oh, no.

Mr. WALCOTT: He is like you; he does not know the Rules.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I was saying

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I can help the hon. member. I want to tell the hon. member that this vote cannot be in that context because we are not introducing anything that would be a reflection of the House. The Government introduced this motion to vote this money, so in voting it we are debating it as a fresh Resolution; so the hon. member would have been in order had we in discussing this Resolution to acquire the books said that it was a waste of money. This is a Resolution which the Minister is introducing into the House as a fresh debate, and therefore it starts all over again, and it is a different thing from reflecting on a vote of the House.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I do not accept that at all. This is a revote and for all my time in this House

of Assembly I am definitely sure that when a Resolution comes before us for a revote, there is little or no debate, and it has not been changed. The Hon. Premier in moving the Resolution pointed out that as a result of the lateness of the arrival of these books, the money lapsed and therefore we have to revote it. It is not a new Resolution, and in order not to carry on any longer with this question, I beg to move

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, with the greatest respect to the hon. member, what the hon. Leader of the House is trying to do is very unkind. From this side of the House, certain questions were posed at the Minister and I am suggesting that he must be very discourteous not even to reply. The hon. member should not try to take advantage of the situation by trying to make a motion when the Minister himself has not finished replying. I do not think that is correct and at least it is suggesting that the Minister of Education is absolutely incompetent for the Leader of the House to get up and suggest that the question be put. The Minister of Education has handled it quite well although the hon. member might disagree. As the hon. senior member for St. Peter said, this is a distinct, separate Resolution, and the member cannot suggest the question being put. The question is going to be put; so how are you going to stifle debate? Are you suggesting that the Minister is incompetent or are you afraid of the Minister answering something that members have asked?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to make this clear; I do not know if the hon. senior member for the City is referring to the question which he posed in connection with what appeared in the Press concerning the Coleridge-Parry School, but I was just awaiting my chance on that. In so far as the question of the Coleridge-Parry School is concerned, in my view it has nothing at all to do with this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I would just like to say this

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Would you just wait and let me finish speaking? If you say that this Resolution is a revote of money and deals specifically with copies of the book "Barbados our Island Home", the affair at the Coleridge-Parry School is something separate and distinct and has no connection with this, and I intended to rule that that question was out of order. The matter is *sub judice*; the Governing Body of the School is dealing with it, and I think it is out of place. I would suggest if you want to bring up the matter that you will have to make it the subject of another debate. 4.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I never intended to have any debate on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But I am not allowing the question.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You cannot prevent the question. You cannot prevent me from posing the question whether you wish to turn it down or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But I have ruled that it is out of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But I will still pose the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But I am not going to allow it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is all well and good. I will bring in a motion to institute a debate on it. However, it will appear to the public that the action of you, Mr. Chairman, is that you are trying to pull the Government out of something which looks sticky. I have no axe to grind. Let me say that no backbencher has approached me on this matter. I say again that you cannot prevent any member from posing the question. If I address the question to the Minister and the Speaker rules that it is out of order or you rule likewise, well then, you rule that way. However, that is a matter for the public to decide. Do you not think that I do not know when it is that I should pose a question? Now that you have come

to the rescue of the Government, you have brought something to my knowledge which I did not know. You say that it is a question which is *sub judice*. Are you saying that there is a case in court concerning the matter? I did not know anything about it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You rose on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: No, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You did rise on a question of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Oh, yes, I now remember, but I have not finished yet. With the greatest respect to Your Honour, you cut in and crossed my point of order. I am saying that I did not know that this matter was in court and the public does not know it. It is so difficult when you ask about something to get an answer. I am not a member of the Government Party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to quote me correctly. You say that it is a matter in court. I said that it was *sub judice*.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You have party politics in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has risen on a point of order. You have established your point of order and you cannot make a speech now. Having established your point of order, you should sit.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will sit but I hope that the Minister will not be advised by you. However, if he does not like to answer the question, the public will still be satisfied that I have asked the question.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I intend to stick to the rules. The Hon. Minister of Trade has been in the House long enough to know the rules.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. senior member for the City rose on a point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: I rose to speak when the hon. senior member for the City jumped up in front of me and I was really going to reply to what the Hon. Minister of Trade had said. When I sat down, the Hon. Minister rose on a point of order pointing out to you, if you will remember, that on this matter you had given a lot of latitude to hon. members by implication but that we had reached the stage where the question which we were considering was a revote. I jumped up and spoke. He then jumped up and said that he was speaking on a point of order for the second time. He was addressing you on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And he gave way to the hon. senior member for the City on a point of order.

Hon. M.E. COX: It was a point of order, and not a point of interruption. It was a point of order in drawing to the hon. member's attention that there was an infringement of the rules of the House. However, since it would appear from what hon. members on the other side have said that we do not want the matter debated, I just want to say that we have absolutely nothing to hide.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point out, apart from the technicality of it, that in so far as saying that this was a revote and what we were doing was a reflection, this is a motion to send the House into Committee of Supply to vote these sums of money. Though this is a revote, this House can refuse to vote the money and it would be no reflection on anything that was done. You can only be reflecting on something which you cannot change. You cannot use the word "reflection" on something if you can change it. You reflect on something which you cannot change; something which is already law and something which you are trying now to bring up a fresh debate on. That is why there is a rule which says that you cannot reflect on a vote of the House. If it comes back as a revote, it is something which has come back to us and which we can debate again from top to bottom. As the hon. member has said, you cannot re-

frain from discussing the matter which is being put to you.

What I did want to say, though, was that you cannot rise on a point of order and make a substantive motion to close the debate because if you rise on a point of order, you are rising to show that something is wrong; therefore, you cannot take that same opportunity to make a motion to finish a debate. That was all I was rising previously to point out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I thought the hon. member was speaking too quickly. You should have waited to see what I would have done.

Mr. WALCOTT: You will realise that it is an academic discussion because we are dealing with textbooks. The points which have been raised were points which should have been answered from the public's point of view. With due respect to the hon. senior member for the City, we knew that he did misrepresent, but do not take him too seriously. I hope the Hon. Minister would appreciate that those of us who spoke on the text books did it with some feeling of justification and not with a feeling of narrowness.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: Mr. Chairman, really, the note is so clear that I do not see any reason why we should have had all this discussion on this matter. It says that Mr. F. A. Hoyos has written a textbook. (A VOICE: That is not in this note.) That is the note which we had last year. 4.55 p.m.

This is the note in connection with this item last year:-

"Mr. F. A. Hoyos has written a textbook "Barbados, Our Island Home" for the use of school children over the age of 11. The book, which was suggested to the author by the Barbados Elementary School Teachers' Association in keeping with the policy of the Caribbean Union of Teachers, contains information on the plant and animal life of the island, its institutions, history and geography etc. The text, which has been prepared with the help of "a number of persons of different interests and activities," is considered valuable for use in all schools and the Ministry therefore proposes to sponsor its introduction. For this purpose the Ministry is placing an order of 5,000 copies of the book with the publishers, MacMillan & Co. Ltd. The amount of \$6,200 is needed for the outright purchase of 5,000 copies. Approximately half of this amount will be recovered as Government-maintained schools will be able to purchase the books at half price."

With that background, I consider that hon. members are clearly conversant with what is before us. I do not see that what has arisen should have arisen.

The question that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RECOMMITTAL OF HEAD XIX - ECCLESIASTICAL

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before the Hon. Premier goes on further, I am asking for a recommitment of Head XIX. The Government usually reverts to their business at 4.30 p.m. of the clock, but today we went back to Government Business long before that hour. There is just one point I would like to clear up. From the look on hon. members' faces, it seems that I will not have a recommitment of this Head, but I will give the reasons why I should like to have this Head recommitted. This Head deals with the payment of a cost of living allowance to the Anglican Clergy to the amount of \$4,320.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member going to make a motion for the recommitment of this Head?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Sir, and this is my preamble as to the reasons why I am asking for this recommitment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, the hon. member cannot now deal with the subject.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am entitled to deal with the subject so as to give my reasons for asking for the recommitment of the Head. As I was saying, I did not realise that Govern-

ment Business would have been resumed before I came back in the House. I should just like to get the record straight. If the Hon. Premier will grant permission I would crave that permission so as to be able to point out that under the Local Government Act, 1958, at least in December 1959, the Governor-in-Executive Committee signed the regulations which compelled the Local Government Councils for the various areas.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is now going to the subject matter. He started off nicely by saying that he came back to the House late and he wanted to give the reasons why he would like this Head recommitted; he wanted it recommitted so that he could make one point. Well, that point can be made after the Head has been recommitted, but not at this stage.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I should just like to give my reasons for asking for this recommitment. I was saying that Government Business was resumed today one hour before the normal time and therefore I am asking for the recommitment of this Head. I am just giving reasons for the recommitment and in asking for this recommitment (A MEMBER: Make a motion.) (ASIDES). Mr. Chairman, I was trying to point out that one of the reasons why I am asking for the recommitment is that Government Business was resumed before the time I expected it would have been resumed and I want to get the record straight. I do not want it to be felt that I did not know what I was saying on a matter of such vital importance (ASIDES). Even if you want to recommit something, the whole question is how people will vote. (ASIDES). I will stand up here until 2 o'clock in the morning and speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. senior member for the City proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I cannot proceed in this atmosphere. I was saying that this amount of \$4,320 is being asked for so as to pay a Cost of Living Allowance to the Clergy and I want to point out that as late as 1959 the Governor-in-Executive Committee sent down regulations prohibiting the Local Government from giving anything more in the matter of salaries to the City Council. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there is another Chairman of the Northern Council here. The hon. member said that I know my way around the Local Government Act, but I just want to say that as far as the City Council is concerned, this matter of the subordinates of the established Church which this affects was raised.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already told the hon. senior member for the City that he can give his reasons.....

Mr. MOTTLEY: That is not a reason.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are now dealing with the subject matter, and the matter can only be discussed after recommitment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: We differ in opinion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to rule now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: With the greatest respect, this is a matter of opinion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am ruling now. I cannot allow you to deal with the subject matter as a reason for putting the motion. After you have given your reasons, it is my duty to put the motion, but before that I cannot allow you or anybody else to deal with the subject matter. My ruling is that after you have given your reasons and the question is put, you can deal with the matter, but do not now attempt to deal with the subject matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Now what would you call the subject matter?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As soon as you get to it, I will stop you.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The subject matter in this Resolution would be the cost of living allowance to the Clergymen; therefore I am bound to say at some time in the preamble why I should like the matter recommitted. I am going to be quite controversial. If the Government does not like to give an opportunity for recommitment although they have proceeded with Government Business an hour earlier than anticipated, that is a matter for them. I heard the Hon. Leader of the House say something about not stifling debate, and whenever someone expresses a view here, whether it is logical or the argument is correct, it is a matter that the Government must have a majority; therefore, I am moving that Head XIX - Ecclesiastical - be recommitted so that I can explain the matter for the simple reason that it was said that the whole thing lies at the feet of the Municipality and the Northern and Southern Districts, and therefore an opportunity should be given so that I can clear it up.

I am under the circumstances asking that Head XIX - Ecclesiastical - be recommitted.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order to point out that I do not go in for this sort of nonsense. This debate would normally have started at 4.30 o'clock, but it came before normal Government Time; so if the hon. member was speaking prior to that time, out of pure parliamentary decency when he comes back to find Government business in progress he should be given an opportunity to speak, knowing that he was the last person who was speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: May I enquire if it is the intention of the hon. member to second the motion for the recommitment?

Mr. WALCOTT: I was speaking on a point of order to point out to you that as a matter of parliamentary decency there are certain things that should not need a vote. The Chairman should be able to use his influence without having a formal motion to extend to any member time to discuss a matter. What is wrong with that? This is nothing to debate where you have to beg somebody for votes, because any member who votes against that should not be a member of Parliament, because he does not understand the common courtesies he should have.

Mr. TUDOR: I beg to second the motion made by the hon. senior member for the City.

Hon. M.E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that we have been accused on this side of not agreeing to a motion when it was not even put. How can the member anticipate that we would not have been willing? It just is not fair. It is all right to come here and say that no member should be a member of this House if he does not agree to recommitment. When did we express any disapproval to a recommitment even at this late hour when this debate has dragged on from morning? We have not expressed our views against any recommitment, so how can the hon. member accuse us of that?

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I said what I did because of the hon. member's action when I told him in a *sotto voce* remark that this was nothing you have to put to the House if the Leader of the House agrees to the recommitment. You only have to put a motion for recommitment if the members do not agree, and that is why I said I do not regard it as a matter for a formal vote. If I ask in here whether you are going to accept a recommitment, your gesticulations would be sufficient to intimate whether if you are going to agree, because you would only have to nod as the Premier does. Sometimes from that side you see a member speaking and you ask him to move the adjournment, but you do not do it on the basis of making him move the adjournment and then vote against him, and that is why I say that the member should be given an opportunity to speak though it will perhaps prolong the business of the House, but that is another matter.

Hon. M.E. COX: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member must understand is that before a recommitment can be made, a substantive motion

has to be made; you must make a motion that the Item be recommitted. It is different from asking leave to deal with the particular matter. When you ask for leave, it is declared by the Chairman; he just tells you that the member is asking leave; but when you are going to recommit an item, you have to make a motion.
5.15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The substantive motion has now been moved and I am going to put the motion.

The question is that Head XIX be recommitted. Hon. members in favour will please say "Aye" and hon. members against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, it is very amusing that those members on that side of the House feel that they have all the say; but when they get up and say what they have to say, it turns out that they have very little to say and what they have said means nothing. Speaking on this Head and on this matter, you will remember, Sir, that when the House adjourned I was speaking. I think I was mild in my speech then, but it seems to have got under the skin of the Hon. Premier and he made the point that I had attempted to throw the blame on the Government. As a matter of fact, you will recall that during the entire debate I pointed out that I felt it was an error and I was quite sure that the Government would come in due course and remedy it. No one could suggest that that was any attack at all and I saw no reason why the Hon. Premier in his reply should have said that I have thrown the whole blame on the Government.

I am going to repeat what I said. I actually said then that I felt it was an error on behalf of the Government in not realising that if you give a cost of living allowance to the superior officers, that is to the Clergymen, you should also give consideration to the subordinates and give them also a cost of living allowance.

Why I asked for recommitment of this Head is because the Hon. Premier said that he thought I knew something of the Act. I want to point this out to him. It is not their fault if they have been wrongly advised. I am going to be more charitable to them than they think. I do not believe that if it were brought home to the Hon. Premier that he was giving the clergymen a cost of living allowance, and in doing so that he was denying the organist, the sexton, the bell ringer and people like that a cost of living allowance - I do not believe that he would have done it. Let me say that I have succeeded in public life because I have always been outspoken. It is not true to say that either of the Councils had anything to do with it. The Local Government Act of 1958 contains a clause dealing with ecclesiastical grants. It says that Regulations made under this section shall specify the amounts of the annual grants to ecclesiastical bodies. The Regulations concerning the amounts to be given to this body were assented to by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 22nd December, 1959, which is five months ago. I would have appreciated the Government saying that this has not been drawn to their notice. In this changeover, you must have all these anomalies and things which would take sometime to get over. I can assure you that I am going on from strength to strength because the people know in what I have been doing, I have been honest.

The Government dealt with everything which was given to them in 1959. They got all their figures from the Commissioner of Local Government. With regard to the provisions relating to this matter, you will see in Regulation 3 that it is laid down:-

"Subject to the provisions of Regulation nine of these regulations, the sums specified in this regulation opposite to each Council specified in this regulation shall be the amount of the annual grant payable by the Council to the Synod in respect of the salaries of church officers that is to say:

Council of the City of Bridgetown	..	\$11,844
Northern District Council	..	\$27,099
Southern District Council	..	\$14,602

Then the Regulations deal with insurance of church buildings and residential buildings of the clergy and then with maintenance and then with repairs to buildings.

Specifically, it does not affect the City Council more than as regards the St. Michael's Cathedral. It affects more the Northern and Southern Councils. The City Council has to put in their Estimates only \$11,844, while you will see that the Northern Council has to put in \$27,099 and the Southern District Council \$14,602. Although this is the municipality, that is all that we have to put in. As I have said, the majority of the churches in the municipality pay their own salary. The Regulations tell you how much you have to put in for insurance, how much for maintenance and repairs.

This is the point which I want to make. The Hon. Premier said that he thought I knew something of the Act and that I wanted to place the burden on the Government. What I have read out in the Regulations is what you did in December, 1959, long after you had passed and paid out your cost of living allowances to public officers and Civil Servants. This is nothing which could be done without your telling us to do it. Those were the instructions given us. You said that we could do nothing at all in respect of any of these salaries until you did this. What is therefore the position? Why should you say in public that the reason why the bell ringers, the organists, the sextons and those people who are the subordinates have not been given a cost of living allowance is because of the Councils? It is not fair to the Councils.

Further, too, you get up and say that if the Councils make a recommendation, you will do it. Why say that when you, yourself, by the laws of the country say that you can only pay in this amount of money? There is no opportunity for the Councils to do it; there is no elasticity here. What you did was to get all your salaries which were paid from the North, from the South and from the City, add them together and say that these are the salaries which you have to pay; therefore, this is the estimate which you must put in for that. You are faced with these difficulties. You have not disestablished; therefore your clergymen are still entitled to their pensions; and with the establishment of the Local Government Act, as you know, there is some doubt, as to those persons who did not retire and take gratuity, as to whether they are entitled to this from the Local Government. I am sure that the Hon. Premier must have realised that too because many people are in grave doubt about it. As I have said, it does not affect more than about half dozen people in the municipality but it affects many people in the other two areas.

You say by this Resolution that you are going to give to the various clergymen a cost of living allowance. It is now for you to say, having bound down the Local Government to a fixed amount which was estimated on what you were paying as salaries before to the subordinates, that you should give cost of living allowance to them now. I have specifically said before that you did not wilfully do it. I realise that it is one of these things which because of the changeover, you would not see. People who have reached a certain age could resign and get a pension, but the people who had not put in the number of years which would entitle them to a pension would have to go on working until they qualified. In the circumstances, we suggest to the Hon. Premier, if you are saying that you will do the greatest good for the greatest number, if you have sixty or eighty clergymen to whom you are giving this cost of living allowance and you have 180 people comprising of bell ringers, sextons, organists, organ blowers, and so on, why not come in with an amendment to give them too? Do not suggest that it is a matter entirely for the Councils when they dare not pay one cent more! If a man was getting \$40 on the 25th March, 1959, we cannot give him one cent more.

5.25 p.m.

Where I am in doubt is, where the organist or sexton, say, of St. George's Church, who was paid \$40.00 or \$50.00 a month and was still in the service of the Government, whether it could be done as the gentleman at St. Thomas would like to do it: that is, to receive the money from the

Synod and divide it between different people. That is what you have left in doubt; that is where you have left the subordinates at the mercies of the Synod. I am absolutely certain that, with the exception of the gentleman at St. Thomas, not one person would have his salary reduced. As I say, what you have in doubt is whether those salaries of the subordinates can be reduced or whether their salaries could be affected or what.

Now the Premier has said and he pledges that the Government will do something in the matter if the Local Government Councils ask for it; but I say that there is no authority for the Local Government Councils to do that. If in the north or in the south they will say: "We are making an appeal to you for increased salaries for the sexton and bell ringer of St. George", I, as Chairman, would say: "I have no authority to do that." You have insurance separate from salaries and you have maintenance separate and distinct from repairs. I am suggesting to the Hon. Premier that he should take the opinion of his experts in this matter and he will find that he will have to add on an amount of about \$11,000 as Cost of Living Allowance and so amend this Resolution. If we add on, say, \$15,000 to the Synod, there is nothing to show that we can pay so much to Mr. So and So. As a matter of fact, you have not offered to the subordinate employees the protection which you should have offered. Originally, everyone had that protection because the Synod together with the Clergymen could not oust people out of office because of their whims and dislikes. I suggest to the Hon. Premier that the correct thing for him to do now is to amend this Resolution; you can give a grant but next year you should allow the Cost of Living Allowance to go on. If you agree with the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number, then there is nothing to prevent the subordinate employees from getting this Cost of Living Allowance. That is the point I am making.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to prolong this debate but I still do not agree with the hon. member. The Government has brought down a certain amount of money for paying a Cost of Living allowance to the Clergymen. The Government has already given a Cost of Living Allowance to its servants but, unfortunately, by an oversight, the clergy were omitted. However, the Government has provided for its servants, Civil Servants and those who serve the Government, this Cost of Living Allowance. We do not provide for the staff of the Vestries or the Local Government Staff and therefore it would be out of order for the Government to say: "We will do this on behalf of the subordinate staff of these Churches."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have not suggested that the Government should say that; I say that the Government should amend this Act so as to afford the opportunity to the Local Government Councils to give the Synod the necessary money to pay this Cost of Living Allowance. I am not saying that you should do this; I am only saying that you should amend this Act so as to give the Local Government Councils the power to do it.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Oh yes, I agree with that. (MEMBERS: That is the only way in which it can be done.) I said earlier in the day that if the Local Government Councils were, at this stage, willing to approach the Government and put up something to the Government, we would act on it.

Mr. GODDARD: The number of officers affected in the City of Bridgetown is six.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I am not contesting the number of officers; I am talking about the principle. That is all.

Mr. GODDARD: I would be concerned with the principle, but I am drawing attention to the fact that the Northern District Council which is controlled by the Labour Party, has seventeen organists, 17 sextons and about 15 bell-ringers.
5.35 p.m.

We are only drawing to Your Honour's attention the number that is involved in the Northern District. I am surprised that the members of the Northern District are not on their feet on this matter, because they should be more than concerned about it. I am concerned with the Southern District because I am responsible for that, but it is so simple. What the hon. member has told you is that in December when these Regulations were being made, you did not consult the Councils about then; you brought them down yourself along with the Commissioner of Local Government, so how are we to be concerned about them after they have been effected? Now you are laying the blame on the Councils, not only in the City, but in the Northern and Southern Districts.

Mr. Chairman, I do know that there is a subtle attempt on all occasions by the Government to throw the blame on the City Council, forgetting that the Northern and Southern Councils are also in it, but on this occasion neither one of the Councils had anything to do with this. It was done by the Governor-in-Executive Committee and sent down on the 21st December last year. It is now drawn to your attention and you say that no applications came to you from the Councils, and for that reason it should go there first. As a matter of fact, you did not have to amend it for the Northern and Southern Districts. I do not know if you have increased their salaries, but I do know that the City of Bridgetown has increased the salaries of the officers. There are only six that would have got the increase, and if and when the Northern and Southern Councils have a cost of living allowance for their officers, these will be excluded.

Mr. Chairman, there are six officers at the Cathedral, but there are seventeen churches in the Northern District affected by this - there are seventeen organists, seventeen sextons, about fifteen bell-ringers, about six organ-blowers and about five gardeners - if and when cost of living is increased by the Northern District Council. It has been increased by the City Council, but these people are entitled to it and should be entitled to it from the time that this Order was made or whenever it was frozen.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member appreciates the point. All we are saying finally is this: we did not give this cost of living bonus because the Government of this country by the power conferred upon them in the House of Assembly made these Regulations saying that is all we could give. I defy the Northern or Southern District Councils to pay one cent more than what is in the Estimates. They have to give just what you said; therefore I am respectfully suggesting that this cannot be changed by a Resolution; it can only be done by making an amendment to the Orders and you know what they are. When that is done you can then arrive at the amount which you would pay at, say, \$9 a month, because you have in the Act, as the hon. member pointed out, the number of persons you employ. (Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: The Government does not employ them.) The Local Government employs them and they also employ scavengers and the nurses at the Almshouses, but you said in the Act that the Councils should go on to employ these people and pay them increases as we think fit from time to time. When it comes to the Church officers, you have called a halt; you decide how much we should pay and you set it out. Maybe it is done for a reason, but whatever the reason is I do not know.

You have here, Mr. Chairman, Sections dealing with these people, the various denominations and so on, and in the Northern and Southern Councils you say that the nurses at the Almshouses and the people in the Sanitary Departments should be paid a salary as the Councils think fit, but then you say that the Church is so bound up with Local Government and the Vestries that you are not going to allow us to deal with them, because you are taking steps to disendow and disestablish the Church. It would not be fair to throw them to the wind, but you say you are not giving them any more, and you leave them in doubt as to whether their pensions are to be paid by the Councils. Those are the people against whom you say your hands are tied. You dare not give the bell ringer or the sexton at the Cathedral Church one cent more, but you can give the scavengers or the nurses at the Almshouse in St.

Peter. We dare not give one cent more in Poor Relief than in 1958, and I have that in black and white from the Government. The Chairman of the Public Assistance Board is always drawing to your attention that we dare not give any more; but I will give; and when you find that I am carrying home something, you can lock me up. I am going to relieve the poor.

I contend, therefore, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect to the Hon. Premier that you have to amend these Regulations. We cannot amend the Rules and Regulations in here, and for the Hon. Premier's information I have sworn because of being misled by the Premier of the West Indies that you cannot fool people that any member in this House can amend these Regulations; so do not fool yourself. This can only be done by you and that is why I do not vote for Regulations, because where I have no power to amend anything, I am not voting for it. We cannot amend one single Regulation; we either have to throw them all out or pass them; therefore Government must amend these Regulations.

Mr. Chairman, you have set out the number of officers of each Church - The Cathedral, St. Joseph's Church, St. Aidans etc. - and I suggest that you take this number and decide to give those employed not less than \$9 and put them on to the provisions in Section 3, so that instead of the City Council having \$11,644 for salaries, it would have \$12,644 or whatever the amount may be, so that they would be in a similar position as the clergymen. I am in wholehearted agreement with the Government in bringing this Resolution for the Clergymen, although as the Premier said the Church should have been disendowed long ago. We have different views, but respect each other's opinions on this matter; but while I agree with that, do you think it is right to keep all these subordinates suffering because you have by your Regulations tied the hands of the Local Government? It is not fair to say that it is the fault of the Local Government.

The question that Head XIX Ecclesiastical stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.45 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$13,635 do now pass.

Hon. L. St. A. THORNE: 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. L. St. A. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE FIRE SERVICE BILL, 1960

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: To move the House into Committee on a Bill to constitute a Fire Service for the island and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

On the last occasion, Clauses 1 to 13 inclusive, were passed.

Clause 14 was under consideration at the moment of interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed in Committee, Mr. BRYAN in the Chair.

Clause 14 was called and passed.

Clauses 15 to 21 inclusive were called separately and passed.

Clause 22 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 22 stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, on a previous occasion, in our discussion of this Bill on this Section, we said that it required light being shed on it. Our point was this. Who is to determine what is a sufficient number of members of the Police Force to attend at a Fire for the purpose of assisting the Service in the execution of their duties under this Act? The Chief Fire Officer may request "X" as a sufficient number, but the Commissioner of Police may think that "X" is not a proper number and that the number should be "Y". If there is a divergence of opinion, especially if there is an appreciable difference between the two numbers, who is to determine what is a sufficient number? As I have said, I threw out the suggestion to the Hon. Premier and I do not know if he has further considered it and further discussed it with the Chief Fire Officer and the Commissioner of Police as to whose decision is to be the ultimate one as to the sufficient number of members of the Police Force to attend at a particular fire by virtue of this sub-clause 1, of Section 22.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that it would be obvious that the Commissioner of Police is Head of his establishment and therefore, depending on the exigencies of the service, he will decide that 20, 30 or 40 or whatever the case may be would be a sufficient number; he will send that number and the Chief Officer would have to accept that number. The Fire Officer may ask for any particular number. Perhaps he may only say: "Send me some men", and leave it in the hands of the Commissioner of Police to send a sufficient number.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am grateful to hear from the Hon. Premier how he feels it would be done, but it must be remembered how the Section is worded. It says:

"The Chief Fire Officer or any other superior officer of the Service may in case of fire, request the Commissioner of Police to detail a sufficient number of the members of the Police Force to attend at the fire for the purpose of assisting the Service in the execution of their duties under this Act, and on receipt of such request the Commissioner of Police shall make available a sufficient number of men as requested."

I wonder if that is acceptable to the Chief Fire Officer that when he makes a request under this Section to the Commissioner of Police to detail a sufficient number of men, it would be left to the Commissioner, and not at all to him, to decide what is the number of men which would be adequate. If that is acceptable to the Chief Fire Officer, well, obviously, it would be acceptable to me and members on this side; but it is obvious that there will be cases in which there will be divergence of opinion; therefore, I thought it wise to get from the Hon. Premier what is his opinion. I now understand from him that it is the Commissioner of Police who will decide on the number and not the Chief Fire Officer.

The question that Head 22 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 23 to 25 inclusive were called separately and passed.

5.55 p.m.

Clauses 26 and 27 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 28 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 28 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, this Clause is one in respect of which I would like to hear the Premier in his capacity as Minister of Finance. The purpose of this Clause is to ensure that all fines imposed on firemen shall be paid over to the Accountant General and placed by him in the Savings Bank to the credit of a fund to be called the "Fire Service Reward Fund", and the Governor-in-Executive Committee may apply this fund and the interest thereon in making special reward to the members of the Service, except the superior officers, who have rendered exceptional, dangerous or arduous service. What I am wondering about this Fund is this; it is for a worthy cause, but if, due to the good conduct of members of the Fire Service, the Fund is in an extremely depleted condition - in other words, if there is little money in the Fund because of the few fines which are imposed, if there are occasions when it is felt that men who have rendered exceptional, dangerous or arduous service should be suitably rewarded and then there is very little money in the Fund, I should like to know from what source will the rewards come. I take it that a case which is worthy of reward would not be neglected; but if the Fund is in a bankrupt condition, that case cannot be rewarded from this source.

We do not want it to be felt that firemen will be fined unfairly so as to boost up the Fund. I am enquiring if the Minister of Finance, on finding that this Fund is below the level where it can be of any appreciable help in order to provide special rewards in cases where members of the Fire Service have rendered exceptional, dangerous or arduous service, will have some other means of bolstering up this Fund, whether he would be prepared to provide some reward or whether he would find some other means of putting money into this Fund. So long as we concede that it is a worthy cause to reward firemen for rendering exceptional, dangerous or arduous service, we should not have it to be said that several firemen were deserving of the reward but there was nothing in the Fund with which to reward them. If there is no Fund and there is no money with which to reward these men, would they have to go unrewarded in these circumstances? I am wondering if the Minister of Finance has any comment to make as to that point which I have put before the Committee.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, this Section has been taken from a similar Section in the Police Act. The Police Act provides for such a Fund and it is a very similar fund to what we have here. This Fund has been going on for quite a long time; it has been under the control of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, and this Fund in the Bill now before us will be run on similar lines as that which exists in respect of the Police Force. As to the Government making any addition to that Fund, that has never been done and I cannot say at this stage that the Government will make any contribution to this Fund. I was speaking to the Fire Officer not so long ago, and I think that they are running a place where they are selling drinks and so on and a portion of the profits will go to this Fund. I cannot say that the Government will make any contribution to this Fund.

Mr. BRANCKER: But if you are selling things on a non-profit basis, there is nothing which should be left over; however, since I have drawn the matter to the attention of the Committee, I hope that the Hon. Minister will bear in mind such a contingency as I have mentioned. Where there is nothing in the Fund, and where there are suitable cases which are eminently worthy of reward, they should have that reward. The Hon. Premier mentioned the case of the Police Fund; but I would like to say that there are many more people to be fined there than in the Fire Service. It is therefore easy to swell the Fund in that case more so than in the case of the Firemen. It is not difficult for the Fund in respect of the Police Force to be kept in a healthy condition as compared with the Fire Service Fund where there are so few firemen to be fined.

The question that Clause 28 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 29 and 30 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 31 was called.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 31 stand part of the Bill.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, as to this Clause, I would like to know if the Premier is satisfied that the present complement of men in the Fire Service is adequate. The auxiliary firemen whom this section gives the Governor the power to appoint, are people who may be called out for service in the Service whenever the Chief Fire Officer considers that their services are necessary. That means that these auxiliary firemen have got to be just as available as any other firemen because it is laid down that whenever the Chief Fire Officer wants them, their services are to be available. I am wondering if this does not mean that you are relieving yourself of a certain amount of financial burden at the expense of the individual. Certainly any auxiliary fireman who is in a job - and I presume that these auxiliary firemen will be following some other avocation - is likely to be called out whenever there is a shortage of staff just as any whole time fireman.

6.05 p.m.

I am wondering if consideration should not be given to an increase in the Fire Service in the regular number of personnel instead of these auxiliary firemen, because I can well see that a hardship may result in certain cases. If for instance a man is employed, and I am assuming some of the auxiliary firemen will be employed otherwise, and he is suddenly called out, what is the position with his job? Will the law provide, as he is called out as an auxiliary fireman, that that would not be a ground for dismissal from the job he holds? If that could be deemed to be a law to be called out as an auxiliary fireman, an employer might not use that as a ground for dismissing him for neglect of duty; but that is the sort of thing which obviously cannot continue indefinitely, because if the employee is called upon every now and again to leave whatever his work is, then the employer is going to find some other ground for dispensing with his services, and again it could not be regarded as fair to the employer of this auxiliary fireman; so I wonder if consideration has been given to an increase in the permanent staff of the Fire Service which would at least cause the number of auxiliary firemen to be reduced to the barest minimum, so that it might just be possible to find one or two young unemployed young people who can be called out at any moment, who would not at the same time in responding to a call have to sacrifice any other private duty or calling which they are following and be available to assist in the duty of the business with the Fire Service. If there are only one or two young people, then they in due process of time might well be drafted into the Fire Service; otherwise you will agree that a hardship might well be caused either to the individuals themselves who are engaged in other occupations, or to the employers of those individuals in cases where they are employed.

On the standpoint of permanent employment, Mr. Chairman, it is always better if a public servant is a whole-time employee to ensure not only that he has such emoluments as are associated with the job, but also that he can live up to the standard and be amenable to the *esprit de coeur* and the discipline of the particular service or Department to which he is connected. The fewer the number of auxiliary firemen and the greater the number of permanently employed firemen on the staff, I think, will be the better in the interest of the Fire Service of the island and the community as a whole.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to that question, I do not think the hon. member need worry about the auxiliary firemen. It was tried out at the new station in St. James and has proved very unsuccessful, and the hon. member should remember. In fact the

recruiting was tried out without success; and if the hon. member will remember, just about two or three weeks ago we had to come back to this House for additional firemen for the staff at the St. James Station.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for that reply and I am sorry to hear that it was tried out, as I understand the hon. member to say, without success. Can I say that I anticipated that in connection with the additional firemen to which the Hon. Premier has alluded? I think perhaps Government has in mind in the next Five Year Plan one or two additional fire stations, and these men would be trained perhaps to get ready to man these stations. Anyhow, I take it we will soon have some revelation about that. That is perhaps how I will also get to know about the new site for the St. Lucy Post Office.

The question that Clause 31 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 32 to 44 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 45 was called. It reads as follows:—

45.(1) The Governor-in-Executive Committee may make regulations for the purposes of this Act.

(2) Without prejudice to the generality of the power conferred by subsection (1) of this section regulations made under this section may provide for —

- (a) the conditions of service of members of the Service;
- (b) the discipline and training of members of the Service;
- (c) the rates of payment for auxiliary firemen;
- (d) regulating appeals against dismissal or other disciplinary action;
- (e) the grant to auxiliary firemen of medicines, medical comforts and medical attendance at the public expense;
- (f) the grant to auxiliary firemen of pensions and gratuities in accordance with subsection (2) of section thirty-six and the terms and conditions upon which such grant may be made;
- (g) the award to the dependants of auxiliary firemen of pensions or gratuities in accordance with subsection (3) of section thirty-six, and the terms and conditions upon which such award may be made;
- (h) the proficiency test to be taken by members of the Service before re-enlistment.

(3) Any regulations made under this section shall be laid before each House of the Legislature as soon as possible after they are made, and if either House, within the period of forty days beginning with the day on which the regulations are laid before it, resolves that the regulations shall be annulled, the regulations shall thenceforth be void without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done thereunder or to the making of new regulations.

In reckoning any such period of forty days as aforesaid no account shall be taken of any time during which the Legislature is dissolved or prorogued."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 45 stand part.

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

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, Clause 3 at the top of page 26 states that these Regulations made under this Section shall be laid before each House of the Legislature as soon as possible after they are made....."

6.15 p.m.

Frankly, I will just make this comment. I do not like the phrase, "as soon as possible", knowing how long recently it takes before certain things which should be laid before the House have been laid. I would like a stated time instead of the phrase "as soon as possible".

The question that Clause 45 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 46, 47 and 48 were called separately and passed.

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. StA. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SAVINGS BANK BILL, 1960

Mr. DEPUTY Speaker: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: Second reading of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill seeks to increase the salary at present paid to the Accountant of the Savings Bank. Such increase is to have effect as from the 1st April, 1959.

Now, Sir, two or three years ago a Committee was appointed to go into the duties of the various Accountants in the different departments and that Committee reported sometime ago. The Committee reported on the work done by the several Accountants, and recommended certain increases of salary. Well, Sir, as regards the other Accountants in the different departments of Government, theirs could be handled easily by amending the Civil Establishment Act by Orders being brought down for them and that was done; but in the case of the Accountant of the Savings Bank, as hon. members know, the Savings Bank operates under an Act and therefore in order for the Accountant to get the benefit of this increase, we have to come and amend the Act.

I repeat, that in the case of the other Accountants theirs could easily be done by ordinary Civil Establishment Orders and that was done; but in the case of this Accountant, this can only be done by amending this Act. That shortly, is the history of this and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that there is any quarrel about this Bill either in its provisions or in its objects. I think the Hon. Premier has quite adequately explained why the House is asked to pass this Bill, but one thing sprang to my mind when I first saw it and it is this. Is the Government quite certain that in doing this it will not somehow or the other stir up jealousy in other Departments among Civil Servants who feel they do comparable work and who feel that their salary should be placed on a comparable scale? I do not know what other Departments they are which have people of comparable status, but I know that there must be some. I just want an assurance from the Hon. Premier that this matter has been gone into and no such claim will arise. One of the difficulties of adjusting the salary of one particular Civil Servant is not that he may not deserve it, but the real difficulty is that others whose claims may be lying dormant may then stake out their claim on the very reason that they were keeping silent until such a case arose. He cannot be expected to say that he does not know that it would not happen but it is only just this fear that a matter which may be lying dormant may only be drawn to the attention of the Government when somebody else sees that somebody else's claim has been established and has been given legal sanction to adjust it and it would be very bad

then to withhold sanction from any just claim which may arise.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I think the fears of the hon. member may be dispelled because I have said before that we had a Committee appointed which went into this matter of salaries of the various Accountants in the various Government Departments and that Committee reported; and, as I have said, the others could be done by Civil Establishment Orders and they were attended to. I have here before me a file showing where the Accountants of the Department of Inland Revenue have received similar treatment as well as the Accountants of the Post Office, the Public Works Department, the Department of Highways and Transport, the Accountants of the General Hospital, of the Department of Science and Agriculture, of the Controller of Supplies and of the Department of Medical Services.

6.25 p.m.

You will see, therefore, that there are quite a few others whose salaries were increased and there were no repercussions. The gentleman who is holding this post is now being considered because the Act had to be amended so that this increased salary could be given to him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I wanted to ask if this salary is to be paid to this Accountant in view of the fact that all the other anomalies have been rectified. Will this increase be retrospective?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Yes.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Although this Act is providing for an increase to this Accountant, was it not possible to second an officer while he was drawing a different salary for doing the work here? You had an officer doing this job while all the accountants and auditors were getting this increased salary. I see that this increased salary will be retroactive, but could you not, from the service, second another officer to be Accountant there and he would be drawing the salary greater than what is attached to this office?

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

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

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

The question was put and agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

The three Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. R. G. MAPP, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 7 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:- To move the second reading of a Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the year ended the 31st day of March, 1960.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is the regular Appropriation Bill. It is the usual Bill which comes down to us at this time of the year. It deals with the supplementary provisions which were made during the previous year. We are all quite well acquainted with this Bill; as I say, it is a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the colony for the year ended 31st March, 1960. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BRYAN being in the Chair.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, the Preamble was postponed.

6.35 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. L. St. A. THORNE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee, and Mr. DEPUTY 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.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 31st May, 1960 at 12 noon.

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

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

6.40 p.m.