

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th August, 1947

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 o'clock noon to-day.

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER (*Deputy Speaker*), Dr. J. A. LEV. WILSON, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, F. L. WALCOTT, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., H. D. BLACKMAN, E. D. MOTTLEY, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., and V. C. GALE.

After prayers, Messrs. GARNER and S. A. WALCOTT enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 12th August, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

DOCUMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Colonial Treasurer his Financial Report for the month of July, 1947.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. SPRINGER (On behalf of Mr. ADAMS): Resolution for the sum of six hundred pounds to meet the cost of sending a delegation to Surinam to investigate the possibility of sending Barbadian labour for agricultural work there.

Special Resolution under the Provisions of Section 2 of the Colonial Secretary's Office Act, 1903, as amended by Section 2 of the Colonial Secretary's Office (Amendment) Act, 1947.

Mr. SPRINGER (On behalf of Mr. CRAWFORD): Resolution for the sum of five thousand one hundred and thirty-one pounds to meet the cost of converting into office accommodation the top floor of the steamers warehouse recently acquired by government from Messrs. Da Costa & Co., Ltd.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for the sum of one thousand and seven pounds to cover the cost of courses in Jamaica for two sanitary inspectors and one public health nurse.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for a sum not exceeding ten pounds to meet the transportation expenses incurred in sending an inmate of the St. Andrew's Almshouse to school for the deaf and dumb in Trinidad.

Mr. SPRINGER (On behalf of Mr. ADAMS): Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882 (1882-2) as amended by the Petroleum (Amendment) Act, 1942 (1942-1).

Bill to amend the Colonial Secretary's Office Act, 1903 (1903-5).

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

Mr. SPRINGER: Of my intention to move the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 later in the day in order to take Order No. 11 out of its place.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882 (1882-2) as amended by the Petroleum (Amendment) Act, 1942 (1942-1) is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, a Bill to amend the Colonial Secretary's Office Act, 1903 (1903-5) is read a first time.

Mr. WARD enters the House and takes his seat.

THE QUARANTINE BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill relating to Quarantine and similar matters.

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

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the junior member for St. Andrew is appointed Chairman of Committees for the first part of the day's sitting.

THE QUARANTINE BILL

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. COX, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill relating to Quarantine and similar matters, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Messrs. TALMA and WILKINSON enter the House and take their seats.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

Clause 5. (1) The Governor-in-Executive Committee may make regulations, with respect to the whole or any part of the Colony, including the port and coastal water thereof, for preventing—

- (a) danger to public health from ships or aircraft or persons or things therein, arriving at any place; and
- (b) the spread of infection by means of any ship or aircraft about to leave any place, or by means of any person or thing about to leave any place in any ship or aircraft.

(2) Without prejudice to the generality of the powers conferred by subsection (1) of this section, regulations under that subsection may, for the purposes therein set forth, make provision for all or any of the following matters that is to say:—

- (a) the collection and transmission of epidemiological and sanitary information;
- (b) the signals to be displayed by ships or aircraft;
- (c) the questions to be answered and information (whether oral or documentary) to be supplied by masters, commanders and other persons who are or have been on board any ship or aircraft or are desirous of boarding any ship or aircraft;
- (d) the detention of ships or aircraft and of persons who and of things which are or have been on board them or any of them;
- (e) the destruction of things which are or have been on board any ship or aircraft;
- (f) the duties to be performed by masters, commanders and other persons who are or have been on board any ship or aircraft or who are desirous of boarding any ship or aircraft;
- (g) authorising the making of charges and providing for the recovery of charges and expenses;
- (h) the enforcement of the regulations;
- (i) the conferring on appropriate officers of powers to board ships and aircraft and to enter premises.

(3) Regulations made under subsection (1) of this section shall not have any force or effect until confirmed by resolution of the Legislature.

(4) The regulations contained in the First and Second Schedules hereto shall be deemed to have been made and confirmed under the provisions of this section.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that that be Clause 5 of the Bill.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—Sub-clause (3) of this clause states:—"Regulations made under subsection (1) of this section shall not have any force or effect until confirmed by resolution of the Legislature." It seems to me that that is the other way around. As a rule, regulations which are made under existing laws, have the force of law until they are approved by the Houses of the Legislature. If an emergency regulation dealing with an epidemic is made under this Act, it will not, according to this

sub-clause, have the force of law until it has been confirmed by resolution of the Legislature. I would like to ask the introducer of this Bill whether there is any particular reason for wording this sub-clause in this manner, especially having regard to the fact that in these days there is quick transportation from place to place.

Mr. SPRINGER: I am not an authority on this subject nor is my honourable friend who introduces this Bill. I can only tell the junior member for St. James that the wording of sub-clause 3 is very clear. Whoever drafted it deliberately intended that any regulations made under sub-clause 1 of this Clause shall be null and void until they are confirmed by the Legislature. As to the reason for it I can only surmise and my surmise is not worth anything more than anybody else's.

Mr. HAYNES: I quite appreciate the difficulty of the junior member for St. James but in a matter of this sort I think it will be putting too much power in the hands of the Director of Medical Services as, I presume, he will be known in the future. After all, why can't a meeting of the House be summoned—the Speaker has full power to do so—in the event of an emergency arising and settle a question of this sort? I think, as the senior member for St. George said, this sub-clause has been worded like this for a proper reason and that was the impression I had when it was read before the General Board of Health.

The question that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 6. (1) Subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, the Quarantine Authority may make rules for implementing or carrying into effect any regulations in force by virtue of section five of this act, and for supplementing any such regulations as regards any matters for which the Quarantine Authority may deem it expedient to provide with a view to carrying into effect the purposes set forth in subsection (1) of that section.

(2) Without prejudice to the generality of the powers conferred by subsection (1) of this section, rules under that subsection may, for the purposes therein set forth, make provision for all or any of the following matters that is to say—

- (a) regulating the granting or withdrawal of pratique;
- (b) regulating the issuing of bills of health, certificates, and other documents;
- (c) the governance of quarantine mooring stations, anchorages and berthing places and of places where persons or things are detained or taken for examination and of places used for the observation or isolation of persons;
- (d) the sanitation of ports and aerodromes and their surroundings, including measures for keeping them free from rodents, mosquitoes and other vectors of disease;
- (e) fixing the charges sanctioned by regulations in force by virtue of section five of this Act and providing for their incidence.

(3) The power to make rules under this section shall be without prejudice to any power to make regulations under that sub-section may, for the purposes therein set that rules shall not have any force or effect if and to the extent that they are at any time inconsistent with any regulations in force by virtue of section five of this Act.

(4) Rules made by the Quarantine Authority under this section shall not have any force or effect unless approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that that be Clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr. SPRINGER: In seconding that motion I should like to point out that there has been an omission in sub-clause (3) of this Clause. As it is worded, it does not make sense. I second the motion in order to get the sub-clause before this Committee.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to move that the further consideration of Clause 6 be postponed.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that the further consideration of Clause 6 be postponed is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS enters the House and takes his seat.

Clauses 7 to 12 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD enters the House and takes his seat.

Clause 13. The Harbour Police shall every morning between the hours of 6 a.m. and 6.30 a.m., leave notice at the office of the Quarantine Authority of every ship anchoring in Carlisle Bay within the preceding twelve hours.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to move that that be Clause 13 of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: What about ships anchoring in the daytime? As far as I know a day carries 24 hours, not 12 hours.

Mr. SPRINGER: I take it that it is not necessary for the Harbour Police to give notice of ships anchoring in the daytime because everybody will be able to see ships that come during the day. But it will be necessary to give notice of those ships which anchor in the night when we all are supposed to be asleep.

The question that Clause 13 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 14 to 20 inclusive and Regulations 1 to 18 inclusive of the first schedule are read and are agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 be reconsidered for this reason. I am going to suggest that we report progress and ask leave to sit again, otherwise we shall occupy the whole of this day's sitting with the reading of this Bill.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second the motion for the reconsideration of Clause 6.

The question that Clause 6 be reconsidered is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: There is a printer's error in regard to Clause 6. I beg to move that the words "that sub-section may for the purposes therein set" occurring in line 3 of sub-section 3 be deleted and that the words "section five of this Act and *vice versa* provided" be inserted in the blank.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to accept the amendment.

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, Clause 6, as amended, stands part of the Bill.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, the Chairman reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

REFUND OF CUSTOMS DUTY TO MESSRS. D. M. SIMPSON. & CO.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I ask leave to postpone the further consideration of the Resolution for £873. 13. 5. as a refund of Customs import duty and package tax to Messrs. D. M. Simpson & Co., on machinery and accessories imported for the manufacture of fuel from megasse.

There being no objection, the further consideration of the Resolution is postponed.

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE TO GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution is for the sum of £21,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to pay a cost of living allowance to persons in receipt of pensions from the Government with effect from the 1st April, 1946, and until the 31st March, 1948.

Inasmuch as members on the other side of the House—and I am thinking more especially of the junior member for St. Michael—have been pressing for some time that the Government should give pensioners the same cost of living allowance as it gave to persons who are still in the Civil Service, I should like to say that there is a phase of these matters which even members of this House, apart from the general public, are apt to forget. Matters which involve questions of principle and the expenditure of large sums of money have first to be sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and this question of cost of living allowance to pensioners has been the subject of correspondence for some considerable time with the Colonial Office; so that if the Government seems to be tardy in sending down this Resolution, honourable members must remember that we are not yet a republic. We still have to listen to the Colonial Office whether we like it or not in some respects. The proposal of the Government is that this cost of living allowance shall be retrospective from the 1st April, 1946, because it is only fair that pensioners should get the same advantage as members of the Civil Service got. It is proposed that the rate on the first £100 of pension on part thereof shall be 50 per cent. and the rate on the second £100 or part thereof shall be 40 per cent. The principle of confining it to the first £200, as honourable members know, has been put forward by the Government and accepted by the Legislature during the War. As honourable members will see from the schedule, the terms and conditions are that after the date of the passing of this Resolution no pensioner shall be entitled to receive war bonus in addition to the allowance to which he shall be entitled under this Resolution. The amount of the allowance to which any pensioner shall be entitled under this Resolution in respect of any period between the 1st April, 1946, and the date of the passing of this Resolution shall be re-

duced by the amount of any war bonus received by such pensioner in respect of the said period. It is clear that a pensioner cannot get war bonus and cost of living allowance too. If he has been receiving war bonus, it will be deducted from what he receives under this Resolution and the maximum is £90. I have much pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. GALE: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—I am very glad to see that at long last this Resolution is before us but I would like to know one or two things in connection with it. Last week, I think, I received a reply from the Government that it is within their knowledge that twelve pensioners died since these arrangements were being made. I would like to know whether it is contemplated giving this cost of living allowance to the estates of those deceased pensioners. It does seem fair to me, Sir, because the delay seems to be the fault of the Government. Had it not been for that delay those pensioners would have received this allowance. I am speaking in respect of the period 1st April, 1946, until the date of the death of the respective pensioners.

Mr. ADAMS: Without appearing to be facetious I would say that it is rather unfortunate that those pensioners should have gone and died and so brought about this complication which the Government has not considered. The most I will tell the honourable member is that I will bring his suggestion to the notice of the Government for its consideration. Perhaps I should tell the honourable member that another pensioner died apparently at the same hour that he was speaking about the matter on a previous occasion; that brings the number to thirteen.

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

RESOLUTION TO MEET EXPENSES OF DELEGATES TO CLOSER ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The next Resolution is for £750 to supplement the provision in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 1947-48 under Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, item 40, Conferences. As appears from the addendum, the amount voted for Conferences has run down to very little and in view of the coming Montego Bay Conference it is estimated that a sum approximating £750 will be needed to meet the cost of passages and other expenses of the delegates and advisers from this island to the Conference. I do not know what all members of this House feel as regards the Montego Bay Conference and I hope honourable members will forgive me for saying what I am going to say because it sounds personal but if the delegates who are attending this Conference from Barbados are paid only at the ancient Colonial Office rate of 30/- a day, unless they happen to have private incomes they may find themselves in a financial difficulty. I repeat that I am in a very delicate position in making that statement but it is a matter for the House if it chooses to say that the Colonial Office is too generous or not generous enough in respect of its estimate of how much per day should be paid to any delegate. I can only put forward the Government's proposal based on a long line of precedents that when Barbados is sending delegates to a Conference or people abroad for training, it should give so much per day to Head Officials and a lesser sum to Minor Officials. Whether those sums are adequate or not I leave honourable members to decide for themselves. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman,—I have had the honour to be a member of one or two delegations from this island and I quite agree with the senior member for St. Joseph when he points out that as a rule delegates are out of pocket when they return to Barbados; it is a very uncomfortable position in which delegates find themselves. I do not know what allowance it is proposed to give to the delegates to Jamaica but if it is, as I understand the senior member for St. Joseph to say, 30/- per day each then that is totally inadequate. A delegate cannot live in Jamaica, I am sure, on \$7.20 a day. Every member of this Committee would like our representatives not to be worried over the financial end of their visit while they are representing us in Jamaica. I do not know what the rate is but while I do not want to be overgenerous I want to be liberal. I do not want our delegates to have to put their hands in their own pockets every time they want a drink in Jamaica.

Mr. WARD: I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks of the last speaker. Everyone knows that owing to the increased cost of living and transport \$7.20 a day is absolutely inadequate and we should also bear in mind that we are sending delegates to this Conference who may not be financially strong to meet any out-of-pocket expenses which may be incurred by them while representing this colony. I feel that the Government should go into this matter carefully and consider what is a liberal sum to allow each of these delegates to Jamaica, not that we want to give them too liberal a sum to enable them to spree but we want them to be able to live in the way in which delegates to a Conference should live. The Government should go into the matter again and see if it cannot make the allowance more than \$7.20 a day.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I cannot imagine a delegate being offered 30/- a day, least of all, delegates chosen by and from this House. It is a recognized fact that so far as the West Indies are concerned, Barbados leads the way in social legislation and to send our delegates to Jamaica on an allowance of 30/- a day is practically asking them to loaf. I will not be a party to that. I feel that the further consideration of this Resolution should be postponed in order to give the Executive Committee an opportunity to reconsider the matter and to let its members know that we, as members of this House of Assembly, feel that 30/- a day is not a sufficient allowance for persons representing Barbados at so important a conference. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed, with the view of letting the Executive Committee know that the feeling of the House is that this allowance should be increased. I make that motion if I stand alone.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to second the motion for the postponement of the further consideration of this Resolution. Those of us who have had opportunities to travel, especially in recent years, will understand that this allowance is far below what will be required. The average cost of hotel accommodation to-day in strange places is \$6 or \$7 a day and I am saying that the lowest rate of allowance which this Government should send to this House for these delegates is 50/- per day and 50/- per day is, to my mind, nothing with which these delegates can go around and raise flags. There is a peculiar feeling in the world to-day that one must do more tipping than one pays for even one's service; one is expected, when one gets up from the table at which one has been served, to leave a couple of bobs on it, and it is *infra dig* to ask our delegates to go Jamaica on an allowance of 30/- a day, except they are going

there to some organization that is in the habit of doing funds. I second the motion for the postponement with the view that the Executive Committee will reconsider this Resolution and raise the amount in accordance with the views expressed by this Committee.

Mr. GALE: I quite agree with the remarks of the honourable members who have been talking about the necessity for a larger amount to provide hotel accommodation, passages and so forth for the delegates. There is no doubt about it that the minimum for which one can get hotel accommodation in the West Indies to-day — I have had such accommodation lately — is about \$8.00 a day and I think that the amount set out here is rather small. At the same time, I do not think that we would be doing the best thing if we postpone this Resolution because there is not very much time before these delegates leave for Jamaica and I certainly think that this House would be quite prepared, if this amount is proved to be insufficient, to pass a supplementary Resolution for the difference. By that time, the expenses of the delegates would be known and the Government can easily send a supplementary Resolution to this House for the extra amount, if any.

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to make my position clear. The only amount that I know to be official is 30/- per day. I think that representations have been made to the Colonial Office on certain occasions and the amount was increased to £2 in one instance, but the official amount has been 30/- per day. I have not specially enquired from the Administration whether it made its calculation on that basis or not but I have done some calculation of my own and it seems to me that this amount is arrived at on the basis of 30/- a day. I think I can say without any breach of confidence that the Administration puts itself entirely in the hands of the House in this matter. If the Legislature say that they feel that this allowance is insufficient, the Administration is perfectly prepared to go by whatever intimation the House gives it; that is to say, if the Colonial Office's figure is only 30/- or £2, the Administration is prepared to say that the House feels that in keeping with the dignity of the island, the allowance should be £3 and will be prepared to give it. Last year when I went to the St. Thomas Conference, the Windward and Leeward Islands delegates informed me that although the Colonial Office's figure was 30/-, they asked for at least \$15 American Currency per day and got it. I think that if I report to the Administration that the House feels that in keeping with the dignity of the occasion and the position of Barbados in relation to the West Indies generally, the delegates should not be put in an embarrassing position financially, I feel pretty sure that the Executive Committee will send back down a Resolution for the increased amount. If that is the general feeling of honourable members I will accept the proposal for the postponement of the further consideration of this Resolution.

Mr. WARD: I do not think it is necessary to postpone this Resolution for this reason. We are sending these delegates and two advisers to Jamaica and they are supposed to be there for 14 days. Suppose we allowed them £5 each day, that will amount to £350 for the 14 days and the passages will hardly cost £400; so that the £750 will meet the expenses for two weeks. As regards the remarks of the junior member for St. Peter I do not believe in the Government doing any tipping. I feel that if the delegates want to give tips, they should do so out of their own pockets. What we should do is to pay their passages and hotel accommodation and give them pocket money. £5 or £6 per day for the last mentioned purpose is, to my mind, thoroughly adequate. I repeat that I do not think it is necessary to postpone this Resolution. I feel that all that is necessary is to bring to the

notice of the Administration that the House is in favour of an increase in the allowance to the delegates and that will cover everything. If any extra money is needed, the Government can always come back to this House with a supplementary Resolution for the amount.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to ask the senior member for St. Joseph a question in connection with this matter and it is this: Has any provision been made in the fixing of this amount for a Secretary or some person of that nature to the delegation? I do not intend to make any further remarks until I get an answer to that question.

Mr. RAMSAY: Before the senior member for St. Joseph replies I want to say to the senior member for St. Lucy that these delegates are going to Jamaica not in their own interest but in the interest of Barbados and I fail to see why Barbados should not look after them in the proper way, — the way in which the senior member for St. Lucy would look after himself if he was absent from the island. I go further than that. These delegates will not be in control of the island of Jamaica and I would like to know if a special plane will be put at their disposal to take them back home when they are ready to return. Parsimony must be left entirely out of the matter. These delegates are important people in this community and they must be given every facility to stay in Jamaica in a manner worthy of this island. To talk about multiplying 5 delegates by 14 days is balderdash because we can never tell how long they are going to be required to remain in Jamaica. Let these delegates go to Jamaica as men and not as persons who will be expecting charity to be dispensed to them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Before I made my motion for the postponement of this Resolution I ascertained from the senior member for St. Joseph what the calculation was and I think he made it clear that the calculation was at the rate of 30/- a day. It is for that reason that I made my motion because 30/- a day, I repeat, is out of the question. As regards the suggestion that the Government can come back to this House with a supplementary Resolution for any extra amount that is needed, I, if I were one of these delegates, would refuse to go on that condition. How can the Government ask the Leader of this House, the Attorney General, the Acting Colonial Secretary, and the other two gentlemen to keep a record of the number of times they sent cables to this island or gave tips to persons in Jamaica? I do not think the most reactionary conservative in this island would approve of such a policy. I repeat that the reason for my motion to postpone the Resolution is to let the Administration know that the feeling of this House is that the members of this delegation should be given such an allowance as would enable them to feel like men, like real Barbadians. Let us imagine a delegate to this Conference from Trinidad ordering a round of drinks and the senior member for St. Joseph ordering water (Laughter). That is no joke. Jamaica, it is well known, is seven-eighths Americanised and the practice of tipping in Jamaica is as prevalent as it is in America itself. And you can imagine, with the number of tourists visiting Jamaica, what the cost of living is like. Even in Barbados 30/- a day for hotel accommodation is out of the question unless one is going to live at a fifth class hotel. I appeal to honourable members not to pass the Resolution as it is to-day but let it go back to the Executive Committee with the view of having the amount of the allowance increased.

Mr. GALE: When I suggested not to postpone this Resolution I was thinking that the members of the delegation would be leaving the island shortly. If they are going away at the end of this month, we will be having only one more meeting of this House

before the end of the month and it may be that that meeting will not be held for want of a quorum, in which case instead of £750 being at the Government's disposal for this purpose, there will be nothing at all. Those are my reasons for having suggested that the Resolution should not be postponed. I quite agree that we do not want to be parsimonious in this matter. We want our delegates to go and acquit themselves like men and to be given a proper allowance to enable them to do so. It will be absolutely impossible for these delegates to go to Jamaica and live in a first class hotel, as they ought, on less than \$20 a day.

Mr. WARD: I still feel that it is not necessary to postpone this Resolution. As the junior member for St. Michael said we may not have a quorum at our next meeting and there will be no money available for this purpose. I am sorry that the junior member for St. Peter misconstrued what I said. I am perfectly sure that if the Government allowed these delegates £5 each per day, they will be satisfied. Give them so many pounds for their hotel accommodation and for pocket money and if the £750 proved to be insufficient, we can always pass a supplementary Resolution for the extra amount.

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to say, in reply to the question of the senior member for St. Peter, that it had been brought to the notice of the Administration that possibly some secretarial aid to the delegation will be necessary and enquiry has been made of the Government of Jamaica in the matter. I do not know whether the feeling of the House is that we should take our own secretary or whether we should have enough money to engage somebody in Jamaica. However, the Government has made enquiry as to the possibility of getting secretarial aid in Jamaica.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am not dealing at length with this point like we dealt with the point about the insufficiency of the allowance but I feel that in view of the importance of this Conference and of the fact that we are sending a delegation of five persons to it, it is essential that a secretary should accompany them. The reasons are obvious. If there is going to be any co-ordination among these five delegates, then there must be a means of bringing that co-ordination to a proper head and to be able to do so, it seems to me that they must have secretarial assistance. When they get to Jamaica they are going to find an over-all secretariat but those of us who have been following the activities of delegates all over the world realize that when they leave their respective countries they take with them their staffs and do not rely on the countries in which the conference is being held to furnish them with secretarial aid. I regard this as an important Conference and the taking of a secretary will be a means of bringing back something concrete. Delegates in the past have visited other places and when they come back, the people hear nothing, as far as the delegates are concerned. At this stage of our history we should make a break with the past and let someone accompany this delegation as secretary. I do not agree with the postponement of the Resolution on practical grounds; it is not essential to do so. Honourable members know that this amount is not sufficient and a supplementary Resolution can be sent down for the extra money. I feel that the Government will take action on the principle which has been enunciated by honourable members and that being so, we should pass the Resolution to-day.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I am not in agreement with the postponement of this Resolution. We may not get a quorum next Tuesday and it places these delegates in a very uncomfortable position to have to go to the Executive Committee and ask for money

for themselves. At the same time I should like the Administration to know the feeling of the House in this matter, that is, that these delegates should not receive an allowance of less than £4 or £5 per day and I should like the senior member for St. Joseph to tell the Government that this House feels that 30/- should not be taken into consideration at all and that our delegates should get at least £4 or £5 per day.

The question that this Resolution be postponed is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, RAMSAY, and MOTTLEY—10.

Noes: Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, CRAWFORD, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, WARD, and Mr. SPEAKER—7.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. COX, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of one Resolution and the postponement of two in Committee of Supply and asks leave to sit again.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Resolution which is passed in Committee of Supply is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

THE BOATMEN, CARTERS, AND PORTERS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George, —Second reading of a Bill to amend the Boatmen, Carters, and Porters Act, 1891 (1891-10).

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker,—The purpose of this Bill ultimately is to produce an increase in the rate of fares to be paid to porters, carters, and boatmen of passenger boats for hire in Bridgetown. It is proposed that the Act itself be amended so as to delete the schedule of fares set forth in the Act and to provide that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall make regulations from time to time, to be approved by the Legislature, to alter the fares concerned. I think this is very much in the interest of the boatmen and carters and I am pretty sure that if it had not been necessary for the Act to be amended, it is highly probable that these fares would have been changed before now. If this Bill is passed, then it will be followed by a Resolution to provide for a schedule of rates of an amended and more up-to-date nature. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

At this stage, 2 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER adjourns the House until 2.45 p.m. in accordance with Rule 40 (a).

REPLIES LAID.

On re-assembling,

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to questions No. 61 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew; the replies to questions No. 52 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. James; the replies to questions No. 57 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and the replies to questions No. 41 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 61 (a)

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move for the suspension of Rule 61 (a) in order to resume Government Business.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended in order to resume Government Business.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am always willing to agree to the suspension of the Rule when the Government makes out a case that there is an urgent matter which should be settled in the afternoon and that private members should give up their time; but in the absence of any attempt on the part of the Government to make out such a case, I do not see why we should give up Question Time again this afternoon. After all there is a series of questions to be dealt with; there is one put by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph which has been the subject of discussion for some time now and he has not been able to get it completed because of the frequency with which we have given up Question Time. I do not think we should do that again this afternoon.

The question that Rule 61 (a) be now suspended in order to resume Government Business was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, RAMSAY, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and WARD—14.

Noes: Messrs. BRANCKER, SMITH and WILKINSON—3.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, fourteen honourable members voting "Aye", and three honourable members voting "No."

BOATMEN, CARTERS AND PORTERS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the adjournment for lunch took place, the House was debating the motion for the second reading of a Bill to amend the Boatmen, Carters and Porters Act, 1891 (1891-10). The honourable junior member for St. Michael was speaking.

Mr. GALE: I have received the information which I required.

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

The second reading was passed.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were read and passed.

Clause 3 was read as follows:—

3. Section twelve of the Principal Act is hereby repealed and the following new section substituted therefor:—

"12. The Governor-in-Executive Committee shall make Regulations prescribing the fares to be taken by porters, carters and boatmen of passenger boats, for hire in the City of Bridgetown, the Careenage, and Carlisle Bay, and such Regulations, when approved by the Legislature and published in the Official Gazette, shall have effect as if the same were herein set forth and enacted."

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: This Clause says that the Governor-in-Executive Committee shall make Regulations prescribing the fares to be taken by porters and so on. What is worrying me is that there is no definite

assurance that the Governor-in-Executive Committee will always comprise Labour members who may know the grievances and complaints of porters, boatmen and people of that class. I was wondering if the members of the Executive Committee will comprise members of the Labour Government, who will know the grievances of these types of workers. I should like to know if the Secretaries of Unions will be incorporated here or if these workers will have at all times the representation which they have at present.

Mr. SPRINGER: The honourable member has strayed very far from our constitution; it is a novel procedure for private organizations to be law-making bodies. There is no need to come within the scope of the organizations; the Legislature has to approve of the Regulations and therefore you will have the House, which will comprise the representatives of the people, and they will have the first voice in deciding whether the Regulations will be approved or not.

Clause 3 was passed.

The remaining three Clauses of the Bill were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumed.

On motions of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. ADAMS in each case, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89.

Mr. SPRINGER: In accordance with the notice which I gave today I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be now suspended in order to proceed with Order No. 11 on the Order Paper as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. ADAMS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE SALARIES OF OFFICERS OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Order No. 11 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

The question that Order No. 11 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Special Resolution under the Provisions of Section 2 of the Education (Amendment, Act, 1943 (1943-3) as amended by the Education (Amendment) Act, 1947 (1947-15).

Mr. SPRINGER: This is a special Resolution which has been introduced in accordance with the Education Amendment Act, 1947. It provides that the salaries of all Officers of the Department of Education apart from the Director shall be provided for by special Resolution passed by the Legislature. The list includes the Assistant Director of Education, the two District Inspectors, the Inspector of Handicraft, the Inspector of Domestic Subjects and the Inspector of Infants Methods—all of whom have been provided for under the Act—and four other Officers, namely, the Principal of Erdiston Training College, the Vice-Principal of Erdiston Training College, the Woman Tutor and the Housekeeper thereof. What this House has to give its attention to today is the approval of the appointment of the Officers of Erdiston Training College at the salaries set out against their names—

£750 per annum for the Principal, £600 for the Vice Principal, £500 for the Woman Tutor and £150 for the Housekeeper. It is unnecessary at this time of day to elaborate on the importance of starting off the Training College for teachers as soon as possible; we have been waiting for it for some time. The buildings are in an advanced stage of completion and the College should be opened before the end of the year. It cannot possibly be opened before the end of the next month or two because it would be impossible to get to the staff before then. It is important to get the appointments approved as quickly as possible because it is not possible to advertise for the staff until the Legislature approves of the appointments. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: Before the question is put I should like to draw to the attention of this House and the Government that the salary of the Housekeeper of this Training College appears to be inadequate. I do not know what the duties of the Housekeeper are, but taking into consideration what domestic servants are paid it seems to me that this salary is inadequate. No explanation has been given as to the duties of the Housekeeper, but if they are to be those of a housekeeper a certain amount of book-keeping and so on will have to be done. If we are not going to have an outmoded Housekeeper but some young and efficient person, it does appear to me that \$60 a month is insufficient to pay for these duties at a College of this sort.

Mr. SPRINGER: The honourable member would be right if this salary were all her emoluments. She will be boarded and lodged and she will get the Cost of Living Allowance. When all the emoluments are taken into consideration the amount will be a reasonable one.

Mr. COX: There is only one point that I should like to make and it is in connection with the Inspector of Domestic Subjects. The salary of this post is £190 per annum rising by annual increments of £10 to £230 per annum. To my mind, this individual has a responsibility which is above that of a headmistress of an elementary school; and I see that a headmistress of an elementary school which has over 201 pupils gets £200 per annum rising to £250 per annum. I feel that the amount paid to the Inspector of Domestic Subjects should be increased because she is supposed to be in a position which is above that of a headmistress in an elementary school, and yet she is being paid a salary less than that of a headmistress. Another point is this: this individual has to move around. I know that the Government pays a travelling allowance but it might be necessary for this individual to pay a chauffeur and that entails greater responsibility. I feel that the Government should take into consideration that this individual is in a position above that of a headmistress of an elementary school and make suitable adjustments.

Mr. TALMA: I cannot be convinced that the salary proposed for the Assistant Director of Education is anywhere in keeping with that office. His salary is £650 per annum; the Director of Education is very often no better qualified either mentally or otherwise than the Assistant Director and the former gets £1,000 per annum. There is too wide a gap between the two salaries. Whenever the Director is ill or absent the Assistant Director has to perform the duties of Director and then each of them is entitled to a Cost of Living Allowance on the first £600. The salary of the Assistant Director has been wrongly fixed and you have to consider what the honourable member who has just sat down has said in connection with having to employ a chauff-

eur. It has to be remembered that work of this nature entails travelling around the island and today a chauffeur has to be paid not \$20 a month but \$40 or \$50 a month. If each of these individuals has to pay for this you can by the ordinary method of calculation find out how much he is getting. As regards Erdiston Training College, all the teachers in this island will eventually be trained there and the salary of the Principal of this College is £750 per annum. You will see if a comparison is made, that there is really no comparison whatever between the work which this individual has to do and that of the Headmaster of Combermere School, for instance. The Headmaster of Combermere School does administrative work and very little actual teaching. Despite all the support given in the Press, Combermere School is one of the worst Schools in this island as far as record is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order in bringing the status of Combermere School into this debate.

Mr. TALMA: I was thinking of the results achieved.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is out of order.

Mr. TALMA: When you compare Combermere School with other Schools and see the results achieved—

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already said that the honourable member is out of order in bringing that in. That has nothing to do with what is before the House.

Mr. TALMA: I am always willing to bow to Your Honour's ruling, but I am trying to point out that the Headmaster of Combermere School deserves less than this other individual.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is out of order.

Mr. TALMA: I was simply saying that the Principal of Erdiston Training College will have to train about three or four hundred teachers so that his work is greater than that of the Headmaster of Combermere School, a school where few scholarships are obtained. I was hoping that we would attract a better type of man—one who knows something about training teachers. The fact that you have a B.A. or an M.A. does not mean that you can train people. Some B.A.'s mean nothing; they can be bought. (Laughter). If a proper salary of, say £1,000 per annum were attached to this post, that would attract a proper type of individual who will know about training people to teach others. I fear that the members of the Executive Committee, if they are responsible for this, will not be able to attract a proper type of teacher to come here.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I will keep talking to honourable members in this Chamber because if there is anything with which you do not agree you should criticize until something is done about it. There is something unfortunate about teachers all over the world; they seem to be in the unhappy position of being paid salaries which do not seem to fall in line with those of other people in the community. We are now dealing with salaries in this special Resolution and there is a series of posts. I should like to point out that in relation to certain posts like the Inspector of Domestic Subjects, as mentioned by the honourable senior member for St. Michael, there has been the policy in the past to pay a Barbadian salary. If you believe that a local man will hold a certain post you pay him a local salary, so to speak; but if somebody from outside is going to hold it, the tax-

payers must pay a higher salary. I cannot agree in 1947 that £250 per annum is too much for a person holding the post of Inspector of Infants methods to begin with. We know how Barbadians look at \$100 per month; they think it is something excessive. I think that you should consider that people have reached a position when they can be placed in such a category. I feel that if people are not well worth what they have to be paid we should look for people with greater efficiency. I feel that the Government should be well aware of this because they say that they propose to make changes. I know that some changes have to be made. I spoke about this matter on the last occasion and I am surprised to see that they have come back to the House in the same way. A specialised post should carry the same salary whether the holder of it is a man or a woman. If you have a woman as Attorney General you pay the same salary because you are paying the salary attached to the post. I do not see that you should relegate a woman to an inferior position. I should like the honourable senior member for St. George to realise that while these salaries are not in conformity with those of the past, in 1947 we cannot have contented servants unless we pay them proper salaries. Where we have disgruntled teachers there will be the ill effects on the children.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I should like to point out that advertisements appear in the Press asking people with School Certificates to teach for 3s. a day and the salaries set out here are handsome as compared with that. Teachers who left this colony for Curacao and came back here after some time were told that they must teach for \$16 or \$18 a month. That is scandalous; but there is nothing scandalous about these salaries. The salary for the Principal of this Training College is £750 per annum plus £140 per annum as Cost of Living Allowance and if you compare that and other salaries with the salaries paid to the teaching fraternity, I feel that these are handsome salaries. As regards the salary of the Housekeeper, I have been assured by the honourable senior member for St. George that a Cost of Living Allowance will be paid and board and lodging will be provided. To my mind that salary is handsome as compared with Headteachers of elementary schools, some of whom are paid \$80 a month which is inadequate. Because you are bringing in specialised people to be appointed to these posts you are asking that they be given bigger salaries. I would first have to be satisfied that the salaries offered to the elementary school teachers more especially those who are acting, are increased before I could agree to that. I hope that this will be the last occasion on which I will have to criticise from the floor of this House what is paid to those people who are acting—

Mr. SPEAKER: You are dealing with these salaries here.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Resolution comes from the Department of Education and that is why I was dealing with it in that way. I repeat that these salaries are handsome as compared with those paid to the elementary teachers.

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

The Resolution was passed.

HOTELS AID BILL POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip.—Second reading of a Bill to encourage the Hotel Industry in this island. The honourable member is not in his place.

ADDITIONAL CLERKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to move that Order No. 12 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to make the motion.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Order No. 12 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day therefore stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—

A Resolution that His Excellency the Governor be authorised in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (2) of the Clerical Service Act, 1944 as amended by Section 2 of the Clerical Service (Amendment) Act, 1947 to appoint four additional clerks to the Clerical Staff of the Clerical Service.

Mr. BLACKMAN: This Resolution purposes to give the Governor the authority to appoint four additional clerks to the Customs Department. The Comptroller of Customs complains that on account of the increased number of ships bringing large cargoes to the island and the establishment of an additional distillery at Gregg Farm, St. Andrew, the present staff is unable to deal with the work which has to be done. The work of this Department has very considerably increased within the last ten years and the revenue has more than doubled itself within this period. The imports and exports for 1942 were £2,022,171 and £1,862,084 respectively making a total of £3,884,255; while in 1946 the imports and exports were £4,992,492 and £3,142,164 respectively making a total of £8,134,656. I just mention that to show the increase in the amount of work done by this Department. I do not think that there is any need for me to say anything more than that. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: This Resolution is in connection with the Customs Department and I want to make a general criticism. It is rather miraculous as to how the Customs Clerks are able to do their work at the Baggage Warehouse. It is a common thing to see passengers arrive at the Baggage Warehouse—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that has anything to do with this Resolution.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am bringing to the notice of the Government that I am surprised that they are not asking for more clerks to do the work.

At this point, it now being 3.30 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER stated that the time had arrived for the consideration of Private Members' Business.

ADDRESS Re DECREASE IN DAIRY FARMING POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the decrease in Dairy Farming in this Island, etc. On the last occasion the honourable senior member for St. Joseph made a motion for the adjournment of the debate on this Address and this was seconded by the honourable senior member for St. Michael and agreed to. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has the right to speak first today.

Mr. ADAMS: I have spoken to the honourable junior member for St. Peter in whose name this

Address stands and suggested to him that he might redraft it in a way in which all of us should agree that the matter be drawn to the notice of the Government, although we may not agree with the wording of the Address. I think that the honourable member agrees that we should postpone consideration of the Address until he has arrived at a different wording and we can agree that the Address be taken as the first Order of the Day next Tuesday. If that is agreeable I beg to move that the debate on the Address be further postponed.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: I hope that I will not be precluded from making my reply. (A MEMBER: No). I quite appreciate the postponement of the debate on the Address but I want to reserve the right to reply. As far as I am concerned, my idea is to bring the matter to the notice of the Government whether the Address is passed or not.

The question that the debate on this Address be further postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member is substituting a new Address for this one I suggest that it be printed and circulated.

Mr. RAMSAY: Very well, Mr. Speaker.

ORDER NOT PROCEEDED WITH

Mr. MAPP: I beg to move that Order No. 83 standing in my name be taken as the next Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that Order No. 83 be taken as the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. RAMSAY, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, ADAMS, TALMA and Dr. CUMMINS—8.

Noes: DR. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, SMITH, BLACKMAN, MOTTLEY, HAYNES, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—10.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the negative, eight honourable members voting "Aye", and ten honourable members voting "No".

ADDRESS RE DIS-ESTABLISHMENT AND GRADUAL DIS-ENDOWMENT OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the motion that an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the Dis-establishment and gradual Dis-endowment of the Anglican Church in Barbados do now pass. When this motion was last under debate, the honourable junior member for St. James moved the postponement of the debate and the honourable senior member for the City seconded that motion. The honourable junior member for St. James will have the right to speak first to-day.

Mr. WILKINSON: This debate has been going on for some weeks now and that has given honourable members an opportunity of getting in touch with people who are interested in this matter. I have discussed the matter with poor people and only two of them have told me that they are in favour of the dis-establishment and dis-endowment of the Anglican Church. I am glad that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph during the course of his speech made the point that the dis-establishment and dis-endowment of the Church is not a Party question; that it is a spiritual question and with that

I entirely agree. What we have to decide is whether it is in the best interest of the island and the people concerned to have the Church dis-established and dis-endowed. Sir, I have listened very carefully to those who are in favour of dis-establishment and dis-endowment but they have failed to convince me that we shall gain anything spiritually by it. We have heard from the honourable senior member for St. Andrew that some clergymen are not worth their salt or words to that effect, and I think that the honourable member said that the majority of clergymen are in favour of dis-establishment. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph pointed out correctly that the question of dis-establishment was never put before the Synod; if that question had been put frankly to the Synod the result would have been that they would have been in favour of leaving the Church as it is to-day. The question put before the Synod was to the effect that in the event of dis-establishment being decided upon, would the clergy do all they could to assist in introducing the necessary legislation? I cannot see how anybody could vote against that. The honourable member who is mumbling on my left has read from the "Advocate" a part of the Resolution which was passed; he did not read the whole Resolution and he read that 33 members of the clergy voted in favour of it and only 9 voted against it. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that the final vote was 50 to 25. One honourable member of this House, probably the honourable senior member for St. Andrew, said that the Bishop came here for the sole purpose of dis-establishment. That is not correct.

Mr. HAYNES: I have never said that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member said that you said it.

Mr. WILKINSON: The Bishop came here with the idea that it would be necessary, in his opinion, to have dis-establishment of the Church; he was not appointed for that purpose. (A MEMBER: Nobody said he was appointed for that purpose). I have discussed this question with a good many people in the parish of St. James as well as in the parish of St. Michael and, as I have already said, only two persons seemed to be in favour of the dis-establishment of the Church. One of them was uncertain, and one pointed out to me that it would undoubtedly cost our people more money because they would have to pay for their burials, marriages and so forth. I have not heard a single argument to convince me that we should be better off or that we should get better spiritual teaching by the dis-endowment of the Church. Let us think of the island as a whole; there is no such person as an atheist in this Chamber; everybody believes in God. Just as it is necessary to have intellectual education it is necessary to have spiritual education. Nobody has pointed out what we should gain by dis-establishment. It has been said that the Church of England is dis-established; the English Church is an established Church but it is partly dis-endowed. I should like to remind the honourable senior member for St. Joseph that he should not speak across the Table. (Mr. ADAMS: That is done in the House of Commons). If honourable members look at the Estimates which have been passed for many years in respect of the Church they will see that they have never been increased. You cannot say that the Church is forever costing more money. I do not think that I should say very much more; I ask honourable members not to make this matter a Party question but one for the good of the island as a whole. However we vote, I am convinced

that honourable members are going to take their view but let us think of the good of the people of the island.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is a very important question—one which must affect the life of every individual in this colony. The speech of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph on this question is to my mind very edifying. The honourable member made it quite clear at the beginning that this is a question on which every honourable member of this Chamber will have his own personal view. The speeches from the floor of this House on this question in the past few weeks point to the fact that undoubtedly when this Address is put to the vote it will have a free, easy passage in this Chamber. However, those of us who have our opinions in this matter should express them even although there may not be the slightest possibility of convincing honourable members who have spoken or who will speak in favour of the Address. This Address reads: "The House has the honour to draw to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the fact that the Disestablishment and Gradual Dis-endowment of the Anglican Church in Barbados is long overdue;" That is the opinion of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and he has taken the opportunity to give notice of this Address. It goes on: "considering the fact that this is probably the only community in the British Empire that has a State-paid Church. The House respectfully asks that His Excellency the Governor take immediate steps to send down Legislation to achieve this necessary change in the running of the Anglican Church."

There are several aspects of this question and I shall proceed to deal with what I consider the first one. Is it necessary or not that the people of this community should be given religious education? Sir from the speech of the honourable junior member for St. John, although it was a very short one, it seems that the people should have the benefit of some religious education. The next aspect which should be brought to bear is the economic relationship. In a community like Barbados with its density of population and with its revenue, is it too much to ask us to spend roughly £13,000 a year on spiritual education? The time will come I suppose for the dis-endowment of the Church but as to whether the time is here now I say "No". I shall give some reasons for that. About four years ago members of the Parties who today comprise the Coalition Government made it clear when campaigning about the country that there are two classes—the rich and the rest—and it is only by legislation that they would be able to compel the rich to subscribe to some sort of religious education for the rest. Until the economic status of the working people of this colony is changed they cannot afford to pay for religious education. From the report of the Diocesan Synod you find that the Government pays roughly £13,000 for the established Church; the Vestries contribute another £10,500 and the offertory or public subscription amounts to £10,000 approximately. Not even those of us who by the stroke of the pen would disendow the Church would have the temerity to say that the ministers of the Anglican Church are handsomely paid. From the statistics it would be observed that about £2,000 of the offertory is given away in poor relief. As to the work of the Church in the past I do not propose to deal with that because that is too well known.

I should like to deal firstly with the honourable senior member for St. Andrew. (A MEMBER: Deal with him briefly). I shall be brief in dealing with him. I should like to let this House know that only a few weeks ago I was going through the parish of

St. Andrew with a youngster in my car and he enquired of me as to who owns these canes and that factory. I replied that they are owned by Mr. Josh Haynes, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that that has anything to do with this debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am dealing with the economic aspect of the matter. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew is the biggest land owner and consequently the biggest taxpayer in St. Andrew—I hope that the honourable member will take this in the right spirit—and he would be the biggest employer in that parish—

Mr. HAYNES: I object to those remarks; I am not the biggest land owner or taxpayer in St. Andrew; there are others who own more land and pay more taxes. There are Messrs. S. P. Musson, Son & Co., Ltd.,—

Mr. SPEAKER: I told the honourable member that this has nothing to do with the merits of the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said I am dealing with the disendowment of the Church from the economic aspect. I will refer to Messrs. Musson Son & Co. Ltd.,—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member should refer to the holdings without referring to the owners of them if there is any point in doing that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It seems impossible for me to deal with the matter unless I mention individual holdings.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can say that there are many holdings but you need not mention the owners of them.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I was saying that there are people like the honourable senior member for St. Andrew who say that the Church should be disendowed, but when the Church was established and endowed in those days, whatever may have been the tenets or the laws laid down, they seemed to serve the opposite purpose which they were intended to serve. I know that I am making a peculiar speech but these are my sentiments. The point I am making is this: if it is an acknowledged fact that there are the "rich" and the "rest" and it has been proved that the rich are but a very small minority it is only by statute that you can compel them to give the necessary financial support to the Church even if they lend any other support to it. The large holders and employers in the various parishes control the purse strings and the money which annually contributed to the Church comes through the Vestries Act as taxes have to be paid. From that angle, if the Church is disendowed, it will obviously mean that the Vestries Act will have to be amended, and people who work for the large holders in the various parishes cannot afford to contribute to the upkeep of the Church because of their economic position. That is one of the reasons why I am not prepared to support the disendowment of the Church at present. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew has apparently based this Address on the fact that at a meeting of the Anglican Synod the Lord Bishop, for whom I have great respect, seemed to be in favour of disestablishment and disendowment. This reverend gentleman has lived in British Guiana for about 10 years and he feels that he has West Indian experience. In his first sermon which he delivered here he pointed out that it was the people that would matter and to have acted so quickly in this way without letting the people that matter have a

voice in the matter is not keeping with that first sermon.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that on the merits of this particular debate?

Mr. MOTTLEY: The remarks of the Lord Bishop at the meeting of the Synod have influenced some people including honourable members.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering how far the opinion of people outside is of value to this debate. This is purely a matter for this House to consider. It is not a question of what people think of the effect which disestablishment and disendowment will have on the community. I know that I have allowed a certain amount of latitude in this matter and I am wondering how far it should go.

Mr. MOTTLEY: From what I have seen appearing in the Press I am prepared to ask a question. It has been argued that the Resolution which was passed favours disendowment—

Mr. SPEAKER: If you will remember, I asked the honourable senior member for St. Joseph if the Resolution was against disendowment what effect would that have on this House?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Except that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph referred to the Resolution which was passed by the Synod and there are several honourable members who have not yet spoken. I think that it is my duty to crave Your Honour's indulgence in putting my side of the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: You should not carry it too far.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will not carry it too far. I am wondering if it is true to say that at this meeting of the Synod a secret ballot was refused on the matter. If that is so, one wonders what would be the position of this House if secret ballots are refused in matters of public interest at all times.

Mr. SPEAKER: I really think that I should rule that out of order. It has nothing to do with the merits of this Address.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If honourable members are not aware of the conditions under which the Resolution was passed they are apt to say in truth and in fact that it was passed along democratic lines. I will not go any further with that. I will now deal with the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. The honourable member said that the people of this colony have lost faith in the established Church; but such a statement is not absolutely correct. You would expect anyone who made a statement like that to give some facts; you would have expected the honourable member for St. Andrew and those who supported him to give us some information as to what percentage of the community are still of the Anglican persuasion and what percentage of the communicating members of the Anglican Church are prepared to agree that the Church should be disendowed. This is a very important matter; the matter of differences as regards religion has caused the greatest wars in the world according to historical records. We are now dealing with this important question an Address having been introduced here by one who does not even happen to be associated with the Church except from outside. Even the strongest supporters of this Address cannot say that if the Church were dissociated from the State we would be much better off. It is an acknowledged fact that Barbados is far ahead of other West Indian colonies where social reform, social legislation and social improvement are concerned and it cannot be correctly argued that the mere payment of ministers of the Anglican Church by the State prevents us from going ahead. Now what is the Anglican Synod?

It is the assembly of Clergymen of the established Church with Lay representatives of the people. I make this strong statement that with the exception of one district in St. Peter, one in St. Michael and another in St. George, few if any members of the Clergy or Laity have gone to the members of the congregation and discussed this vital matter with them. It would seem that the Church for once in its history is now using some of our local sons as Clergymen. I recall when as a child, I went to Church you could only hear "Mary", the mother of Jesus, Gentle Jesus, Meek and Mild". In those days there was no mention of anything about social legislation from the Pulpit. But to-day with a stronger local ministry it is different. I was pleasingly surprised, when, during the hectic campaigns in this parish, the Incumbent of a Church took as his text one Sunday night: "When the righteous are in authority the people rejoice; but when the wicked maketh rule the people mourn." There was one who was drawing money from the Treasury and was courageous enough to say something about the evils. I wonder if after reading the Diocesan Magazine last month, we should go back to what the Bishop of Bath in this enlightened day is reported to have said, namely, that he had been told by leading coloured men in the West Indies that the best thing England can do for us is to send us white priests. When I read that I felt that it was very contradictory to the utterance of the Missionary Canon Burton.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that you are going somewhat outside the merits of this Address.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This all goes to show the reasons why, at this stage, disendowment should not come about.

Mr. SPEAKER: I personally do not see that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I regret very much that Your Honour has not been able to follow me but I shall try to make my position clear. Sir, as regards this question of disendowment, anyone who has been reading Church literature would have seen that the Bishop of Antigua has, in no uncertain terms, stated that in that colony where the Church is disendowed there is the need for at least six priests, and that none of his clergymen has been able to go on vacation for years. The Bishop of the Bahamas has said the same thing. As to the working of the disendowed Church especially in the West Indies, I should like to mention one case in British Guiana where a minister of the Anglican Church occupied a house which the Sanitary Authorities had turned down as being unfit for human habitation. These are things which go to show that all is not as well as those honourable members who are in support of this Address would have us to believe. Certain honourable members have argued that the taxpayers should not be called upon to pay taxes for the upkeep of an established Church when they do not use it; but that is no argument at all because honourable members should realise that you are called upon to pay taxes for the upkeep of the Prison and you do not hope to go there. You pay taxes for the upkeep of several institutions and you do not hope to go into them. The argument as to why should local authorities subscribe to the repairs and upkeep of the Anglican Churches is also a bad argument. One wonders if the honourable senior member for St. Andrew with his experience as a vestryman has never realised that there is no law in this country which compels any Vestry to maintain only the Anglican Church. If the honourable member turns to the Vestries Act he will see what is stated there about taxes subscribed in relation to religious denominations. Every small

Church whether it be Father Divine, the Christian Mission or the Nazarene Mission, and incidentally there are 22 religious denominations in this colony, should be given assistance from the local authorities as has been laid down by our forefathers. Those who really want to see Barbados go forward are in a position to interpret the laws and say how they should be administered. I really wonder if honourable members are not being led into a trap. I say that for this reason; if the laws of this colony say that the taxes which are paid by those who can pay them should not merely be used for the assistance of the established Church, that makes it very clear that the taxes can also be used for the assistance of other religious denominations. For the first time in the history of Barbados you can say that that is being done at least in St. Michael. To my mind, disendowment would have a very serious economic reaction on the people of this colony. The Anglican Church is an established Church and the clergymen draw their salaries from the Treasury; the Wesleyan Church is partly endowed and the Moravian Church is also partly endowed by Grants-in-Aid and I would be prepared to say that the other religious bodies who are able to give intelligent religious teaching should be given some assistance. There are those who say that religious teaching is of no use but what would be our position if it had not been for the Church? It might be argued to the contrary, but if it had not been for those of the early days who took courage and were able to fight, we could not boast today of being ahead of other West Indian colonies.

The honourable senior member for St. Thomas spoke about one church in the north which has a congregation of about a dozen people on Sundays. I quite agree with him: but because that is so it does not mean that the people have lost faith in the religious demonstration. A nodding acquaintance with Schomburgk's History of Barbados would show that as the villages were set up the Churches were carried to the people. Today the villages are some distance from the churches; we know that Barbadians are religious and they must have somewhere to go. If they cannot go to the Church then the Church should be brought to them. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that in days gone by the ministers of the Church comprised the sons and cousins of the well-to-do; and it has been said that those who now have an opportunity of going into the Church should preach more about social reform. I appeal to honourable members to see that if ever there was an opportunity for the Church to work side by side with the State for social reform, it is the present time. Let us see how illogical it is for the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to argue that if the Church were not State paid it would be able to speak out on matters of social reform. Let us take the Incumbent of St. Saviour's or of St. Andrew's or of St. Thomas's Church; if the majority of the congregation cannot afford to give more than a cent in the morning and a cent at night, I wonder if he would have the courage, whether he was moved spiritually or not, to get up on any Sunday and make an appeal for social reform. If you cannot get up now and speak out against the alleged wrongs when your salary is guaranteed by the people, how much will you be able to do so when you have to depend on the subscription or offertory of people like the honourable senior member for St. Andrew? That will never work. This is not a Party question and whatever you think about people in dealing with the Church you have to see it in the light that everyone has his own opinion. Now as to the value of the Church property in this is and; I say that the value of

Church property used by the State or the Education Board is roughly £1,000,000 sterling; that is a rough conservative estimate. If you visit certain Churches in this colony to-day you will see that 3rd and 4th standard classes are actually carried on in them. If you ask the Government by the passing of this Address to disendow the Church what will be the result? If it is said that the State must buy out the Church property, should it not be asked if we can really afford to spend £1,000,000 to buy Church property when there are so many obviously necessary social reforms to be carried out? Our children must be schooled; for generations the Churches owned the schools until the advent of democratic legislators in our midst. It was the Church which first looked forward to educating the people; I challenge anybody to say that that is not correct. I should like to mention here that as far back as 1827 the Rector of St. Lucy took it upon himself to administer the Holy Communion to a slave and in those days he was brought before the Court of Grand Sessions and convicted. Eventually the Crown pardoned him unconditionally. To return to the question of the education of the people, can you afford to spend £1,000,000 sterling to buy out the Church property? We have to continue to educate the masses. If I am challenged as to the value of the Church property, cannot the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and his supporters say what it is? Should you not have a Body set up to put the necessary statistics before the Government? Will we pay £1,000,000 sterling? Will a Bill in perpetuity be sent down to this House asking for 2% on the capital value of the property. I think that we should consider whether this will not eventually work out to more than what we are paying the Church today. The people of this colony should know that children are being educated in the Church and you do not pay for that; if you pay the ministers of the Anglican Church 1% on £1,000,000 you are not giving them anything. We cannot build our own schools or buy these schools when there are so many things to be done. Unless we are satisfied beyond doubt that there was corruption and that the teaching was contrary to the principles laid down we should not talk about disendowment. Honourable members should not sit here and agree to pass this Address merely because it is a question of religion and of men's conscience; they should think of the repercussions. It is true that as far back as I can remember, as soon as the most socialist minded came into the political life of this colony we heard of the disendowment of the church. As far back as 1924 or 1925 we heard these gentlemen who are interested in social reform say that the money which is paid to clergymen should be used in connection with social reform; and suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, this Address has come before us. One wonders if an Address in the same strain would have been brought in this House by the honourable senior member for St. Andrew years ago. Mr. Speaker I should not like to be as rash as the honourable junior member for St. Philip, but I feel very strongly in this matter. I feel that now that Clergymen who are not ashamed to be of African descent are benefiting from religious teaching we should be grateful for it. Honourable members seem to think that a parson in a pulpit is exempt from the laws of Sedition, but even in England he is not exempt. Some honourable members may think that it would be an unusual thing for the parson in some particular district to preach against social reform. When as a boy you were taken to one of the established Churches by your grandmother or some other relative

you had to sit at the bottom of the Church and if your parent was a communicant member he had to wait until other races had the Holy Communion administered to them; but today if honourable members would take time off and visit these Churches they would see that the conditions are different. I remember well as a lad singing in a choir—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know how many reminiscences will be recalled. (Laughter). I hope that they will not be many or long because I do not think that they have anything to do with the debate.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The point I am trying to make is that in those days when we of the masses visited the Church we found people of the best class high up in the Church. The well-to-do people were always at Church; but today you will find that people like the honourable senior member for St. Andrew in the Church are few. The people of the class of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew have taken religion too lightly. (Hear hear). If these religious principles were enacted for a particular reason, in my opinion they work for the benefit of the masses and that is an opinion which is shared by quite a number of people in this colony. I know that in the scheme for disendowment it is proposed to do away with certain cures; cures like Boscobel, St. Matthews, St. Clements and many others are to be abandoned, and I wonder what will become of the people at the end of Boscobel. They will be left to their own fate. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that we should look to the Church for spiritual guidance in times of trouble; I say "No", we should work alongside the Church. I say that we should work in association with the Church at all times in matters of legislation and so on. I had an experience a few days ago when speaking with the Surinam Commission. I enquired as to what arrangements would be made for religious teaching in the event of our people being emigrated to Surinam and I was surprised to hear from the Director of Social Welfare that the Roman Catholic and the Moravian Churches in Surinam are handsomely endowed. Whether you call to aid or endowment, whether you call it by some other name or use some legal technicality, the Church will be asking for compensation for the property which they own and which the State is occupying. It is only yesterday that we had an out and out Labour Government and it is common knowledge that the Government refused to pay £1,000 for a place in King Street to accommodate school children and the Wesleyans had to pay it. What will the position be when the Anglican community ask you to pay them for their schools? If you say that you will not endow the Church any more and you pay the Anglican Church for their schools, it is obvious that the Wesleyans will also realise that you are using their schools and you will have to do something in respect of these schools. Mr. Speaker, there are several other points to be made on this question of disendowment; honourable members will realise that there are two sides to any question, they have heard during the past three or four weeks the speeches made in support of the motion and they should have some patience

in hearing our point of view in the matter. As to the question of disestablishment I suppose that there are members of this Assembly who are well acquainted with constitutional procedure and with the position in Great Britain. I wonder whether any honourable member will tell us that as we are still a colony of the British Empire and with an established Church in Great Britain that we should agree to the passing of this Address.

Dr. WILSON: Mr. Speaker:—It is rather late in the day and I beg to move that the further consideration of this Address be now postponed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am quite willing to agree to the postponement.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that you should make the motion for the postponement and you will have the right to speak again.

Mr. MOTTLEY: There are some historical facts which I would like to mention on this question of disendowment but in view of the lateness of the hour I beg to move that further debate on this Address be now postponed.

Dr. WILSON: I beg to second that.

The question that further debate on this Address be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, TALMA, MOTTLEY RAMSAY, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—10.

Noes: Messrs. SMITH, FOSTER, COX, SPRINGER, ADAMS, F. L. WALCOTT and HAYNES—8.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the affirmative ten honourable members voting "Aye" and eight honourable members voting "No".

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Before you put that motion the Order Paper have to be fixed.

Mr. RAMSAY: I made the motion with the idea that the operations of the House should cease for the time being. I did not make it from any other motive; I beg to apologize.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to withdraw the motion.

Mr. RAMSAY: I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 26th day of August, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER accordingly adjourned the House to Tuesday next, the 26th day of August, 1947 at twelve o'clock noon.