

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 29th July, 1947

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN (*Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. J. A. LE V. WILSON, Messrs. L. E. SMITH, M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, D. A. FOSTER, R. G. MAPP, H. W. SPRINGER, M.A., G. H. ADAMS, B.A., J. A. HAYNES, B.A., and V. C. GALE.

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

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting which was held on the 22nd July, 1947, having been circulated are taken as read and confirmed.

Mr. BLACKMAN enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers:—

Report of the Registrar on the Vital Statistics for the year 1945.

Despatch No. 38 from H. E. the Governor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and despatch No. 68 from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to His Excellency the Governor on the subject of the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1947-48.

Post Office advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 30th of June, 1947.

Statement of the transactions of the Savings Bank for the year 1946.

Quarterly return of transactions in Rum to the 30th of June, 1947.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £195. 1s. 1d. as a refund of the Customs import duty and package

tax paid by the Commissioners of Highways, St. John, on five packages of road rollers.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £67. 2/- as a refund of the Customs import duty and package tax paid by Dr. L. K. Nicholls on professional apparatus imported for his use.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £873. 13. 5. as a refund of the Customs import duty and package tax paid by Messrs. D. M. Simpson and Co. on machinery and accessories imported for the manufacture of fuel from megasse.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Resolution for £279. 10. 5d as a refund of the Customs import duty and package tax paid by the British American Tobacco Co. (Barbados) Ltd. on 64 cases of Aluminium Foil which was subsequently re-shipped to the U.S.A.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Bill to amend the Prisons Act, 1890 (1890-13).

Mr. SPRINGER: Bill to amend the law relating to the Christ Church Foundation Schools.

Mr. SPRINGER: Bill to amend the Boatmen, Carters and Porters Act, 1891 (1891-10).

QUESTIONS.

Mr. SMITH: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House.

(1) Are the periods of duty of Police Constables at the out Stations regulated by a Schedule?

(2) If the answer is in the affirmative

(a) Are these periods of duty similar to those of the Police Constables at the Central Station?

(b) If they are not similar, will the Government say how they differ?

Mr. RAMSAY: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present in the House at its next meeting.

1. Is it a fact that a Housing Co., located at Swan St., City, has collected very large sums of money, about thirty thousand dollars, and that the subscribers are on the verge of losing their deposits?

2. If the answer to the above is in the negative, will Government please enquire into it?

3. If the answer to No. 1 is in the affirmative, will Government take the necessary steps to see that the subscribers are not deprived of their monies?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. ADAMS, a Bill to amend the Prisons Act, 1890-13 is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. CRAWFORD, a Bill to amend the law relating to Christ Church Foundation Schools is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. CRAWFORD, a Bill to amend the Boatmen, Carters, and Porters Act, 1891-10 is read a first time.

Mr. TALMA enters the House and takes his seat.

THE PENSIONS BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume Committee on the Bill to amend and consolidate the law of this island relating to pensions of public officers.

Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House resumes Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: When we were last in Committee on the Bill Clauses 6 and 8 and Regulation 18 were postponed.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that clause 6 be reconsidered.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—The Government has considered the suggestion of the junior member for St. Michael but does not think that the Bill should be altered in the way suggested by him or at all, for the reasons which I have previously given. The Bill is not compulsory. Clergymen may choose to remain until they are 70 years old if they like and this Bill will affect only those Clergymen who enter the Service of the Church after it has been passed; these will have to retire at 55 or 60 and again, it is felt that after this year Clergymen will cease to be civil servants and will have their own pension scheme. For these reasons the Government does not think it necessary to make any amendment affecting Clergymen. The position is this: they can choose to come under this Act and retire at 55 or 60 or they can choose to remain until 70. I, therefore, beg to move that Clause 6 stand part of this Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 6 stand part of this Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 8 be reconsidered.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 8 be considered is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir,—Clause 8 was postponed because we would have to amend it if we amended Clause 6 in relation to the age at which clergymen should retire. It is, therefore, unnecessary for me to say more in connection with it. I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part of this Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Regulation 18 be reconsidered.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Regulation 18 be reconsidered is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I believe that I was out of the House part of the time when this regulation was being considered but as I understand it, the point was being made by the senior member for St. Michael as to whether the Government would not make a change as to the necessity for a pensioner to hold his office for three years immediately preceding the date of his retirement in order to get a pension on the salary of that office. I believe the answer was given already by the senior member for St. George. This is the universal method in respect of these Pension Acts and even if that were the only reason, I suggest that inasmuch as the chief reason for the whole Bill being enacted is that this island should be uniform with the rest of the British West Indies. I think that the senior member for St. Michael will agree that any other arrangement would entail a great deal of complication and, as I think the senior member for St. George has pointed out, may in some cases actually work a hardship on people. As matters stand at the present moment, one can easily see that by sheer luck an officer may be promoted to a higher salaried post just a few weeks or days before the date of his retirement and receive a pension computed on the basis of the salary of the office to which he was promoted. Take for example, the Police Force, although this is not a Police Pension Bill. A Sergeant may be promoted to the rank of Sgt. Major a week or so before his retirement and by that act alone will be entitled to a pension on the salary he receives as Sgt. Major while other Sergeants of the Force, equally as capable but who because of the absence of opportunities for becoming Sergeants-Major if they retire, will receive pensions only as sergeants. I mention that instance only by the way but as I have said, it is essential that the Pension Acts throughout the British West Indies should be as uniform as possible. I, therefore, move that Regulation 18 stand part of the Regulations.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. COX: My point was——

The CHAIRMAN: I am going to rule the honourable member out of order because, to my mind, his suggestion will mean a charge on the Treasury. Yet, I would like to hear him.

Mr. COX: I was not making any motion which would result in a charge on the Treasury. My chief reason for raising that point is this. An officer who works for £100 per annum happens to receive an increased salary of £150; he has not been promoted but his salary has been increased. That officer, if he retires before he has been in receipt of the increased salary of £150 for a period of three years, is not in a position to receive pension on the £150 merely because he has not served at that salary for three years. If you say that an officer must serve in a particular office for three years before he can receive a pension on the salary attached to the office, that may be all well and good although I do not agree to it but how do you reconcile that with an officer whose salary has been increased but who has not been promoted and yet cannot receive a pension on the increased salary if he has not been drawing it for three years prior to the date of his retirement? As far as the explanation of the senior member for St. George goes, officers in the Civil Service will receive pensions on increased sal-

aries even though they may not have been receiving those increased salaries for three years, but the employees like policemen and others outside the Civil Service, will not be similarly treated. I still think that that is unfair. I think that the Act should be made so comprehensive that all Government employees will fare alike as far as pensions are concerned.

The question that Regulation 18 stand part of Regulations is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. TALMA, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of this Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

THE GITTENS PENSION BILL.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 3 as the next Order.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip,—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the payment of an additional pension to Julian Hyde Gittens.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—This is just one of the ordinary Pension Bills which seeks to authorize the payment of an additional pension at the rate of £52. 10s. per annum to Julian Hyde Gittens who was formerly Accountant in the Department of Highways and Transport. In the Objects and Reasons of the Bill it is stated that the Government has seen fit to suggest that this additional pension should be paid to Mr. Gittens and I think the reasons are such as will commend themselves to honourable members. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the Chairman reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

THE WORRELL PENSION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George—Second reading of a Bill to authorize the payment of an additional pension to Walter Walton Worrell.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—Owing to a mistake, the Bill appears on the Order Paper in the name of the senior member for St. George. I ask leave to take charge of it.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Bill seeks to authorize the payment of an additional pension to Walter Walton Worrell. The reasons are very simple and

are set out quite distinctly in the Objects and Reasons. Worrell entered the service of the Education Board as a Pupil Teacher on the 1st March, 1925, and left in October, 1929, to join the Police Force. He remained in the Force until he was discharged in December, 1946, as being medically unfit. The Government is advised that his services between March, 1925 and October 1929 in the elementary teaching service of the colony are not pensionable by law but it considers that Mr. Worrell should, in the circumstances, be granted a pension in respect of that period of service; that is why this Bill is before the Legislature and I beg to move that it be now read a second time.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the Chairman reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. CRAWFORD, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

THE JORDAN AND MC COMIE PENSION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—Second reading of a Bill to authorize the payment of gratuities and pensions to John Richard Jordan and George Rudolph Mc Comie.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—As honourable members will see from the Objects and Reasons, these two gentlemen were formerly members of the Volunteer Force, in the case of Lt. Jordan, 23 years, and in the case of Armourer Sergeant McComie, 18 years. The Volunteer Force, was, as honourable members will remember, disbanded in 1942; the personnel, including these two gentlemen, were incorporated into the South Caribbean Force and these officers were paid from War Office funds at War Office rates. They have now been released from the Military Service and the Government is advised that Mr. McComie's service is pensionable under the Public Employees Pension Act, 1937, but that Mr. Jordan's service would not be pensionable. The Government considers it equitable that both of these officers should be granted gratuities and pensions calculated on the salaries which they would have received had they not been transferred into the South Caribbean Force, and makes allowance for additional years of service for the abolition of their respective offices in accordance with the terms of the Pension Act, 1925. It is just possible—I cannot say more than that—that the Volunteer Force may be resurrected and it is possible—I also cannot say more than that—that these two gentlemen may be re-employed in the Force. If that takes place, their position, as regards pensions, will have to be reviewed. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the

House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

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. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: The only Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is for the sum of £45. 2. 11 as a refund to the Ministry of War Transport of passages, maintenance, etc. of Regimental Sergt-Major W. S. Cameron and his wife and their child in connection with their return journey to the United Kingdom at the expiration of his contract with the Barbados Volunteer Force.

As honourable members will see from the addendum, Sergeant-Major Cameron was appointed in 1939 as Regimental Sergt-Major Instructor of the Barbados Volunteer Force. His contract expired in 1942 and he was instructed to join a certain unit in Aruba. He left Barbados with his wife and child on the 12th September, 1942. A claim has been received from the Ministry of War Transport for this sum of money in respect of rail fares and maintenance of Sgt-Major Cameron, his wife and daughter from New Orleans to New York in respect of the period 5th to 7th October, 1942. The Auditor General considers that the charge is a proper one against the funds of this colony and we are now being asked to vote the amount. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Resolution 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 is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

THE ARTHUR EVELYN ARMSTRONG PENSION BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip — Second reading of a Bill to authorize the payment of an additional pension to Arthur Evelyn Armstrong.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The House is again being asked to authorize the payment of an additional pension to a retired government employee. The facts are very simple and are clearly set out in the Objects and Reasons and I doubt whether there is any necessity for me to develop them at any length. I, therefore, beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—I do not consider this Bill to be on all fours with the Bill which we passed a few moments ago in favour of Worrell. Worrell was in the teaching service, a quasi-Government Service, from 1925 to 1929 and then he was transferred to the Police Force. In this case, this gentleman was Chaplain of the Prisons for a period of 8 years, which period does not entitle him to a pension. He left the Government Service, went into other avenues of employment and then came back into the Government Service as Headmaster of Combermere School. I am wondering, Sir, whether a Bill of this sort is not somewhat of a precedent and I personally do not feel that I can vote for it.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to voice sentiments similar to those of the honourable member who has just sat down. The Objects and Reasons state that the service of this gentleman as Headmaster of Combermere School is pensionable by law but that his services between 1926 and 1934 are not so pensionable. I wonder if a person like myself who was a humble Civil Servant would be granted a pension or a gratuity for the service I rendered to the Government! If all persons who render service to the Government are not so privileged I do not see why one person should be selected to be granted it.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I am going to be bold enough to move the rejection of this Bill because this Reverend gentleman left the Government Service and then became the Headmaster of Combermere School, a pensionable post. I do not think that to pass this Bill will be acting fairly to other persons who cannot leave the Service for any stated period and come back to it. We have some teachers now who have been away and have returned to the island and I am sure that it would be difficult for them to receive consideration of this nature from the Government for the services they rendered as teachers. I do not feel that it is right for this gentleman to draw a pension as Chaplain of the Prisons and at the same time draw a pension as Headmaster of Combermere School; therefore, I beg to move that this Bill be rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that if honourable members are in favour of postponing this Bill I am sure that the members of the Government will be willing to accede to the postponement but I would just like to mention, in passing, that the Reverend Armstrong held the post of Chaplain of the Westbury Cemetery and also conducted a private school. When he was appointed Chaplain of the Prisons, he was required to give up his school and he did so. When he was appointed Headmaster of Combermere School, he was called upon to resign the Chaplaincy of the Prisons, on the ground that he could not hold two public offices at the same time, both being pensionable. In his petition to the Government asking that his services now under consideration be regarded as pensionable, Rev. Armstrong emphasised the fact that he had to give up his school when he took the job as Chaplain of the Prisons, although it was a part-time job; there have been other reasons which have been set out in the petition submitted by Rev. Armstrong in connection with this matter but it would take some time to go through the entire list of them in order to meet the objection raised by honourable members. There is no immediate hurry over the passing of this Bill to-day; if honourable

members are so inclined and anybody moves the postponement of the further consideration of the Bill, the members of the Government will be pleased to accede to it.

Mr. COX: I am not going to support the rejection of the Bill at this moment. I would rather move that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed. It seems queer to me that this gentleman took his job as Chaplain of the Prisons with the definite understanding that it was not a pensionable job and now he has retired he comes to this House asking for a pension.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of correction. The Chaplaincy of the Prisons is a pensionable job.

Mr. COX: Sir,—Paragraph 3 of the Objects and Reasons states:—“This latter service” (meaning the Headmastership of Combermere School) “is pensionable by law; but the Government is advised that his services between 1926 and 1934 are not so pensionable.”

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am sorry I have to correct the honourable member again. Surely what is meant here in paragraph 3 of the Objects and Reasons is not that the post of Chaplaincy is not pensionable but that the services rendered by Rev. Armstrong as Chaplain are not pensionable because he left the Government Service and went into other spheres of employment.

Mr. COX: That makes my case stronger. He knew that he would not be pensioned for the services he rendered as Chaplain of the Prisons; he rendered those services with the definite understanding that he could not get a pension and now he is asking for a pension.

Mr. CRAWFORD: He was not sure that he would get another job in the Government Service.

Mr. COX: Like the senior member for St. Peter I am wondering what attitude the Government would adopt in respect of those teachers and other people who left the Service, went away, came back and re-entered the Service, if they made application for a pension for their previous periods of service. Before I vote for this Bill I would have to be assured that all other Government employees will be treated in this manner. I, therefore, beg to move that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Paragraph 3 of the Objects and Reasons states that the services rendered by Rev. Armstrong as Headmaster of Combermere School are pensionable by law but that his services as Chaplain of the Prisons are not so pensionable. I can quite appreciate the point made by the honourable introducer of this Bill, namely, that it is not a question of the office being non-pensionable but that the period of service by Rev. Armstrong is not pensionable. One wonders whether when Rev. Armstrong became Headmaster of Combermere School he had to resign the Chaplaincy of the Prisons. It is fairly obvious that the Government would not be able to pension him under the Act for the services he rendered at the Prisons because the period of service was too short but it seems fair to me that having had to retire from the Chaplaincy of the Prisons and take another Government post he should get a pension for the services he rendered at the Prisons. That the office of Chaplain of the Prisons is pensionable cannot be disputed but the period for which he served is not pensionable. Going into another Government job he could not be given a pension and draw his salary as Headmaster of Combermere School at the same time but now that

he has retired it seems fair that he should receive a pension for the services he gave at the Prisons.

Mr. RAMSAY: It appears that this Committee has lost sight of a very salient point. The Reverend Gentleman left one branch of the Government Service to go into another branch at a higher salary. Is there any argument that he fell ill and did not get his maximum pension on retirement from the Headmastership of Combermere School? Rev. Armstrong has received his pension on the higher salary attached to the post of Headmaster of Combermere School. I cannot say that this is dishonest but the Government has no more right to send this Bill to this House than I have to presume to be President of the United States of America. Rev. Armstrong has discharged his duties at Combermere School and has retired with his full pension and it is quibbling to talk about giving him an additional pension for his services as Chaplain of the Prisons. This Government is guilty of a dereliction of duty; it is not fit to be a Government. This gentleman gets a pension on the full emoluments of the office of Headmaster of Combermere School and now he comes and asks for something more. “Rejection” is not the word for this Bill; it ought not to be considered at all. Some honourable members say “rejection” others say “postponement.” I am for neither. I am not in favour of considering it at all.

Mr. TALMA: I would like the senior member for St. Philip to explain to the House what pension this gentleman receives at present. Is he getting his full pension rights on the higher salary? If that is so, I cannot see any grounds for granting him and him alone an additional pension.

Mr. ADAMS: Before the question is put I am going to ask honourable members who have expressed strong views to give, at least, the Executive Committee time to ruminate on those strong views because, speaking for myself, none of these arguments were present to my mind when I agreed to send this Bill down to the House. I appeal to honourable members to give the Executive Committee a little time to consider their points of view by postponing rather than rejecting the Bill to-day.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I have already stated that the members of the Government would be willing to accept the postponement of the Bill.

Mr. SMITH: I beg to second the motion for the postponement of this Bill.

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

CLERICAL SERVICE (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 Clerical Service Act, 1944 (1944-27).

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker.—This is a very short Bill. It merely proposes to delete five words from the Act. The Act known as the Clerical Service Act says in sub-section 2 of section 3:—“The Governor may with the approval of the Houses of the Legislature appoint additional clerks not exceeding ten in number as he shall consider necessary,” that is to say, in addition to the establishment of 48 clerks fixed in the Act but as events have shown, it has become necessary with indecent frequency to amend this section. It is felt that the words “not exceeding ten in number” may, without detriment to the position of the Legislature or to the country, be deleted so that the Governor will then be given power

to appoint such additional clerks as he shall consider necessary with the approval of the Houses of the Legislature. The position to-day is that although he may appoint additional clerks by Resolution with our approval, yet the moment the number of ten is exceeded, or whatever number we have to put from time to time, he has to have the Act amended and then produce a fresh Resolution. It is, therefore, felt desirable that instead of having to amend the Clerical Service Act from time to time, those words "not exceeding ten in number" should be deleted so that the Governor may appoint from time to time the additional clerks which, he feels, are needed. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: I want to draw strictly to the attention of the members of the Government this. There is a peculiar method obtaining in this country, as far as appointments to the Civil Service are concerned. I notice every now and then that this Government, or the Executive Committee or whoever is responsible for appointing Civil Servants, is constantly shirking its duty and throwing its responsibility over its shoulder; it is a dereliction of duty. They take all sorts of persons who cannot be employed in any other walk of life and put them over the heads of deserving people. I do not wish to say more than that. I have so much information to back up my statement that I can keep this House listening for a year. I need hardly tell the Government about the circumstances which exist to-day in respect of appointments to the Civil Service. I am warning the Government through the Leader of this House,—I am saying it without fear of contradiction and, by the way, I am going to give up the position as Chairman of Committees because it does not suit me—to make the Colonial Secretary keep a list of the names of persons who apply for employment in the Service and when a person is wanted, whether it be for four years or one year or one hour, select one of those on the list of applicants for the job. A lot of ne'er-do-wells, good-for-nothing vagabonds, thieves, robbers—I say it with a full sense of my responsibility—have been brought into the Civil Service, a pack of thieves who would not be allowed to walk down Broad Street after 4 o'clock in the afternoon—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is going beyond the terms of the Bill.

Mr. RAMSAY: All right, Mr Speaker, I will take my seat.

Mr. MAPP: Although I will not speak in anything like the strong terms in which the honourable member who has just sat down spoke, yet I must say that I am in wholehearted agreement with the sentiments he has expressed. All of us will admit that the days of patronage are long past. These are not days when you should extend the one-sided patronage that used to be extended in the past. These are days when persons who enter the Service should do so by way of efficiency.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is out of order. The last honourable member was out of order too but I did not have a copy of the Bill before me when he was speaking. I cannot allow you to press that point. The sole question is whether the number of clerks should be increased; that is all.

Mr. MAPP: I agree to the principle of this Bill. I do not think myself that it makes for efficiency if every time the Civil Establishment is to be extended the Government has to come to this House and have the Act amended to give the Governor power to appoint additional clerks. I think that

that procedure results in a waste of time and that the Governor should be given authority to appoint as many clerks as he thinks necessary. I was hoping to be able to add to the remarks of the junior member for St. Peter but if your Honour rules me out of order I must bow to your ruling.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Ramsay being in the Chair.

Clause 1 is read and agreed to.

Clause 2. Sub-section (2) of section three of the Clerical Service Act, 1944, is hereby amended by deleting the words "not exceeding ten in number" occurring in lines four and five thereof.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that that be Clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. TALMA: Mr. Chairman,—I would like to say that I feel very happy to see this amendment before this Committee to-day because I can fully appreciate the great hardships and inconveniences which are experienced by the clerks in the Civil Service, especially the junior clerks. This is the practice in the Civil Service as I know it. When the Chief Clerk in a Department goes on leave, the Second Clerk is called upon to act in his place. In that case the Department is one clerk short and very often some other clerk takes ill or goes on leave also or something else happens and the junior clerk is expected to do the greater part of the work during the absence of those two clerks. So by this amendment, it means that the juniors will not be overburdened with work in future; it means that they will be able to get assistance. Let us hope that this is not an amendment on paper only but will be enforced at the opportune moment. Let us hope that if a Department carries 15 clerks and the chief clerk happens to be acting as Magistrate or away on leave, the full complement of clerks will be employed because there is much unemployment in this country and there are many people who are anxious and willing to work. Let us hope that well-known Leaders in the Government to-day will see to it that the Act is not only changed but that the amendment will be enforced and the enforcement will only come about by employing more people and granting relief where necessary.

Dr. CUMMINS: I am not voting against Clause 2 but I see here the words "not exceeding ten in number." These ten in number will have to be appointed somehow and I believe that these appointments are made through what is called a Patronage Committee. Now, years ago I belonged to an organization which used to be known as the Democratic League and which used to advocate that appointments and promotions in the Civil Service should be done by way of an examination and I think that it is time that the services of this Patronage Committee be dispensed with. Let us have Civil Service examinations and let appointments and promotions be made on the results of those examinations. I do not want to say much more but I know that in these enlightened days the machinations of this Patronage Committee are not always acceptable.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—Certain tendencies which have crept into the policy of appointing Civil Servants have been condemned to-day and I need not proceed to add to those condemnations. In the main administrative branch of the Civil Service it is true to say that lately promotion

and appointment are made chiefly on efficiency and qualification but in the Civil Service as a whole numerous side entrances have been made in various departments which are temporarily created, not permanent departments, and various people who have entered through the side door, drafted in at the back, so to speak—would not gain entrance through the front door of the Civil Service. I say that it is a deplorable practice and should be condemned in this Committee. I do not think that I should go on to say much more about it. All of us know the feeling of the House on it but in future, I hope that the Government, in making appointments to these non-permanent branches of the Civil Service, will consider only those who are qualified, as is done in the case of the main administrative branch of the Civil Service.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman,—I have one or two observations to make before this Bill is passed. I am very pleased to see that the Government is becoming more business like in its method, that is to say, instead of sending a bit of paper to the House of Assembly on every occasion on which a clerk is to be appointed to the Clerical Service, it has decided upon a more expeditious way of doing it. But I would like to point out that all is not well in the Service. Not too long ago the Head of the Administration left this colony and you had the Assistant Colonial Secretary acting as Colonial Secretary, acting as Assistant Colonial Secretary and acting as a further Assistant Colonial Secretary. Well, to my mind, it is a reflection on the Service if one man can fill three posts at the same time while we are paying a lot of money to other people who should be qualified to fill these posts. Some honourable member said something about the Postmaster. If this undesirable practice went on for a couple of days, one might not think it necessary to comment upon it but we find that the Assistant Colonial Secretary who had just arrived in the colony was sent over to the Labour Department to act as Labour Commissioner and the Postmaster was moved from the Post Office where there was a great deal of trouble—stealing and so on going on—and sent to the Colonial Secretary's Office to act as Assistant Colonial Secretary, while we, not long ago, passed a Bill providing for the appointment of another Assistant Colonial Secretary and an Assistant Secretary, so that there will be somebody to fill the breach if the Service was short of a Colonial Secretary. But that did not happen. There seems to be a tendency on the part of those in authority to believe that only certain people can keep secrets; that when it comes to another set of persons they cannot keep secrets and that, as a result, certain information would reach the wrong people. Well, I would like to emphasize this point. This House passed a Resolution last week for £107 to make up the amount spent by the Chief Clerk of the Labour Department who was sent to England to take a course of training along with big Labour muck-a-mucks from other colonies; as a matter of fact we spent about £500 for that purpose and that officer is back in the Department doing his work. My point is this: what is the use of spending money to train officers whose services cannot be used when the opportunity arises to use those services? What is the reason? Is it because they are black? The only thing to be assumed is that the Chief Clerk of the Labour Department, because he is black, cannot sit in the chair of the Labour Commissioner who receives £1,000 a year, so they have to put the Acting Assistant

Colonial Secretary to act as Labour Commissioner in order to avoid this Chief Clerk becoming presumptuous too early. I would like to say that these practices are not desirable. If there is an officer in the Colonial Secretary's Office who is capable of performing the duties when someone is required to act in an administrative capacity in that office, that officer's services should be used. The junior member for St. John acted as Colonial Postmaster on several occasions when the Postmaster was ill or on leave. As soon as the last Postmaster retired, the present Postmaster was appointed in a couple weeks' time and we find that this same officer was moved to the Colonial Secretary's office to act as Assistant Colonial Secretary when there was one of their chief clerks—I do not want to call names—who possesses academic qualifications as high—perhaps higher—as those of the Postmaster, but that chief clerk who is in that office and who possesses those high qualifications cannot act in this supposedly high post. Who is responsible for these practices? I have put a question in respect of this matter and I shall deal more fully with it when the time comes to do so. These things cannot go on in Barbados. It appears that in this administration only two or three people can fill certain positions. We cannot spend money to pay officers and then allow certain people who come here to tell us that those officers cannot fill certain positions because they cannot do executive work. How can they tell whether or not those officers can do executive work if they are not given the opportunity? There is an officer in the Colonial Secretary's Office named Mr. Rocheford who is eminently qualified to act in the capacity of an Assistant Colonial Secretary but he is a native and when they talk about natives, they mean people looking like myself; so, therefore, we cannot hold positions of authority. If there are some in this Chamber who reflect that idea we should not hesitate to lay the charge at their door also, simply because we are afraid that we will hurt somebody's corns. I do not have any corns to be hurt—praise Christ. I am not afraid to face a situation to which the attention of honourable members should be attracted. I am going to vote for this Bill but I am pointing out these things because we do not always get the opportunity to do so; sometimes the same people to whom these things are pointed out do not like the idea; they prefer to remain silent and to think of their self-preservation. I am here to represent the people and I feel that this is a matter to which I should call attention in the interest of the people whom I represent.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman,—I cannot say that I endorse every word the honourable senior member for St. Peter said but I certainly have profound sympathy for the point of view he has expressed and I would like to say the same thing in respect of the remarks which you made before you took the Chair. As honourable members are aware, the position occupied by the member of the Executive Committee who deals with a point like this, is a difficult one. I have not the least desire to attempt to shift blame from myself or other members of the Executive Committee but in this case the matter does not rest with us at present. When we have a full responsible form of Government—the ministerial system—then the administration of the Civil Service will be the responsibility of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, as well as the question of formulating policy. Up to now, under

the Colonial Office System it is not our business as such. We have no voice unless we are asked for our opinion in matters of this sort. I shall only say that I will state in the right quarters the criticisms and points of view which have been expressed by honourable members in this Committee.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN, the Chairman reports the passing of this Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. SPRINGER seconded by Mr. BLACKMAN in each case the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

BRIDGETOWN AND SPEIGHTSTOWN (TRAFFIC) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip,—To move the passing of a Resolution to sanction Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 37 (1) of the Police Act, 1908 (1908—2).

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—The reason for this Resolution is that the clerk of the Scavenging Department has reported that the small push-cart which is used in connection with the cleaning of the City streets was not permitted by the Police to pass through Broad Street during the day and when representation was made to the Police Department asking the reason why, it was pointed out that under the existing regulations—the Bridgetown Traffic Regulations—no lorry, wagon, truck, dray, hand-cart or vehicle of burthen is permitted in Broad Street from the corner of High Street to the corner of Prince William Henry Street between the hours of 9 a.m. and 3.45 p.m. The Commissioners of Health are more or less responsible for the cleaning daily of all the streets in the City and they are also responsible for the removal of all refuse from those streets. I am informed that this small push-cart is used at stated intervals during the day in the task of keeping Broad Street clean and free from refuse; so if the Commissioners are to be able to carry out this duty, it is necessary that the existing regulations should be so amended as to enable them to do it without transgressing the law. It is, therefore, suggested that the amendment as specified in this Resolution be passed in order to permit the scavenging of Broad Street to be done at any hour during the day. I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: Before the question is put I want to say that I am not against the idea in this Resolution but I notice that paragraph (h) states:—“Nothing in this paragraph shall apply to any hand cart used by the Commissioners of Health of the Parish of St. Michael for the purpose of scavenging.” I would like to ask these scavengers not to place pieces of broken bottles at the corners of the streets because they sometimes ruin the tires of the people's vehicles. I suggest that they put them a little further away from the corners of the streets.

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

RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT WITH THE BRITISH UNION OIL CO. FOR SUPPLY OF NATURAL GAS.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to ask leave to take Order No. 2 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip,—To move the passing of a Resolution to ratify the agreement made between the Executive Committee and Ernest Gunn Macintyre, one of the constituted Attorneys in this island of the British Union Oil Co. Ltd., for the supply of Natural Gas to the Belle Pumping Station.

Mr. CRAWFORD: This Resolution merely seeks to ratify the Agreement made between the Executive Committee and one of the constituted Attorneys of the British Union Oil Co. Ltd., with regard to the supply of natural gas to the Belle Pumping Station. The text of the Agreement is set out in the schedule of the Resolution and the addendum draws attention to the fact that on the 14th January, 1947, His Excellency transmitted for the information of the House a copy of the draft agreement between the Executive Committee and the British Union Oil Co. Ltd. for the supply of natural gas to the Belle Pumping Station. The House is also reminded in the addendum that in its Address to the Governor, dated 28th January, 1947, it signified its concurrence in the terms of the Agreement. Nothing, therefore, remains to be done to-day but to ask for the formal ratification of the Agreement. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. RAMSAY: I want to draw the attention of the House to paragraph 5 of this Agreement. I want honourable members to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest it. It says:—“The supplier” (that is supposed to be this British Union Oil Co. Ltd.) “shall free of charge install a meter for measuring the quantity of gas consumed,” and it goes on further to state what shall be the responsibility of the householder: “and the Executive Committee shall provide adequate accommodation for the necessary metering equipment and adopt efficient means for protecting the same.” All I am saying is that this latter provision is irrelevant. We should only ask this Company to put in a meter and not to charge us for it. This shows that this Government is not doing its duty in other respects. It protects itself in this matter of the installation of a meter for the measuring of the quantity of natural gas supplied to it by the British Union Oil Co., Ltd., but on the other hand it does nothing to protect the poor householder from the tyranny of the Electric Company in respect of their charge for the meter which they instal to register the current which is used. (Cheers).

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

PASSENGERS BAGGAGE (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take Order No. 16 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John.—To move the passing of a Resolution to sanction the regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 177 of the Trade Act, 1910 (1910-4).

Mr. BLACKMAN: This Resolution just asks the House of Assembly to sanction certain regulations made under the Trade Act. The object of it is to increase the charge on packages not exceeding six in number from 3d. each to 4d. each and to make the charge on every additional package 2d. instead of 1½d as it is at present. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—This is an important matter and I may have a lot to say in connection with it. As it is near two o'clock, I beg to move that the further consideration of this Resolution be postponed.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

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

QUESTION DISALLOWED

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to disallow the question put this morning by the honourable junior member for St. Peter inasmuch as the matter has already been raised in a question put by the honourable junior member for St. Philip.

Mr. RAMSAY: I bow to Your Honour's ruling.

REPLIES LAID

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the replies to question No. 50 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Lucy.

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, leave was granted the honourable member.

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

Mr. SPRINGER seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day under Government Business is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Clerical Service Act, 1944 (1944-27). When the motion for the second reading of this Bill was being debated on the last occasion the honourable senior member for the City had last spoken and the House was adjourned at 2 p.m.

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. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read as follows:—

2. Subsection (4) of section five of the Principal Act is hereby repealed and the following new subsection substituted therefor:—

"(4) If on the coming into operation of this Act or at any time thereafter it shall appear to the Governor that the provisions of this Act with regard to the earning of salary or annual increments would cause undue hardship to any officer, or if at any time any case shall arise in connection with the earning of salary or annual increments in respect of which there is no provision in this Act, the Governor may make such adjustment as he shall deem expedient provided that the limits prescribed by this Act shall in no case be exceeded."

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill. I beg to assure honourable members that the point taken when this Bill was first before the House has been carefully investigated by the Government. I can assure the House that there is not a single person to whom this Bill will apply who was merely in War Service and not a member of the Civil Service. There were temporary clerks acting for persons who were away on military duties and the hardships arose when the two-year probationary period had, in some cases, been already passed by those persons holding these temporary posts. According to an opinion by the Attorney General, unless this change was made these persons would have to undergo the probationary period again. I can give the assurance that nobody is coming in through Dr. Saint's war-time organization and going over the heads of any members of the Civil Service.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 2 was passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumed.

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

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John:—To move the passing of a Resolution to authorise His Excellency the Governor in accordance with the provision of section 3 (2) of the Clerical Service Act, 1944 (1944-27) to appoint one additional Clerk to the Clerical Staff of the Clerical Service.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I ask leave to postpone this Order.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to postpone the Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order 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.

The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Colonial Treasurer's Act, 1941 (1941-9).

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to postpone this Order; I have not got the file with me.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to postpone the Order.

MIDWIVES AND NURSES REGISTRATION RULES POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. John: To move the passing of the following Resolution: A Resolution to approve the Rules made by the General Nursing Council under section 9 of the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932 (1932-1).

Mr. BLACKMAN: This Resolution asks this House to approve Rules made by the General Nursing Council under section nine of the Midwives and Nurses Registration Act, 1932 (1932-1). These Rules are intended to form part of the Rules made by the General Nursing Council and finally approved by the Legislature of this Island on the 14th of March, 1934. They make provision for a course of training and conduct of examinations for midwives and nurses. The Rules are very complete. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Have not these Rules come before this House either this session or last session?

Mr. ADAMS: They have come before the House this session but they were in slightly different form. All our work was really nugatory; these Rules came the House as amended in the last session. They were not strictly before the House; they should have come as they left the Nursing Council and it is with the object of correcting that mistake that they have found their way back on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then what was laid before the House should not have been laid.

Mr. ADAMS: Yes Sir. Our work was really nugatory.

Mr. SPEAKER: The only thing I am considering is whether we should consider again something which we have already considered.

Mr. ADAMS: They could not be passed into law because we did something which we should not have done.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no particular hurry about the matter I should like to give it some more consideration. (After a pause). Will the House accept my suggestion to postpone the consideration of these Rules?

MEMBERS: Yes Sir.

Mr. RAMSAY: I beg to move that the consideration of these Rules be postponed.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

COLONIAL TREASURER'S (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 13 as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, the honourable member was granted leave to proceed with the Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume Committee on the Colonial Treasurer's (Amendment) Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee on the Bill. Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was last in Committee on this Bill, Clause 2 was being considered when progress was reported with leave for the Committee to sit again.

Mr. SPRINGER: I do not know whether you will recall, Mr. Chairman, but on the last occasion when this Bill was being considered in Committee I moved an amendment to Clause 2. My motion was that Clause 2 Sub-Clause 2 in inverted commas as

printed be deleted and the following inserted in place thereof:—

"(2) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in sub-section (1) of this section, if the Colonial Treasurer through illness shall become temporarily incapable of performing the duties of his office or shall die, the Governor may if he shall consider it expedient so to do appoint some fit and proper person to act in his place and stead until an appointment shall have been made by the House of Assembly. The Governor shall inform the House of Assembly at its next meeting of such appointment and the House of Assembly shall thereupon nominate some fit and proper person to be approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to act in place of the Colonial Treasurer."

The motion for reporting progress was passed before my motion was considered by the Committee. I merely say that so as to re-introduce the position to the Committee in case honourable members may have forgotten it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the Bill. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it. The question now is that the words proposed to be inserted stand part of the Bill. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

Clause 2 as amended was passed.

Mr. ADAMS: Before I move that you do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee, I think that it is right to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has not fought the dissenting members of the House on this issue because we hope that members of all Parties are agreed on the necessity as soon as possible for having a financial secretary and have our affairs conducted in a different way from the ancient, traditional way of taking a glorified cashier and appointing him to the office of Colonial Treasurer. I beg to move that the Chairman do now report the passing of this Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPRINGER: seconded the motion which was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN reported and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION BILL POSTPONED

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph:—Second reading of a Bill to grant additional sums of money out of the Public Treasury and to appropriate the same for the service of the years ended the 31st of March, 1941, the 31st of March, 1942, the 31st of March, 1943, the 31st of March, 1944, the 31st of March 1945, and the 31st of March, 1946.

Mr. SPRINGER: Some honourable members are saying that they have not received printed copies of this Bill and we are therefore asking leave to postpone it.

There being no objection, leave was granted for the postponement of the Bill.

RESOLUTION SANCTIONING REGULATIONS RE TRADE ACT

Mr. SPRINGER: Before you call the next Order, Mr. Speaker I would like to know if we

would be in order to resume discussion on Order No. 16 this afternoon in view of the fact that it was postponed only this morning. The honourable junior member for St. John may have referred to these Regulations as those dealing with the Package Tax but these Regulations are nothing to do with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see nothing against dealing with it now.

Mr. SPRINGER: I beg to move that Order No. 16 be taken as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. RAMSAY seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the motion for the passing of a Resolution to sanction the Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 177 of the Trade Act, 1910 (1910—4).

Mr. BLACKMAN: The object of these Regulations is to increase the amount paid to the Customs porters for the hauling of packages from—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has already made a motion. The motion for the postponement of the further consideration of the Resolution was made by the honourable senior member for St. Peter and it was seconded by the honourable senior member for St. Michael.

The honourable members did not rise to speak.

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

The Resolution was passed.

DIPLOMATIC PRIVILEGES BILL

Mr. SPRINGER: I ask leave to proceed with Order No. 18 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. George: Second reading of a Bill to make provisions as to the immunities privileges and capacities of international organisations of which His Majesty's Government in the U.K. and foreign Governments are members, etc.

Mr. SPRINGER: This is a Bill which is referred to in very lengthy "Objects and Reasons" which I would not attempt to read out *in extenso* now. It begins by saying that "Envoys of foreign sovereign powers accredited to His Majesty in England are by the law of England accorded certain immunities and privileges, and English envoys in foreign States receive reciprocal treatment."

Consequent upon the setting up of the various international organisations during the war just ended, the question arose as to whether the representatives of those organisations should be accorded similar privileges and immunities."

The matter was dealt with in England by an Act passed two years ago: we did not pass it at that time because it did not seem as if the question would arise here. The Assembly of the United Nations in February last year approved of a General Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations and each of the member Nations was asked to assent to it. Two Resolutions were passed as follows:—

(a) that provision should be made (apart from the said convention) as to immunities, privileges and facilities to be enjoyed by the International Court of Justice set up under the Charter of the United States; and

(b) that negotiations should be opened with a view to the unification of the immunities and privileges enjoyed by the United Nations and certain other international organisations.

Certain other things followed and the Secretary of States for the Colonies has requested that legislation along the lines of the English Act of 1944 should, with appropriate amendments be introduced in the Colonial Territories and this Bill has been put forward accordingly. The Governor will be authorised to name the organisations to which the Bill shall apply: the extent of the privileges and immunities which are to be allowed to the particular organisation; to name the officers of the organisation and the persons employed who shall enjoy these privileges and immunities and finally to name any other classes of officers on whom privileges and immunities are to be conferred and the extent thereof. All Orders made by the Governor must be laid before the Legislature. The Bill also seeks to provide for the extension to the staffs of the representatives of the member Governments and to the families of officers of the organization of the same privileges and immunities as those which are conferred on the representatives or officers. Now that we are becoming internationally-minded and actually getting somewhere towards it in spite of certain spanners being thrown into the works by certain people, it is felt that all facilities which may assist in the carrying out of the national mission should be granted just as they are being granted by States today; and we will be merely following the general pattern if in the event of our coming across these people we treat them with the same privileges and courtesy which they receive at the hands of the Imperial powers. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: 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.

The second reading was passed.

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

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, seconded by Mr. Cox, the Chairman reported progress and that the Committee had asked for leave to sit again.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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* DIS-ESTABLISHMENT AND GRADUAL DIS-ENDOWMENT OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

Mr. SPEAKER The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business is to resume debate on the motion that the Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the Dis-establishment and gradual Disendowment of the Anglican Church in Barbados do now pass. When this Address was being considered on the last occasion, a motion for the postponement of its further consideration was made by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and this was seconded by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and agreed to. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas can speak now if he wishes to do so.

Dr. CUMMINS: I do want to say a few words on the passing of this Address. Last Tuesday quite a few of those honourable members who spoke on this matter thought that this Address sought to destroy the Church in some form or other as was done under Communism. However, the idea is only to disestablish and disendow the Church. I believe that those honourable members spoke more from sentiment than from reason and commonsense. They were motivated by the fact that the tradition which has caused the Church to be endowed for the past 300 years should not be broken; but Sir, this is a day of change. Change is a biological law, a biological process which must affect everything. From time to time we amend laws in this House because of the change of thought to bring them in line with the change of thought of the present day. I feel that the opinion of this community in favour of the disendowment of the Church is overwhelming. I think that it has been mentioned and, it is quite true, that Barbados is the only place in the English-speaking world with a State-paid Church. I do not know when it came about in England, but it is sufficient to say that the English whom we Barbadians are very fond at times when it suits us to say we are following—they disendowed their Church long ago, and from what I hear the Church in England is still a flourishing institution. Disendowment in Barbados, to my mind will be the only thing to save the Church. I say that for this reason: those of us who know Barbados, who move around with the people and who will not speak with our tongues in our cheeks, know that the Church of England, the endowed Church, has lost its influence to a great extent in the lives of the people of this community. I hear of a church away down to the north which, if it has a dozen people on Sunday mornings, is considered a full church because the Clergy have lost touch with the people. On Sundays they go into the pulpits and in a perfunctory manner perform the services that they are more or less compelled to perform by law. They preach some sort of sermon and come down from the pulpits; apart from that, they are not interested in the lives of the people. I feel that it is wrong and immoral for this Government to continue to maintain an institution for which the people of this colony have lost, I would not say respect, but a great amount of regard. I read somewhere in the Good Book when I used to go to school that you cannot serve God and mammon: and we know that the Clergy in the endowed Church keep one eye on the Treasury and the other eye somewhere else. The principle eye is on the Treasury. (Laughter). There has been a lot of argument falsely founded on the assumption that if the Church is disendowed the poor people will suffer, that they will have to pay for their marriages, their baptisms and their burials. Well, I have taken the trouble to enquire from a few Wesleyan parsons and a few Moravians whose Churches are not endowed but they receive a small grant—I have enquired from these people as to what is done in their Churches as regards marriages, baptisms and burials and I have been told that people who identify themselves with the Church get these services performed free. Naturally, if you do not belong to their Church and you want these services performed, you will have to pay for having them performed. I am informed that paying for marriages is nothing new: I understand that at St. Paul's most of the marriages are performed on Sundays and people pay for them: people do not mind paying for them because that day suits them best. They prefer that day rather than a day which does not suit them. If these people happen to

be members of different churches they will get these services performed free. There is a misconception, as far as I know, that the present Bishop is responsible more or less for the step which is being taken to-day as regards the disendowment of the Church. I have not spoken with the Bishop about this matter but I do know that three or four years ago—long before the Bishop came to this island—the honourable member on my immediate left, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, introduced a Bill in this House relative to the dis-establishment and disendowment of the Church. I am not defending the Bishop in this affair, he is quite capable of defending or taking care of himself; but I think that I should make it publicly known that he is not responsible for this Address which is before us to-day in connection with the movements towards Disendowment. In 1923 or 1924 I happened to be a member of the Democratic League which is now defunct—the honourable junior member for St. Peter and I were members of that Organisation—and one of the main planks in the platform of the Organisation was the disendowment of the Church. Disendowment has been preached throughout the length and breadth of this island and so it is nothing new. It is true that the matter has taken a long time to reach the stage of discussion in this Chamber, but the fact is that from 1923 or 1924 the Democratic League has been preaching disendowment. I have said that it is immoral to ask people to-day to contribute to the upkeep of an institution for which they no longer have any regard. I believe that if I want my religion I must pay for it. Whatever religion I choose, I am prepared to pay for it and it is immoral to-day to ask people who belong to other faiths—some people belong to none at all—to subscribe to the upkeep of the Anglican Church. I think that £13,000 or £14,000 a year is spent for the payment of the Anglican parsons and besides that the Vestries have to prepare their churches. As you know, every penny that is spent on the Cathedral—if they want a broom to sweep it—that comes from the taxpayers of St. Michael. I think that the day has long passed when we should call upon the taxpayers of St. Michael who belong to other churches to pay for the upkeep of the religion to which they do not subscribe spiritually. For this reason, I am prepared to vote in favour of this Address. I am reminded of a story which I read sometime ago—I do not remember where—but it was to the effect that years ago when the Church of Rome began to acquire wealth, a Cardinal from some foreign State visited the Vatican and after having been shown over, the Cardinal who was showing the other one over remarked: "No longer will the Church be able to say 'Silver and gold have I none.'" The other Cardinal replied: "Neither will it be able to say 'Take up thy bed and walk.'" By that I mean having regard to the acquisition of material wealth, that they have lost that spiritual influence which they once held and which should be rightly theirs in this community. I hope that this House will vote in favour of this Address.

Mr. MAPP: Much of the force of an Address of this nature has, to my mind, been lost through the intention of the Government as announced this morning by the Leader of the House, to disestablish and disendow the Church quite shortly. Nevertheless, an Address of this nature provides a useful sounding-board for the opinion of honourable members and I do not want to give a silent vote on the matter. Now it has been said that the Synod of the Anglican Church has not or did not express itself as

being in favour of disestablishment and disendowment. I thought myself that it had done so. At least it is true to say that the Church is in favour of it; the Head of the Church himself is definitely in favour of disestablishment and disendowment. Are we to assume that the person who is the head of an institution which is there to provide for the spiritual needs of the people is so unconcerned that he would advocate doing something which will not contribute greatly to the spiritual growth of this community? I can hardly believe that. I do not say as the last speaker has already pointed out, that the Bishop has started this move; this move started long before the Bishop came here. At one time public opinion was greatly in favour of it so much so that very few members of this House could say otherwise than that the Church should be disestablished and disendowed. I am not depending upon the reasons given by the Bishop for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church which will weigh with the Clergy and the people as a whole; I have some positive reasons for it and before I give those reasons, I should just like to say that I am a very strict Anglican. Mr. RAMSAY: That isn't saying much). I agree that that is not saying much. I have a free mind in some things; I strictly and purely conform to the performing of the rites and rituals of the Church which is established and endowed in this island. The principal reason for the establishment and endowment of the Church is because the State has taken it upon itself to follow a particular kind of religion. That is wrong. We grow up as members of the church; we are members of the Church and we think that this is the only Church; that if you are a member of any other Church, you are not being guided along the right line. That is what is thought and therefore to some extent, the arguments in favour of establishment and endowment based upon these factors are purely a question of sentiment. One of the outstanding reasons why the Church should be disestablished is that no body of laymen such as this, the majority of whom may not be church members—they may be atheists—should say what rules should govern church worship. It is true that we do not initiate these laws ourselves but we sanction them. If opinion in England has moved against the establishment of the Church, if it has been felt by churchmen that it is wrong to have a House composed of men who may be atheists to legislate for the spiritual needs of the people, I think we should fall in line with that. That is an argument which you cannot very well destroy. I have discussed this matter with priests and laity alike and many priests seem to be in favour of disestablishment. The argument used to be employed long before we attained our present political composition and people were suffering as they never suffered before—the Church as a body was there to preach the Word of God and they never howled against the wrongs of that day—that if you disestablished and disendowed the Church in those days you might be offending the very persons to whom the people look for help. That argument has disappeared to some extent. In which ever way you view it, the Church is in a peculiar position when it comes up against secularism. On the one hand it is tied to the State it represents and is therefore unable to preach against social wrongs against which it should be able to preach; on the other hand if you did not have it tied to the State but to certain individuals who may be strong financially, it would also be tied and unable to speak as it should speak. If the Church wants to do its duty as it should be done, if it wants to be a moral force and to preach the word of God, it must not be tied to any secular patri-

at all. It must be independent so that it can criticize and be prepared to do its duty at all times. Another argument is one which has been raised by the last speaker. Why should a Wesleyan or a member of another Church be called upon to pay for the upkeep of a section of the Church in which he has no part? It may be an atheistic institution. Who can say or lay it down with authority that other members of the community who may be members of another branch of religion cannot receive as much religious inspiration out of their branch of religion as the members of the established Church receive from theirs? This is largely a matter of custom; the English Church, the Established Church, was an outstanding institution and we have therefore become members of the Church. Can we now say because we are members of that Church that, as I read another member has said, the other branches of religion should be swept off their feet and that they are not doing any good? There may be religious worship in which you receive all the enthusiasm which another receives in his religion. It is a matter of expressing their rites and rituals which may not be enjoyed by you although it gives some spiritual comfort and joy. Why therefore should we say that the other branches of religion should be blotted out and one be maintained by the State? I have said that I am a free thinker; lots of people will say that I am speaking herself on to say that these other people may be performing a function as great as that of the Church is simply damning myself for ever. We cannot lay down any law to apply to the matter of religion. I feel that that is impossible. Those are the main reasons why I am in favour of the passing of this Address. I have not heard any arguments which can sway me from my intention to support it. The arguments that the poor people may be called upon to pay for the performance of certain rites and ceremonies as a result of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church can be overcome. If we think that we should subsidise the Church so as to allow certain ceremonies to be performed on behalf of the poor people, we can give it a grant bearing in mind, of course, what its financial position is. On the best possible basis I have seen nothing that would lead us to say that the Church should not be disestablished and disendowed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members—

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry that honourable members who seemed to have been prepared to speak on this subject have forced me to continue the debate at a time when I was busily engaged in doing something else. But Mr. Speaker, this is a subject on which I think all the members of the House should have an opinion whether they express it or not, and one to which all members of the House should pay great attention. I hope that if at times I speak as if some matters were too elementary to remind honourable members of the House will pardon me because I so often find myself taking things for granted as being within the knowledge of an audience, even of a Legislature, and later discover that they are things of which they are profoundly ignorant. The history of disestablishment and disendowment should be known to every school boy. I found in 1944 when I introduced a Bill on this point, that honourable members of the Legislature confused the two things. It therefore became necessary to speak to them and give them an explanation of the difference between disestablishment and disendowment. Honourable members will I hope, pardon me if I do that this afternoon. Although for many years the question of disestablish-

ment has agitated the minds of the people in this island, although it has been customary for politicians who wished to raise a popular cheer to attack the Church and say some of the things which have been repeated in this House during the course of this debate about clergymen not doing their work, after all the Anglican Church is a man-made institution and none of us, even the most politically-minded, is infallible. If clergymen do not seem to be as spiritual as they are likely to become in their old age, according to the honourable Junior member for St. Peter, one must remember that the exigencies of modern life, the necessity of working for a living, the necessity of getting into a respectable profession is part of the characteristically Victorian outlook of middle-class Barbados. Some clergymen are clergymen because it is a respectable profession—more so than being a teacher at an elementary school. It is not therefore to be expected that all clergymen will meet with the same respect that we should like to know we extend to members of any church. I do not base any argument on the alleged deficiency of this or that member of any church. Even in Heaven we are told that there were not all good angels; we should not expect them on earth or claim that we can reach that stage. Speaking, I hope, normally and dispassionately, I should say that the Church is based on something much higher. I am going to be as moderate as I can in my language, but, speaking for myself, I would not consider that I had one atom of self-respect if I were a clergyman of the Anglican Church in Barbados, especially if I were an Anglo-Catholic. The Anglican Church Act was drafted and is perpetuated by 24 of us, some of us atheists, some agnostics, one at least a Roman Catholic, some of us Wesleyans and others members of the Established Church, and the Clergy have to comply with the Act on pain of not getting their salaries at the end of the month. No self-respecting man would continue to sit under that. He has to promulgate the 39 Articles in order to draw his salary, and if he does not believe in them and draws it he does so on false pretences. He does not believe in them but promulgates them with reservations. At this point the question is bound up with disestablishment. When we say how the Bishop has to discipline the Clergy and he has no real power, we are striking at the very basis of good government of the Church. I repeat that on the general principle of disestablishment when a body of persons who are to be told what their spiritual thinking is to be by 24 haphazardly-chosen laymen, none of whom is bound to be a member of any Church let alone be a member of the Anglican Church, that is a position of which any self-respecting man should be ashamed. The Church should be disestablished from the State and be free to establish its own doctrine, its own discipline, its own form of worship and it should be, I think, the greatest force in the life of nations. The Church should be so superior to the State, it should stand on so elevated a plane above the State that all men should look to it for guidance in times of difficulty, trouble and even in times of piping peace. However much we may feel self-contained, all of us look elsewhere for spiritual and moral guidance, and no one can reasonably say that members of this community look to the Anglican Church for moral guidance. After all, the Clergy are human beings; if they were to thunder against evils which have existed in this colony for centuries and which still exist, the act courts financial disaster; it

courts social ostracism and even hatred of their own relatives, because, after all, for 300 years the Clergy in this colony have been composed of the sons and brothers and cousins of legislators. To get into the pulpit on Sundays and say to a Legislature that you are not perpetuating evils is to ask for your salary to be lopped off from the Treasury. The Clergy should not be put in that position.

As regards the question of disendowment, speaking generally, my own view has been, as far as I remember set out in 1944, in the Bill which suggested a gradual disendowment over a period of years as was done in British Guiana. The £13,000 should be a diminishing quantity by so much a year until it all went. I believe the view of the Bishop is that the sum should be maintained for a number of years and then stopped. That is a matter of detail which the Executive will consider in due course when it sends down a Bill in accordance with the principle of this Address. I do not wish to tire the House with any long historical exposition of the course of disestablishment or disendowment in English History. Doubtless honourable members will remember, at least some honourable members will even have read the debates when the Welsh Church was disestablished. They will remember the disestablishment of the Irish Church and they will know or should know or have the means of refreshing their memories of the history of disendowment in England. When it is said that those of us who have paid attention to this subject, those of us who believe in both disestablishment and disendowment, are the enemies of the Church, I say, Mr. Speaker, and I speak not for myself alone, that we deplore the position which the Church has reached and we feel that by getting it apart from the State, it will once again attain to that dignity and high level which it is the function of the Church on earth to maintain. I said a moment ago that all of us look for spiritual guidance at some time or other in our lives, and I hope to see the Anglican Church in Barbados as the free repository of all we miss so much in our public life in Barbados. I hope to see the Church having everything on a high spiritual plane so that when in doubt even legislators will be able to turn to the leaders of the Church for guidance just as our forefathers used to turn to them with such faith for spiritual guidance when they were in doubt. I shall do very little more than refer honourable members to some quotations and I hope they will not take notice of what I am doing and exercise their right to ask that what I am reading from be made a document of the House. I wrote out what I was going to read but I am afraid that I have misplaced it. When it is alleged that those of us who believe in disestablishment and disendowment are opposed to the Church, I ask those who make such an allegation to study the history of disestablishment not only of the British Church but the history of disestablishment in the West Indies. I am fortunate to possess a little book on Disestablishment and in 150 pages or so are set out the Liberal Party's views on Disestablishment. It contains the history of disestablishment throughout the British Empire and refers to the West Indian Colonies including Barbados, and this passage should appeal very much to honourable members whether they are in favour of disestablishment or against it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable members should give the gist of what he wants to quote.

Mr. ADAMS: In 1881 at Newcastle Church Congress a number of clergymen were discussing this question of disestablishment and one of them got up and said that he was probably the only man in the gathering who had practical experience of a State-supported and Disestablished Church existing side by side. He was the late Bishop Mitchinson, formerly Bishop of Barbados, a name that resounds with reverence and affection, one of the greatest Churchmen we have ever had, one who did as much for the Church as he did for education and one who did as much as any other clergyman who has come to this colony. He compared State-aided Barbados with the Disestablished Windward Islands. In the former, he said, during the whole period of his ministry although the Clergy talked very much about progress, he had never known them to make one distinct step forward towards adapting themselves to changing circumstances. He went on to say that in the disestablished diocese of the Windward Islands although when disestablishment was being discussed there was great opposition on the part of the clergy and laity, after it became a *fait accompli* there was forgetfulness of the system of establishment and the Church went on to greater and greater usefulness in the Windward Islands. When they were faced with the necessity for reconstruction they went to it with wonderful eagerness and they produced results that they did not produce when they were established. The laity were more liberal in their gifts to the Church, the clergy were more active in their spiritual work and they made a rapid progress in the Windward Islands. Bishop Mitchinson showed how great a contrast there was between Barbados, where the clergy did not have to worry because they were paid, and the Disestablishment. I invoke the name of Bishop Mitchinson because he was no Radical in any sense of the word; and I couple with him the name of that reverend gentleman who, all of us can thank God, now happens to be Bishop of Barbados. I am surprised at some of the things that have been said. The Bishop's position on the question of disestablishment has been made clear more than once and his Charge has been published in the Press and in pamphlet form. The Bishop has made no secret of it. The general feeling in this colony had been aroused by the Bill which was introduced in 1944 and clergymen began to see that disestablishment and disendowment were not far off. When the Bishop was asked to come here he was specially told that he would be expected to preside over the Church when disestablishment and disendowment were being discussed or became a reality. He came here on that understanding and he has repeated it so that nobody should have any doubt as to where the Bishop stands. The Bishop has put his position to the Synod and suggested that there were only two courses open to it. "It can say 'We shall resolutely oppose any disestablishment proposals'—a thing in which I could never concur—or it can say, 'If any proposals are made by the Legislature, we are willing to co-operate in order to secure a settlement which is just and fair to all interests involved'. It could of course say 'We believe that disestablishment is what is required for spiritual good of the Church and we therefore ask for it.'" As honourable members will remember the Resolution that was passed is this:—

"Whereas the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Barbados has been the subject of discussion over a period of years: (Not a bolt from the blue this time) and

Whereas a Bill to that end was introduced into the House of Assembly during the session 1944—46; and

Whereas an Address to His Excellency the Governor praying for legislation to give effect to the same is on the Order Paper of the House of Assembly in the name of Mr. J. A. Haynes:

Be it resolved that the Synod of the Diocese of Barbados, duly constituted and assembled requests the Bishop of the Diocese to inform His Excellency the Governor, that, if invited to do so, the Synod will be pleased to confer with the Government in the preparation of necessary legislation, should the House of Assembly pass the Address and His Excellency grant the prayer of the Address.

On the vote being taken, the Resolution was carried on a 50-25 division. Of the clergy present 33 voted for and 9 against it—an overwhelming vote; of the laymen, 17 voted for and 16 against it. When the lay vote is examined, it will be seen—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering, if we admit a thing of that kind, how many others we will admit and where are we going to stop?

Mr. ADAMS: It is up to honourable members if they have Resolutions to refer to them during the debate. I am replying to the suggestion that the Church or the Head of the Church is not in favour of disestablishment; that is the only reason why I have quoted that Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you authorise people outside the House to submit their opinions where are you going to stop?

Mr. ADAMS: It is a matter for the patience of the House and how long they are willing to listen.

Mr. SPEAKER: What I am saying is that you can put your own opinion and other members of the House can put their own opinions; but when you quote the opinions of other people that might go a very long way.

Mr. ADAMS: I am quoting the authorities of the Church who are in favour of disestablishment. I am replying to the suggestion that nobody knows if the clergy or laity are against it. I am merely saying that that is not a fact. I am quoting from published reports on the point and the Resolution that was finally passed after the deliberations.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am only pointing out that that might give opportunities to other members of the House to begin quoting from other people.

Mr. ADAMS: I quite appreciate that, but it is a matter for the House to examine the allegation that the Church does not want disestablishment and to satisfy those who may be in favour of maintaining the *status quo*.

Mr. SPEAKER: The members of this House must decide for themselves whether or not they agree with disestablishment and disendowment and not put forward in the House arguments or resolutions passed by other bodies. I am wondering whether this is the right way to do it or not.

Mr. ADAMS: It is difficult to have a debate on any subject without quoting some authority that can be respected. It is not enough for me to say, for instance, that it is better to build a house of concrete rather than of shingles unless human experience has taught us that building a house of concrete is better than building one of shingles. It is difficult to say anything in a debate without quoting persons who can be respected as authorities on the particular subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: A document that is produced in the House becomes a document of the House.

Mr. ADAMS: If honourable members do not pay any attention to what I am reading from it may not become a document of the House. I have heard the position of the Bishop and the Church threatened and I am quoting the bare authentic views in reply to the suggestions that the Clergy, Laity or the Church are opposed to disestablishment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am merely showing you my point of view.

Mr. ADAMS: I say that it is a matter for the patience of the House as to whether they will listen to honourable members or not. My point was that it is not merely the Bishop and the Clergy who by that great majority are in favour of meeting the Government if this Address is passed and the Government sends down a Bill or takes it upon itself to begin the consideration of a Bill in the spirit of the Address; it is also the Laity in spite of what appears to be an equal vote. What happened was that there was a proposal to have nothing to do with the matter at all unless the House had decided on this Address and after that amendment was lost and the other amendment which I have just read out was put, then some members voted in the way they did because they had voted for that amendment; but they were overwhelming in favour of disestablishment. So that when we are told that we are putting something down the throats of the Clergy or the Anglican Synod, my answer is that the reverse is true. They are greatly in favour of disestablishment; a straight vote of the laity would produce an equal overwhelming vote in favour of disestablishment as in the case of the clergy. What was really in the minds of the laity at first was the feeling that the honourable senior member for St. Andrew was merely giving notice of a Bill and intended to leave it there and if the Church and the laity did nothing he would do nothing; but there was no feeling of opposition to disestablishment.

I shall make one last quotation as to the Bishop's attitude generally about disestablishment. After speaking about the discipline of the clergy and laity and of how disestablishment would put an end to some of the existing laxities, the Bishop said this:

"I do not propose to go further into the pros and cons of the case; my own views are well known. I never have been, and am not now, a supporter of an established church, which I consider quite contrary to everything Our Lord meant His Church to be."

There could not be stronger language; to say that the Bishop is against disestablishment is to speak the exact contrary of what is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not like to interrupt the honourable member, but what I want to find out is this: Suppose the Bishop had been just as strong on the other side and other members had brought it up as an argument. Would that be an argument that this House could take into account?

Mr. ADAMS: If some of us feel that there should not be disestablishment and we could say that the Church would be against it, that would help our argument considerably. Those who are opposed to disestablishment would be doing an injustice to the Church not to mention that the Church is opposed to disestablishment. I repeat; it is difficult to see how, in any matter affecting a body of people, you can ignore the people's views. If you are discussing whether school teachers are pensionable or otherwise, it is your duty to quote from the Teachers' Association; if it is a matter affecting Civil Servants, it is your duty to

say what is the feeling of the Civil Service Association in the matter. I have made these quotations in order to make it abundantly clear that this is no political move. It is merely bringing a unique part of the Empire into line with the rest of the Empire. Barbadians like to feel that they are different from the rest of the world where the Church is disestablished. Doubtless when the honourable junior member for St. Peter speaks he will remind us of that mother who said "My little Johnnie is the only one in the regiment who is marching in step". The honourable member will use his analogy for saying that Barbados is the only colony which is right because Barbados alone has a State-paid and established Church. Although we say things and chuck bricks at the Clergy, one of the strong arguments in favour of disestablishing the Church is the question of church discipline. This is a serious matter. It has happened that a clergyman of the Church got leave from the Colonial Secretary and went away. He got an extension of his leave from the Secretary of State for the Colonies and did not say one word about the extension of his leave to the Bishop; yet the Bishop is supposed to be the Head of the Church! That is an impossible state of affairs which should not be allowed to last any longer, and I welcome the opportunity which this House now has of putting an end once and for all to the immoral union of the Church and the State, a State that contaminates the Church by its association with it, a State that pulls the Church down to its low level. In comparison with spiritual things all States are low and immoral and Barbados is no exception. If we had the Clergy free from the trammels of the State whether the House was pleased or not, the evils that exist in this colony today would not exist. In the centuries that have passed every clergyman looked at his brother in this House or in the Other Place failing to pass necessary measures and said nothing because he is paid from the Treasury. If we had no endowment even over the last century, Barbados would not have been in this sorry mess. There is poverty in the midst of plenty and squalor, filth and disease, although we have the material resources to clean them up. It is the duty of the Clergy to thunder against these things, not to overlook them and merely to see whether the Legislature is acting on the words which clergymen utter in the pulpit. Honourable members cannot think of me as putting spiritual things first, but I say that, as in other countries, what we lack in this country is a universal desire for a real spiritual reformation, we lack in this country the habit of putting spiritual things first. We look to see how much we are getting out of what we do and everything we do; we call ourselves Christians but nobody can recognize this community as a christian community. I am not ashamed or self-conscious when I make that public declaration and I hope that honourable members are agreed that our troubles—it is customary to talk about economic troubles but our troubles will never be solved until we endeavour to look at the spiritual side of things first, and the Church should be there pointing the way. That is my reason for speaking as strongly as I have spoken and I am hoping that the majority of the people in this community will agree with this House in seeing that the Church is disestablished from the State.

I shall be very brief now in dealing with the question of disendowment. None of us could be so evil as to have the views which we have about dis-

tablishment and do anything to hurt the Church or to put it in a less favourable position of being the spiritual Leader of the community than that in which it is now. None of us although we have spoken in favour of disestablishment and disendowment would, by our vote, put the Clergy in a less favourable financial position than that in which they are now; but we have the example of the rest of the British Empire to go by. In places where the endowment of the Church has ceased, people realise that a clergyman went into the Church not because a salary was there, but because he felt that he had a divine mission and he had the respect of the people who saw that he did not suffer. We are a State-paid Church. That is wrong. I hope the House will pardon me for saying what should be elementary knowledge; there are very few real endowments in this colony. If we did not have State-paid Church, I say that the wealthy people in this colony would give the Church money out of which an income would come from year to year. The majority of us feel that the State should not support the Church in the manner it has done in the past and are in favour of putting the Church in such a good financial position either immediately, which is almost impossible to do, or over a period of years that there can be built up a capital sum which will be put at the disposal of the Church so as to provide salaries and pensions for its incumbents. When I began to speak I mentioned what the British Guiana Government did over a period of 25 years. They appointed a Committee in 1919 to enquire into the best method of securing financial assistance for the Church and they included the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian Church, the Wesleyan Church, the Salvation Army and the Lutheran Church; they gave them various sums of money ranging from £50,000 to £3,190—in case of the Lutheran Church. This money was granted over a period of years, bonds were issued by the Government and the Church was put in a position where it would not suffer. That is the most recent instance of disendowment in the West Indian area and I mention it because I have the documents before me. There are no difficulties in working out a scheme whereby the Church will not suffer. Probably even the opponents of the Church would agree to take over its school property. That is a matter of detail. If the property is valued at £2,800, give them £5,000 for it (Laughter) so as to give the Church substantial support. (A MEMBER: You may be sorry that you disendowed them). I thank the House which has flattered me and paid attention to my rambling remarks. If I seemed to have spoken with any heat on the matter it is because for years I have given much attention to it, and I do think that in any period of life in this country as in any other country, first things should come first. A reformation of the Church, an end to following in the wake of the State, is, to my mind, the first thing necessary for social reform in this colony. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the passing of this Address which the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has so ably moved.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I am not in favour either of the disestablishment or the disendowment of the Church. (Cheers). I shall appear, of course, to be taking a rather contradictory attitude because I am going to vote in favour of the Address and I am doing so for this reason: I feel that the affairs of the Anglican Church are in a very bad state, and this is an opportunity that will be given to the Executive Committee to go into the Anglican Church Act and

put the whole thing on a proper footing. That is how I feel about the matter. I cannot agree that the Church is above the State; I do not exactly understand that. In England the King is supposed to be the Head of the Church and Defender of the Faith and the Archbishop of Canterbury is under him. If the Governor here is the King's Representative I do not see how the Bishop can be above the Governor. The next point is; as the authorities say, education is divided into three parts—intellectual, physical and moral or spiritual. It is known that we spend some £200,000 on intellectual education and a fair amount of money on physical education—volunteers, scouts, girl guides, cadets and things of that sort. If we are spending money on physical and intellectual education, I cannot see why the State should shirk its responsibility of spending money on moral and spiritual education. (Cheers). That is how the matter appears to me. I think that I have said all I want to say. (Cheers).

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to move that the further consideration of this Address be now postponed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

The question that the further consideration of this Address be now postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The further consideration of this Address was postponed.

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 5th day of August, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon. I hope that honourable members will not perpetuate the old-time complaint about being too tired to come out after a Bank Holiday. I would like to remind honourable members that there is a possibility of the House overlooking its own business if we do not meet regularly. Perhaps you will permit me to say, Mr. Speaker, that on the following Tuesday there will be a visit from Mr. Seel of the Colonial Office, who has expressly said that he would like to attend a meeting of the House and I hope that honourable members will forego the pleasure of staying away after a Bank Holiday.

Mr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to move that the words "the 5th day of August" be deleted in order to insert the words "the 12th day of August." The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that this gentleman is coming down and that we should meet on the 5th and on the 12th days of August. I think that is all the more reason for a meeting only on the 12th of August. I think that we have had full day to-day and I beg to move that amendment.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 5th day of August, 1947, at twelve o'clock noon. An amendment has been moved that the words "the 5th day of August" be deleted in order to insert the words the "12th day of August." The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Dr. WILSON, Messrs. RAMSAY, F. L. WALCOTT, COX, MAPP, SPRINGER, ADAMS, BLACKMAN, GARNER, CRAWFORD, TALMA, HAYNES and Dr. CUMMINS—13.

Noes: Messrs. MOTTLEY, S. A. WALCOTT, WILKINSON and WARD—4.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, thirteen honourable members voting "Aye", and four honourable members voting "No." This House now stands adjourned.