

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1953—54

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22nd September, 1953.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Messrs M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, F. C. GODDARD, E. St. A. HOLPER, V. B. VAUGHAN, C. E. TALMA and Mrs. E. E. BOURNE.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the 8th September, 1953, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS for Mr. ADAMS:— Resolution to place the sum of \$2,556 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1953—54, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1953-54, No. 11, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. CUMMINS for Mr. ADAMS:— Resolution that the sum of \$4,160 be granted from the Public Treasury as an *ex gratia* grant to Herbert Leon King, formerly Chief Inspector of Highways, St. Michael.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to consider the money Resolutions of which I have just given notice.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to approve the rate of salary to be paid to the Inspectors of Wells appointed under section 16 of the Underground Water Control Act, 1951—66.

QUESTIONS

Mr. TALMA:—To enquire of the appropriate member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House:—

1. Is Government aware that the ration allowances granted to nurses and other employees of the Mental Hospital are withheld during periods of illness or other periods of casual leave, whilst their counterparts at the Barbados General Hospital enjoy such allowances and other perquisites during such periods of off-duty or casual leave?

2. If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government please cause this practice of payment in off-duty periods to be uniform at both Institutions?

3. If the answer is "No," will Government please cause this matter to be investigated at an early date?

Mr. SMITH entered the House and took his seat.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PUBLIC HEALTH GENERAL (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1953

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to take order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—A Resolution to approve the Regulations made by the General Board of Health under Section 4 of the Public Health Act, 1908—8.

Dr. CUMMINS: I suppose honourable members are well acquainted with the proposal of the World Health Organization, and the reason for this Resolution is to provide for the eradication of the mosquito, *Aedes aegypti*, from this island. In order to do that, there will have to be widespread disinfecting and the use of larvicide in people's houses and in water containers, and so on. The object of this Resolution is to amend the Regulations so as to give persons other than Sanitary Inspectors authority to enter upon the premises of people in this island. The Regulation which we now seek to amend gives power only to Sanitary Inspectors to enter upon premises, but this amendment seeks to give authority not only to Sanitary Inspectors, but also to persons authorised by the Board of Health, to enter upon premises. It is proposed to add to the Regulation the use of any larvicide approved by the General Board of Health. We have several new effective larvicides of which D.D.T. is one, and it is felt that we would use modern and effective larvicides in

the eradication of this mosquito. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. LEWIS: These Regulations undoubtedly have a very worthy object in view, that is, to rid this island of any chance of an outbreak of fever due to the mosquito which carries it. As a member of the General Board of Health, when these Regulations came before that Body, I asked what was the reason for being so explanatory in Regulation 2 of these Regulations. They not only say that these are the Regulations of 1913, but they say that these are the "Regulations made by the General Board of Health on the twenty-ninth day of March, one thousand nine hundred and nine and subsequently published at page three hundred and ninety-four of the volume entitled, 'Regulations and Bye-laws to 31st December, 1913' ". They do not say that these Regulations were approved by the Legislature. I thought that that was a most unusual method of describing the Regulations; I thought that the Director of Medical Services who must have been responsible for it would have been able to give an answer in keeping with the dignity attached to his office, but I am sorry to say that he could say absolutely nothing about it. In fact, he did not attempt to give any answer at all.

The next thing is this; in approving these Regulations the Board of Health said that since you are now giving permission to send into people's premises people other than qualified Sanitary Inspectors, these Regulations should exist for the duration of the eradication of this mosquito. Another thing is this; it is accepted that it is an unusual procedure to allow persons approved by the Board of Health to go into people's houses and put larvicide into their receptacles, and that might be resented by people. If any deaths take place people may say that they are the result of the use of the larvicide. For that reason it was stressed at the Board of Health that this campaign of getting rid of this mosquito which is connected with yellow fever, should be a campaign throughout the island to teach people what it is all about. When the populace is not so familiar with the disease which you are trying to eradicate, that might make it difficult for the people to accept the methods you employ.

I understand from the honourable member in charge of this Resolution that the Director of Medical Services is waiting for the passing of this Resolution by the Legislature to start his campaign. What might happen is that the World Health Organization might come upon us at any time; the Director of Medical Services might be ready to start his campaign and the populace might resent people putting larvicides in their receptacles and spraying their premises. I say that the people should be told well in advance that this campaign is going to take place and they should be prepared for it. I would like to mention something which I heard; while we know nothing of yellow fever, we have got the yellow fever mosquito here, it is frequently found in British Guiana and it is said to be taken by schooners which leave this island and go there. There should not be any reason for us to hush-hush about that; the British Guianese certainly advertise it. Only recently a gentleman told me that down the quay side in British Guiana everybody was looking at a schooner which it was said had brought mosquitoes from Barbados. I think that the campaign should have been started from the time this nuisance was brought to this island and we would have got assistance in eradicating it in the same way as it has been done in other islands. We have inspectors who have gone out of the island in order to get some knowledge of carrying out this

campaign, and I think we should be grateful to everybody who is helping us. It is not the help we get, but the way in which we get it and the way in which we treat people that our campaign will be a success or a failure. It is all very well to tell a man that he must put this larvicide in his water receptacle and spray his premises, but I think he should be told in advance that that is not dangerous, and that this mosquito has been here for some time and he would be in danger of getting infected by it. We are dependent upon people who are helping us from outside, they may tell us that they are ready to come down but we may not be ready. I say these things not in any criticism of this Resolution, but somebody will hear that something was said in the House in connection with it, because I think the only publicity this matter has had is a short report of the meeting of the Board of Health.

With regard to these Regulations of 1913, we do not know if they were ratified by the Legislature; this particular Regulation to be amended now might be one which has been rescinded already. I wanted to make absolutely sure that this Regulation was in existence and they could not answer my question at the Board of Health.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I only hope that this attempt to eradicate this particular type of mosquito will really result in the eradication of what is at present a pest and a nuisance to most residents in this town and in many parts of this island. I have lived in Trinidad, Grenada and St. Lucia but I have never experienced in those supposedly mosquito-infested colonies the annoyance by mosquitoes as I experienced when I returned here. It is true that a lot of "Flit" is sold and "Flit" keeps the mosquitoes away for a little time; but it shows a woeful lack of vigilance on the part of the Sanitary Authorities that mosquitoes can be such a pest in this colony. If this is an attempt to eradicate a special type of mosquito, I think that in the same way you are eradicating this special type of mosquito, there is the possibility of eradicating the other types as well. Unless you go to the roofs of premises and see that the gutters are treated with some of this special chemical, this mosquito nuisance will continue. I just hint that to those in authority.

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

MEDICAL REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day also stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Medical Registration Act, 1911.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Bill is necessary because the period of medical training in the United Kingdom has been extended to six years, and medical graduates are required to serve for a compulsory period of a year before they can be registered. That year has to be spent in hospitals approved by the General Medical Council and also approved by the bodies who are authorised to grant diplomas and licences. The Barbados General Hospital is one of those institutions approved by the General Medical Council at which students who have been trained in the United Kingdom can spend their pre-registration year, and that calls for an amendment to the Medical Registration Act. That Act as it is today, requires that persons seeking to be registered as medical practitioners must be duly qualified; they must present their credentials to the local Licensing Body

in order to be registered. Under this Amendment the local Licensing Body will not have the authority to register medical men until they have spent this pre-registration year. It is desirable that young doctors be allowed to register so that they will be able to sign Death Certificates and administer certain dangerous drugs; they will not be authorised to sign Death Certificates or administer certain dangerous drugs without the provisions of this Amendment. These young doctors will not be allowed to practice outside the Hospital until the pre-registration year has expired. That is the substance of this Amendment. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: I think this Bill will have a two-fold object. It will help our newly-graduated medical students to get sufficient experience really to practise their profession and if they are appointed to jobs, to draw conscientiously the high salaries which are being paid for the medical profession at present. But I am wondering whether the use of these young medical men and women at the Hospital will mean that there will be such a regular flow of them that they will do what the student nurses now do at the Hospital; that is, to make a regular, valuable section of the staff. I do not know if it will be necessary for us to provide for six medical officers at the Hospital and then have two or three or more of these persons who are Barbadians who have just graduated and have come to get a certain amount of experience in the area in which they intend to labour. I would like to know in respect of these people who are serving this term in our Hospital, if we are going to pay them at a reduced rate or what; I do not think you should use a man's services and do not pay him for them. If the benefit is in two ways, if the young graduate is getting some experience at your Hospital, you are really giving him a post-graduate course, and is he going to pay you for that, or are you going to pay him at a reduced figure and so save money to reduce the expense of running your Hospital? I do not know if the honourable member in charge of this Bill can answer these questions; you must be making some provision for accepting these people. Will you have to provide quarters for these young graduates, and what will be the benefit to the Hospital? The Hospital will undoubtedly benefit the young graduates who go there for this internship; the honourable member must have some idea as to how this matter will work. Will the provision be at the Government's expense? Will a graduate be going to the Hospital every day as if he is going to a school, or will you have to provide him with quarters? I think that these are things which we should consider because we may find that we are enacting legislation to assist people whereas there should be some benefit going to the Hospital as a result of our having a Hospital which has reached the standard of being approved by the Authorities, but we get nothing at all out of it.

Mr. GODDARD: I would like to know if this Amendment means that the course of medical training will be extended for another year, and if we have been getting doctors coming out a year prior to the time when they will now have to come out. If a doctor gets his certificate here, will that permit him, after his internship, to practise in other countries? I am wondering if the honourable member would give us any information on these matters.

Dr. CUMMINS: In reply to the honourable junior member for Christ Church, I will say first of all that a medical course used to be for a period of five years and the period has now been extended to six years compulsorily. As the position was before,

when a doctor got his diploma he could come out and practise, but now he first has to spend a year in a hospital approved by the General Medical Council. We are giving a Certificate showing that a doctor did further studies at the General Hospital, but the final Certificate will be given from outside. That applies to all colonial territories, not only to Barbados, where the Hospital comes up to the standard required by the General Medical Council. A young doctor will have the benefit of six years' training plus a compulsory year's experience.

In reply to the honourable junior member for the City, I will explain that these young doctors will be paid. We tried to get uniformity in the Caribbean area as to the amount they should be paid, and it has been decided to pay them as they are paid in Great Britain. They will be paid a salary of \$1,680 per year with a deduction of \$480 for board and lodging. We are not sure about the board and lodging at the Hospital, but if these doctors lodge there, the sum of \$480 will be deducted from the salary; if they are not lodging at the Hospital then they will be paid the full salary of \$1,680. They will spend six months in medicine and a similar period in surgery. They will be entitled to their passage being paid by the Government from the country of recruitment.

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

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—In Sub-clause (1) of this Clause mention is made of the Medical Register Act. Is there a Medical Registration Act and a Medical Register Act as well? Both are mentioned in this Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to change the word "Register" occurring in line 3 of Sub-clause (1) to the word "Registration".

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

Mr. LEWIS: Sub-clause (2) says:—

"Any person who applies to the Registrar shall be entitled to be provisionally registered if he produces evidence satisfactory to the Medical Assessor appointed under the principal Act that—

(a) he has been selected for employment in a resident medical capacity in one or more approved hospitals or approved institutions for a period of not less than twelve months."

It is not clear to me if a new graduate can be selected for employment in a resident medical capacity and then he is entitled to this temporary registration, or if this refers to somebody who has come to the island already having passed all the tests and is qualified to be selected for employment.

Dr. CUMMINS: I take it that you apply for this provisional registration. A person may be selected and he can choose to come to Barbados rather than go to Trinidad or British Guiana; but he is qualified to go to any of these colonies. The choice remains with him.

Mr. LEWIS: This does not appear to be the choice of the man; it appears to be the choice of the particular institution. I thought this was a matter of a hospital wanting somebody and the person would serve at the hospital for a year before he is qualified

to be registered. It seems as if they are making provision for accepting these new graduates in a resident medical capacity.

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business having been concluded, the House will now proceed with the consideration of Private Members' Business.

ST. JOSEPH PARISH LOAN BILL, 1953.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph:—To move the second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. Joseph to raise a loan of \$9,600 of which amount \$7,200 is to be used for erecting a new roof to the Rectory and \$2,400 to be used in effecting repairs to the Organ at the Parish Church.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,—This is a Bill which seeks to authorise the Vestry of St. Joseph to obtain a loan of \$9,600 for the purpose of erecting a new roof to the Rectory and effecting repairs to the Organ at the Parish Church. The roof of the Rectory was in a very bad state of repair for a very long time. When I was a member of the Building Committee, year after year we had to put aside the repairs of this building and try to do those things which were most in need of attention being paid to them, but the time has come when we can no longer avoid spending this money. The roof of this building used to leak and our excuse was that the leaking was not in the bedroom or drawing room or where the servants had to work; but the water has now gone through the walls and they are beginning to crack as a result. The floor is also beginning to rot. The roof of this building is one of the old ones which carried more than one gutter and you have to be continually spending money on it. The plumber has to be always soldering the gutter. I had a look at one of these gutters and the whole thing needs to be removed. The Building Committee decided that rather than continuing to patch the roof, it would be better to use a roof without any gutters. It may be argued that no money should be spent on buildings of this sort, but the building is that of the parish and regardless of what happens, it will have to be repaired or there will not be any roof at all. We have been trying to avoid this expenditure, but the time has come when we can no longer avoid it; we will have to put a new roof on this building. We have to get basins and tubs in which to catch the water from this roof when there is a rainfall and the position is now aggravating. I am in a position to say that it is very aggravating to have a house with a leaky roof; you have to be continually shifting from place to place. I knew that when it was raining someone had to go under the bed and the water fell on the bed. We should not allow such a thing to happen; the Vestry will have to do something about the roof of this building.

As regards the organ, this is an expensive organ which was bought many years ago, and the repairer has condemned the particular spot where the organ is situated. The place is very damp and lime had to be put into the organ so as to keep the keys warm to a certain extent so as to prevent them from being replaced by new keys. The organ repairer has recommended that the organ be removed to the southern end of the Church where there is no wall: he suggests that it be placed at a certain height above the floor level so as to get away from the dampness and also the wood ants. I have always said that we can get to Heaven without music, but this is a very expensive organ and we should not allow the expenditure of a few dollars to cause us to lose the whole organ. We have to close our eyes to the cost of these repairs and have this organ removed from its present position. The sum of \$2,400 has been estimated as the cost of the repairs and the erection of the platform on which to place this organ. It is proposed to place the organ on a platform of concrete and we have to avoid encouraging wood ants in this organ again. Hon. members may have read in the Press that the wood ants had taken possession of the organ; the climate of St. Joseph does not suit the organ. We cannot change the climate, but we can change the present site of the organ.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more in connection with the roof of this building and in respect of this organ as the position is clearly set out in this Bill. I repeat that the time has come when we must spend this money otherwise we will lose the entire roof and the entire organ. This money will be repaid at the rate of \$480 per annum, the interest being at a rate not exceeding 5%. We have our plans laid out and we are only awaiting the passing of this Bill so as to get through with the work. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mrs. BOURNE: I personally feel that the dis-endowment of the Church should come about as quickly as possible. However, the buildings are there and instead of allowing them to go to ruin they should be kept in repairs. I always feel that these Ministers are people who get good salaries and there is no reason why we should provide houses for them; they should be made to pay rent. Head-teachers of public schools have to pay rent or a certain percentage is deducted from their salaries for the rent. As far as the repairs of these buildings are concerned, there is just one thing which is bothering me and I was looking through the Vestries Act in connection with it. I wanted to see if the Parochial Treasurer of any parish can be allowed to undertake to do any parochial work other than collecting the rates. I have been receiving complaints from various people to the effect that the Parochial Treasurer of St. Andrew transacts all the work, he brings in his workmen from one end of the parish and other parishioners are not given the opportunity of getting any of the work. I am wondering if the Vestry of St. Andrew are carrying out the law under the Vestries Act. That is a point I would like to bring to the notice of those who are in power; if the Act is wrong, it should be put in the correct form. This is a matter which I feel is a very important one and it should be taken up in the proper quarters.

Mr. ALLDER: I am afraid that I cannot support a Bill of this sort due to the fact that the amount asked for and the amount proposed to be spent on the replacement of the roof of this Rectory is too much. Judging from the speech of the honourable junior member for St. Joseph, he seems to be more

mindful of the slight inconvenience which the Rector now suffers than anything else; he seems to disregard the sorrowful plight in the way of bad housing which many of the taxpayers who will have to pay this money are at present suffering. The honourable member should know better than anybody else how difficult it is for the unfortunate peasant and small trader in St. Joseph to get somewhere to live, and also how difficult it is for them if they already have their own houses, to keep them in proper repair. I cannot see that the roof for this building will cost \$7,200; what is more, the house is still habitable, and from all appearances, the roof is not as bad as the Vestrymen of St. Joseph want to make out. The fact is that with all the rainy weather which has just passed, the Rector and his family are still living in that place; you would have to accept this building as one of the best in St. Joseph. I think that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph should more seek to protect the taxpayers of St. Joseph than to sponsor a Bill of this sort which calls for this large and unnecessary expenditure. That is why the taxpayers in these parishes are crying out year after year for the unreasonable increases which are demanded from them; one hopes that on these Vestries there will be individuals who will realise that the small taxpayer deserves their protection.

I think this same Vestry has been asking for permission to obtain loans for the purpose of embarking on several schemes in recent weeks; but it seems to be the policy on the approach of the change in local government, for all these Vestries to be running helter-skelter in involving the taxpayers in these numerous financial commitments. Even if the Vestry of St. Joseph decided to replace the existing roof of the Rectory, certainly you could get a roof of the best quality costing less than \$7,200. To pass this Bill as it is would be encouraging the Vestry to spend the taxpayers' money recklessly. Times have gone by when these same Vestries attempted to keep down expenditure from which the taxpayers benefited, but in recent months they seem to be seeing everything which they should have done many years back in need of being done now. While I do not want the occupants of this Rectory to undergo any undue hardship where this badly leaking roof is concerned, yet I feel that the amount proposed for the replacement of this roof is too much. I think that honourable members should refuse to grant permission to obtain this loan and let the Vestry devise some other scheme which will call for a smaller expenditure and bring back the Bill here. We should not permit the Vestry to waste the taxpayers' money as what is proposed here appears to be doing.

I would have preferred to see the honourable junior member for St. Joseph refuse to bring down this Bill. I take it that the honourable member knows the building costs of today and as a Vestryman he should have used his influence to get this proposed expenditure cut down. The amount proposed for replacing the existing roof of this Rectory is one for which you could get a reasonably good property in the real estate market today, and to say that you are spending this amount just to replace the roof of this building is doing the taxpayers a disservice. I hardly think that any businessman would be willing to spend this amount of money on property of that value; for such a property the roof should not cost anything near one half of the value of the property. If this property situated as it is, were put in the market for sale, it might only fetch £3,000, and you are proposing to spend nearly one-half the value in repairing the roof. I am afraid I cannot give a Bill

of this sort my blessing; I hope honourable members will see the difficulty in such a Bill.

Mr. BRANCKER entered the House and took his seat while Mr. ALLDER was speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: To some extent one is in sympathy with the honourable introducer of this Bill. He is a member of the Vestry, the Vestry has a Building Committee presumably and one has to assume that the Building Committee went into this matter and reported to the Vestry who endorsed the report and the honourable member, as one of the representatives of the parish in the General Assembly, was asked to introduce this Bill here. But the honourable member himself has no responsibility; as a member of the Vestry he is obligated to keep the parochial buildings in a proper state of repair. He is also obligated to spend the revenue of the parish in the most businesslike fashion; but I wonder whether, in his considered opinion, he does not regard the proposed expenditure on this roof as being extravagant. I do not know the size of this house, but it certainly appears to me, unless you are re-roofing some large public building in this island, that the sum of £1,500 is exorbitant expenditure for the roof of the average Rectory in Barbados. Should we allow parochial bodies to squander money like this when they cannot even supply the ordinary amenities for the parishes? The cost of labour is high and any sort of construction work costs money; but for a building of ordinary size like the Rectory of St. Joseph for which you are providing a roof, how could you spend £1,500? There is no other renovation proposed for this building; it is only a question of providing a roof.

I know that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph feels obligated to carry out what his colleagues on the Vestry want, and he feels obligated to do his share in keeping the parochial buildings in proper repair; but on a little reflection he will appreciate that there is something wrong in the estimate for replacing this roof and he will be willing to take the matter back to the Vestry for further consideration. There is also this point to be considered; if this building is so old that the entire roof has to be discarded, is it sensible to expend all this money on supplying a new roof? I do not know if it is advisable to put a new roof on the old walls; what I do know is that if the honourable junior member for St. Joseph had to roof this building he would not spend this money on it. As a matter of fact, none of us would put his hand in his pocket and put up a roof at this cost. It may be that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph has sufficient information at his finger tips to satisfy the House that the cost of material and labour will amply justify this expenditure; I, for one, will be glad for the assurance that the taxpayers of St. Joseph are satisfied to provide this new roof for the Rectory at this cost.

Mr. MAPP: I am sorry I did not hear the honourable introducer's speech on the second reading of this Bill, but, my view is that we cannot take this Bill in isolation. Looking at the Order Paper as a whole, it seems to me that this amount forms part of a very formidable sum of money to be applied to the repairs of Church property. I really cannot let this Bill go through without registering some kind of protest, and, in fact, I am going further. I hope that this House will agree to refer this Bill to a Select Committee so that the Committee can go through it and consider the amounts which have been asked for more fully before we empower the Vestry to raise this loan. The way in which the taxpayers are asked to maintain the Anglican Church is becoming a disgrace; year after year we are asked to pass sums

in the Estimates and to agree to loans for the purpose of effecting repairs to Church property. Some time ago I saw an article in the daily newspaper in which a protest was made that the Headmaster of Combermere School was called upon to pay such a slight sum for living in the residence at the School and he should pay more; but what about the parsons? In my view the Headmaster of Combermere School is of more use to this colony than a lot of these parsons. They continue to occupy these buildings and we continue to give them their salaries and they do not contribute one cent to the upkeep of the buildings in which they live. I feel that we should take this stand at some time or other; the Maude Bill has been passed by this House, it is now before the Other Place and we do not know what will be its end. I say that it would be a good thing for this Bill to be subjected to further scrutiny by a Select Committee of this House before we agree to it; this Bill should await the fate of the Maude Bill before we agree to it. I cannot see myself agreeing to vote any amount to be spent on any Church property, not merely in St. Joseph but anywhere else. Why do we say every year that the Church should be disendowed and then we pass amounts in respect of St. Joseph and St. Michael? Very soon we will be confronted with Bills from other parishes for the expenditure of money on Rectories and so on. I do not see that there is anything to be said by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph that will cause me to change my mind in this matter; I am very sorry that this stand has to be taken when this Bill is being handled by one of my colleagues. I hope that the House will take a firm stand in this matter and submit this Bill to a Select Committee; I do not want to place any further load on the backs of the taxpayers before we know what will become of the Maude Bill. We have to sympathise with the honourable junior member for St. Joseph who is a member of the Vestry of that parish; he assures me that the roof of this Rectory is leaking buckets of water. As far as the organ is concerned, there is another large proposed expenditure, and from my point of view, I feel that we should not pass this Bill as it is. It is disgraceful that we are called upon to pass these sums of money on this Church property. I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. VAUGHAN: I do not think that the last honourable member who spoke had the courage of his convictions because instead of his moving that this Bill should go to a Select Committee, he should have moved that it be rejected altogether. However, he happens to be one of those honourable members on the other side of the Table.

Sir, as far as I understand it, this Bill asks for authority to borrow money and the honourable senior member for St. Thomas spoke as if the funds were coming from this House. He must remember that he is dealing with a political body—the Vestry of St. Joseph—which like all other political bodies must get the authority of this House before they can borrow money. He did not speak in that vein; he spoke as if the Legislature has to find this money for that body. I therefore cannot appreciate his argument. It seems to me as if the honourable member has some hate against religious organisations.

Mr. MAPP: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member seems as if he cannot understand my argument. I however rise to object to his last remark when he said that it seems as if some honourable members have some hate against religious organisations. As a religious person, I object to the honourable member's statement.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker, I look at this Bill from this angle. The Vestry of St. Joseph is a local

body and the Church is not disendowed. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas spoke very violently against the institution of the Church and repairs to its property. Before he can speak in that vein let him influence his party to disendow the Church, then we will have to respect what he says. Mr. Speaker, Vestries still exist as local government institutions. They are legally established and are responsible bodies with their members elected by the people. If the Vestry of St. Joseph in its conservative wisdom has come to the conclusion that the roof of the parish Church for which it is responsible needs repairing or reconstructing and to carry that into effect it will have to borrow the sum of £1,500, we should do as we are accustomed doing and that is to sanction it. It is the established practice for Vestries to repair Church property. If the honourable senior member for St. Thomas wants to take an honest stand against the repairs to be effected at this Church. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member accusing the honourable senior member for St. Thomas of dishonesty? The honourable member should withdraw that word "honest."

Mr. VAUGHAN: Sir, I would say instead, if the honourable member wants to take a comprehensive stand against church repairs, he should try to influence his party to disendow the Church, but until that comes into effect, I see no reason why we should object to the passing of this Bill to give the Vestry of St. Joseph authority to raise a loan for carrying out repairs to its church property.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, As I see it, this Bill has been presented in the usual manner. There was a petition accompanying it signed by members of the said Vestry and I take it that parishioners of St. Joseph have seen the objects of this Bill advertised and the amount of the loan to be raised for the purpose. However, I do not think that it is wrong for this House of Assembly or even the Other Place to object to the Bill. I would like to make that point clear. I said, Sir, that although this matter has been advertised, it must come before the Legislature and I feel although it was advertised, it does not mean that the Legislature should pass it. The Legislature should be at liberty to criticise it and to reject it if they feel that way about it. It is the right of the Legislature so to do. But, Sir, the position is that this money is being raised for the purpose of subsidising the Anglican religion and adherents of the Pentecostal Churches, the Salvation Army, the Shakers, the Nazarene and everybody else in that parish would have to pay their taxes to repair the roof of the Anglican Parish Church and its organ. I feel that this is where the Legislature should intervene so as to represent these other taxpayers who are not using this property.

Sir, I take it that the honourable junior member for St. Joseph who introduced this Bill and who is an experienced member of this House and Vestry matters, has served on the Building Committee of the St. Joseph Vestry and in that respect must have known something of the condition of the roof of the Parish Church. Whether it is carelessness or neglect that it has got into that position, he should express his opinion so that this House should know something. We are not in the position of knowing the facts. Unless some of us had been able to examine that building to see whether it would take less to carry out the repairs, I feel that we are not in the position to criticise it by saying that the amount to be raised by loan is too much for the purpose.

Sir, we have to look at this matter from various angles. If this House or the party in power does not disendow or disestablish the Anglican Church, the Vestry would have to accept the responsibility which is placed upon it by law and that is to upkeep that Church. It is not unreasonable to expect that in these days when we are still threatening to disendow and disestablish the Anglican Church and with the Maude Bill taking the power of local government from the Vestries just around the corner, that the Anglican Churches' officers through the Vestries would be pressing for repairs to their churches and their organs, their rectories and their vicarages, because in case disendowment and disestablishment come about, it would be best for them if their properties are in a good state of repair. In that manner, they would not have to tax their adherents for the putting of their properties in repair for many years to come. In such a case, I can only congratulate the officers of the Anglican Church who are seeing to it that they get their properties in excellent repair, so that when the time comes, they would be taking them over in proper condition.

I would also like to draw the attention of this House to the fact that some time ago I took the trouble of going through various statements of revenue and expenditure of the vestries as published up to the 24th March, 1953. I did not know that this Bill would have been discussed this afternoon else I would have brought along my analysis of those statements, but speaking from memory, the statements show that the several Vestries have paid out in interest during their last financial year a sum in the vicinity of \$15,000, and that to me is a large sum of money to be paid out as interest, let alone the sum which was paid to decrease the loans. Some honourable members might not think so, but that is my feeling and if along with that sum you add what the Government is paying out in the same manner, I think you will agree with me when I say that some other method of financing these schemes should be investigated. As this matter stands, we are leaving this burden of this loan on the taxpayers of St. Joseph for twenty years. This means that this high rate of 5% interest is remaining there for that number of years, diminishing only by a small sum every year over that period and I think this side of the question should be considered. Some of these Vestries are really paying out handsome sums of money on old loans and as much as would give lucrative employment to someone in the parish. I feel that another method of regulating these loans should be considered. As I was saying, some honourable member might think that this \$15,000 is not a lot of money to pay out on loans by these Vestries; suppose, they are accustomed of dealing with greater sums in the running of their businesses. However, I think that this is a liability which one particular section of taxpayers lays solidly on the taxable inhabitants of the colony and it is a fact that some of those people who have to contribute to the upkeep of the Anglican Churches have also to contribute to their Church which is not supported in this way. It is on grounds as this that there is justification for the disendowment and disestablishment of the Anglican Church.

However, Sir, I take it that the objects of this Bill have been made known to the parishioners of St. Joseph. As a matter of fact, we cannot consider it until we receive a petition to that effect. That petition has been made known. This Bill has also to be advertised in a newspaper and in the *Official Gazette* before it is considered by this

House, so the taxpayers of St. Joseph should be alive to their interest—and we have been made to understand by their representatives in this Chamber that they are so much so, that they are indeed anxious to get rid of the Vestry system. If that is so, and they do not agree to the objects of this Bill, they should be brave enough to make their views known by sending a counter petition to this House. In the absence of such a petition from them, I have to support this Bill.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, The arguments against this Bill make me to remember that some time ago, we had a debate in this House and when I was about to leave the Chamber, I overheard the late marshal saying that it was a pity that the members at that time had not been born donkeys. Sir, it is an old saying: "Empty vessels keep most noise," and this saying is applicable to the debate this afternoon on this matter. This Bill is the result of a petition coming from the Vestry of St. Joseph with respect to the subject matter. It was circulated in the *Official Gazette* and in a newspaper. I do not know if it were circulated in the *Observer* also. What does the petition to this Bill state? It states that the roof of the rectory of the said parish is in grave need of extensive repairs and your petitioners have been advised and are themselves of the opinion that it would be uneconomic to repair the said roof, and that it would be in the best interest of the said parish that the present roof of the said rectory be demolished and a new roof erected in its place, and the estimate of that amounts to \$7,200.

In my opening remarks, Sir, I said that years ago I was a member of the Building Committee and in the course of the duties of that Committee, its members had to visit parochial buildings from time to time and inspect them. When it came to the rectory, the Committee always tried to get away from repairing the roof. I am not pleading the case of the particular person who lives in that rectory because honourable members will remember that sometime ago, I had to make that particular person who was then acting in his capacity as Chairman of the said Vestry, to withdraw some remarks he made of me. As honourable members should also know, there is no bed of roses as far as I am concerned with that Vestry. Although that is so, must I say because the particular incumbent may not be of the best in my opinion that I should let our building in which he lives fall down? Would it be sense if I had a house rented out and because the occupant was none of the best to let that house fall down? I think only an idiot would do that.

Mr. ALLDER: At a point of correction, Sir, I rise. The honourable member seems to think that those of us who have spoken against this Bill object to the keeping of the rectory in proper repair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order. Will you please sit down?

Mr. SMITH: As I was saying Sir, we are not concerned with who lives in that building; we are not concerned today with whether the person living in it is an Anglican or not. It is Church property which the Vestry of St. Joseph has to keep in repair and that Vestry is asking us to give them the necessary authority to raise a loan for the amount stated in this Bill to repair it. There is nothing wrong in that. One honourable member raised the question that the minister who lives in that property should pay rent. I may agree with that but that does not preclude that Vestry from its responsibility. The honourable senior member for St. John can

only get up on the floor of this House to say: "Oh you are spending too much money." That seems to be a pet statement of his. How does he know that this money is too much? Does he believe so because he charges too much for his goods?

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should withdraw that statement.

Mr. SMITH: If it is objectionable, I will do so, Sir. The honourable senior member for St. John does not know the building; he does not know what state of disrepair it is in.

Mr. ALLDER: I must interject, Mr. Speaker. I know the roof of that building. I have had occasion to go there on one or two occasions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the honourable senior member for St. John to make another speech. The honourable member will not be allowed to do so; there is no 'must' about it. If the honourable member disobeys my ruling, the honourable member will know better.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, What does the honourable senior member for St. John know of this roof? When last did he visit the rectory? If even that honourable member ever visited the rectory and went into it, I am sure he did not go upstairs. What calling would he have upstairs? He is not even a taxpayer of St. Joseph. He is not known in that parish. Sir, owing to the great amount of water that leaks from that roof when the rain falls, the walls are greatly discoloured and have begun to crack. The amount of £1,500 that is to be raised by loan is not to be spent on the repairs of this roof alone, the walls have to be re-plastered in many places and it must be borne in mind that this roof has to be taken off entirely and possibly, it would take re-sealing. The honourable senior member for St. Philip said that if it were his house and he had to repair it, he was sure it would not cost that amount to do so. It may be all well and good for them to say that it is costing too much but neither one of them knows how many square feet of roof it is; they do not know that. Honourable members must remember that the Building Committee inspected that building and agreed to the expenditure as well as the taxpayers of St. Joseph have been given the opportunity of knowing what is to be done by seeing the matter advertised in the newspapers. They are in agreement with it; not one of them has objected to the matter.

An honourable member has said that this matter looks fishy. I have already said that this roof was in a state of disrepair many years ago. I take some of the blame, because I was one of those members of the Vestry who tried to keep the Vestry from carrying out the repairs to it but the time has come when the matter can no longer be delayed. Even if you so decide to disendow or disestablish the Anglican Church; whatever course you adopt; you must keep this building in order until such time. You also must keep the parish organ in order. I rise mainly to say that disendowment has nothing to do with this matter. I repeat that this building is owned by the taxpayers of St. Joseph and they must keep it in a state of good repair. I may say in passing that the taxpayers of that parish are the most intelligent electorate in the island.

Sir, this is a bill which no honourable member should raise objection against, or make attempt to prevent its passing because it is not asking for more than what is required. I have inspected the roof myself and besides that, I have been to the place on a rainy day and seen the Rector with basins and other utensils catching the water that leaked from the roof. We cannot race him from out of the place, nor are we seeking to repair it because we

so much wish to keep him from getting wet; we are seeking to repair it because it is our building. If the family of the honourable senior member for St. John were living in this place in the condition it is now, would he be satisfied at seeing his family having to draw up in some parts of it until the Vestry at its leisure repair it? I do not think he would be pleased. The honourable member has talked about it costing too much money. Not very long ago, the honourable member in conversation with me said that he was building a home and complained about the money it was taking to complete it. The honourable member knows perfectly well that you cannot get workmen to put everything in a day's work. The honourable member told me how costly it was for him to erect his home, now he is saying that this roof is costing too much to repair. It is no wonder that Mr. Michael Greaves said what he did about him.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should withdraw that statement.

Mr. SMITH: I withdraw it. Sir, the taxpayers of St. Joseph know what is going to be done and have agreed to it. They are intelligent people. They know that if they do not repair this building it will fall down and then they will have no building at all. Some honourable members have said; "Reject this bill." It is very easy to say so. Now sir, Mr. Mapp. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may not refer to any honourable member personally.

Mr. SMITH: It was a slip of the tongue. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas said that the Government should discontinue to give loans *gratis* to the people of St. Joseph. I would like to tell the honourable member that Government does not give any loans *gratis* to the people of St. Joseph.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of correction. I said nothing of the kind. I objected to the Government contributing so much to the upkeep of the Anglican Church.

Mr. SMITH: The honourable member did say that the Government continues to give loans *gratis* to these people. He did not say the Church. I do not think he should make such a sweeping statement. As far as this Bill is concerned, I thought it would have been given an easy passage through this Chamber. I never expected that so many honourable members would have spoken on it. Let me again state that the parish of St. Joseph has a building which it wants to repair. Its Vestry is not in a position to repair it without raising a loan for the purpose. As the law stands, for a Vestry to raise a loan, it must get the necessary authority from the Legislature. I sincerely hope that honourable members will see the matter in this light and give this Bill a safe passage.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I now move that your Honour do now leave the Chair and this House go into Committee on this Bill. At the same time, I ask leave that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph take charge of this Bill while I am in the Chair.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: I am moving another motion, Mr. Speaker. I move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. ADAMS: If the honourable senior member for St. Thomas means to send this Bill to a Select Committee comprising of the whole House, I would agree with that.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I make this motion seriously, because in spite of what the honourable junior member for St. Joseph has said in defence of the Bill, this House must take this matter seriously. I know of another public body which is continually repairing its properties and there are complaints about it. Some of these bodies are just wasting the taxpayers' money. Let us send this Bill to Select Committee so that this matter would be regulated properly. It is not right that we should allow Vestries to go ahead and do as they please without our intervening to see that what they do is right.

The question that the House go into Committee on the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER: "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Preamble was postponed.

The 13 clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The two schedules were called and passed.

The Preamble was then called and agreed to.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion.

Mr. MAPP: I beg to move that this Bill be not agreed to.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering as to the propriety of a motion of that sort. I have never heard it before. I know that there are rules whereby bills can be rejected at the second reading or can be postponed "to this day six months." I know that there is a rule whereby a motion can be moved at the third reading of a Bill so as to make certain verbal amendments to it. I do not know of any case where a disagreement motion can be moved after the third reading of a Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. The honourable member should have taken the opportunity to do so at the second reading.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill was then passed.

BILL TO AUTHORISE ST. JAMES VESTRY TO RAISE A \$4,800 LOAN

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask leave that Order No. 22 of Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. HOLDER: This Bill is similar to the one that was debated just now, and because of the termination of that Bill I do not think there would be any long discussion on this. This Bill is seeking the authority of this House to raise a loan of \$4,800 in order to repair the roof of the Chancel of the parish Church of St. James. I may say that this Church was rebuilt after the 1831 storm and that roof was in place ever since then save for minor repairs. It now needs overhauling properly. Indeed, the roof of the Chancel is in

such a bad state of disrepair that there are leakages in many places over the organ. The Building Committee of that Vestry has investigated the matter, and after obtaining expert advice has agreed to replace the said roof with a new one. This Bill has been in the hands of honourable members for quite a long time. I appreciate the position that before the Vestry can raise this loan, it must meet with the approval of the Legislature. The petition of the Vestry is in order and this loan has been approved by its members. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I rise to second this motion. In doing so, I would however say that these Vestry matters which have come to this House within the last few months strike me as a bit fishy, they seeming to come up for discussion with such rapidity one after the other. Since I have been a member of this House of Assembly, I have never seen so many Vestry Bills of a similar character on the Order Paper simultaneously. I was wondering if as a result of the Joint meeting of these Vestries when they met to consider suitable amendments to the persent Vestry Act, whether this was one of the things agreed upon. Your Honour, I am aware that this Vestry has petitioned you over this matter and although this is one of the lines of approach in their getting this loan, yet, it seems to me as if the rate-payers of the particular parish concerned have to pay the money and so long as they have not objected to it, there is not much objection we in this Chamber can do. However, it does seem peculiar that within recent months all these Vestries are making similar petitions at the same time and I hope the honourable junior member for Christ Church who is one of the protagonists of the vestry system would be able to explain to me why this is happening. I must repeat that it does seem strange to me. I would like to get hold of the history of these churches and rectories to see whether they were all built at the same time that it would be reasonable to expect that they would stand in need of these extensive repairs at the same time.

Mr. COX: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks owing to some remarks which were made on another Bill, but which I did not say anything at that time merely because I did not want to further enrage the honourable junior member for St. Joseph and for the fact, too, that I do not believe in speaking after any honourable member has made his reply. I think it cowardice to do so. During the discussion, the feeling was expressed that so long as a Vestry of any parish brings a Bill before this House, irrespective of whatever be the nature of the Bill, or whatever might be the sum involved, or anything of that sort, that the members of this House have no right to discuss the matter or object to it. I should like to say that this House of Assembly has never been a rubber stamp and I cannot see it becoming a rubber stamp in the near future or today. What I would like honourable members to realise is that the people who made this law that Vestries must get the necessary authority from the Legislature first in respect of raising loans, saw in their wisdom the necessity for placing such a law on the Statute Book. I feel sure that the various people in the various districts are looking forward, more so to this House of Assembly for representation than they do to any Vestry. While it is true that these Bills must be published in the Press and the *Official Gazette* before they are discussed by us, one can very well see that many of the people in the various

districts do not see an *Official Gazette* or even a newspaper as well as there are many that do not know the reasons for that procedure and perhaps, those that do know are not interested. Because of that, I think it is the duty of this House whenever any Bill comes before it, whether it concerns a Vestry or not, this House should go into it very carefully and scrutinise it to see whether in their opinion it meets with the approval of the people generally. Other than that, we may as well scrap the law and the authority for such bills coming here.

Mr. TALMA: Sir, I too feel that so long as there is no Act on the Statute Book relative to the disendowment of the established Church that this House is in duty bound to pass bills of this sort once we do not have any counter petition from the people who are concerned showing reason why such a bill should be rejected. We have no power at all to reject this Bill without valid reason. This House has, however, power to enquire into the *bona fides* of the loan and to see exactly that the amount is not more than what is reasonable to be spent on the particular thing concerned.

As the honourable senior member for St. James has said, this Bill seeks legislative sanction for the raising of a loan by the Vestry of St. James in the sum of \$4,800 over a period of 20 years repayable in equal instalments of \$240 per annum. This means that this loan would take 20 years to repay; therefore, we can say that no one generation or the present taxpayers of St. James would not be called upon to shoulder all of this burden alone; therefore, they would not suffer as a result of this property being repaired. The fact remains that it is more economical and sensible to repair this roof at once by replacing a new roof than to allow it to fall into a worse state of disrepair. The building is Church property for which the Vestry is legally bound to keep in good state of repair. It seems to me that the proper and expedient thing to do is to repair the roof of this Church because this property is worth money and it would be folly for us to obstruct in any way anything to be done to keep these buildings in proper condition. By virtue of the fact that these Vestries, and the rectors of these parishes are opposed to the passing of the Maude Bill does not alter this. So long as the Vestries are in power to raise loans for the purpose of repairs to their property or to make constructions in the interest of the ratepayers, I shall vote for the necessary legislation to give them authority to do so. That being the case, I shall vote for the passing of this Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I did not intend to speak on this Bill because, as every honourable member should know, I am in hearty agreement with it. As long as we place the responsibility for the repairs and upkeep of these parochial buildings on the Vestries and any of their buildings needs extensive repairs or they have anything to be done of a capital nature which they can carry out by obtaining a loan, it is wisdom in their coming to the House and seeking the authority to borrow the money to do so and this House should sanction it. As honourable members may be aware, minor repairs are carried out by every parish every year, but any building after a period of years will need extensive repairs and it is the general practice of Vestries when such repairs are to be carried out to come to this House and seek authority to raise a loan to repair those buildings.

The honourable junior member for the City, when he spoke on the last Bill, said that \$15,000 was the sum involved in the paying of interest on loans by Vestries during their last financial year and he felt that it was a large sum to be paid out

in that manner. In my opinion, it is a small sum because if you were to take an estimate of all of the Vestries' properties, you would realise what a large sum they would amount to. These properties not only comprise of churches, rectories and vicarages, but there are also the almshouses and baths. If you take all of these local government properties together, you will realise what a small sum is borrowed against them; you are bound to say that \$15,000 interest to pay annually against them is rather small. The honourable junior member for St. Peter also noted that it seems to be a lot of extensive repairs going on at present by Vestries, but it only appears in this manner because we are dealing with Vestry bills, two of which are for loans. As a matter of fact, there are three other Vestry bills standing in my name, but they are not for loans. Unfortunately, I cannot proceed with them today because they were not advertised in time, but they are urgent bills for the paying of pensions and I do hope that when this House meets again that I would be given the opportunity to deal with them because every day I get calls from pensioners who on account of the delay in these Bills being on the Statute Book have not been able to draw their pensions since March. I would say that it is due to no fault of mine.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is something in the contention of the hon junior member for St. Peter with regard to the simultaneous demand on the part of these Vestries to borrow whatever they can for various reasons now they have come to the twilight of their days. It was also said by the honourable junior member for the City that this House was entitled to some statement showing the indebtedness of these parochial bodies. I feel so too but I presume the Executive gets some report as to the financial statement of these bodies. I quite agree with the honourable member because as it is now, we have no means of knowing whether the liabilities of these parochial bodies exceed their assets. In other words, we loan money blindly. I feel these various parochial bodies are saying because they are imbued with a certain amount of authoritative power, especially in these days when they know that they are on the way out: "Let us borrow all we can get now and put into good repair our buildings. We do not know into whose hands the control of these properties will fall and if we incur liabilities or we do not, the responsibility will not be ours." I do feel too that we are entitled to some statement from these Vestries showing what outstanding loans are made against the various properties and in the light of such statement whether we should allow them to obtain another loan. It does not seem to me to be a businesslike approach to these matters to sit here month after month and sanction whatever loan a particular parochial authority may put forward without a statement showing its indebtedness.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, There is much in what the honourable senior member for St. Philip has just said but he has only repeated what I said in here when we deal with such bills. I have said repeatedly that when members of these Vestries petition this House for authority to borrow money, we should have something before us so that we can see what loans that parish is repaying; how much it still owes; against what properties or to what capital expenditure the loans are against; and, what percentage it is paying on each loan. I will say that some Vestries owing to the manner in which they make up their annual accounts show something of what they owe and that is why I have been able to state that the amount of interest paid on loans

by these Vestries was in the vicinity of \$15,000. Since I gave that statement, I have made reference to what this Government provided in the Estimates to be paid out on loans and the amount is \$2,280. But, Sir, the fact is that we have no exact information on these matters of loans. We do not get any annual statement, nor do we get any statement when a bill of this sort is brought in. It would be a good thing for a parochial authority when it sends in a bill of this sort to say: "We owe so much by the accompanying statement." The first time I saw a summary of the liabilities of these Vestries was after Sir John Maude made his report. I may also say that the way in which each vestry makes up its accounts differs. You cannot tell everything you would like to know from the financial statement of any of them. I think it should be incumbent on the person presenting a Bill of this sort to get the facts of the indebtedness of the particular Vestry in that respect so as to make this House aware of the whole matter. I feel that we have neglected our duty in this respect. It is because we are feeling that disendowment is around the corner that we are now taking notice of these loans. Perhaps, if we had the facts, these loans would not appear great. I may say that I think the officers of the Anglican Churches are perfectly right to go to the Vestries and put their houses in order so that they would be in a good position when they are disendowed.

I do not appreciate the remarks of the honourable senior member for Christ Church with regard to borrowing money to repay in 20 years because it seems to me as if these Vestries borrow money for 20 years and leave it alone until the time comes around again. It also appears to me from the amount which is to be borrowed for the repair of this roof that a certain amount of neglect goes on in these matters. I do not know, for instance, if these church buildings are insured against hurricane and are left in a state of disrepair until a hurricane comes along and blows off the roof so that a claim can be made against the insurance company for a new roof. I do not know if that is the case, I do know that the churches have prayers for deliverance from these things. From the condition of these roofs, as we have heard today, they must have suffered some neglect.

I feel it is the duty of Vestries to keep these buildings in proper repair at all times. They should not allow a building to fall into a state of disrepair until it would take repairs of a capital nature. Taxpayers cannot appreciate this expenditure, because you are throwing an additional burden on them when you have to borrow money to repair these buildings and have to repay it bit by bit and pay interest on the debt.

I have not heard of any church getting anything out of the recent earthquake. I do know that many commercial people have got something out of it. I am however pleased that church property has been spared the ravages of something like an earthquake.

I subscribe to the view that matters of this sort should come before the Legislature because, undoubtedly, the Legislature in its wisdom—I hope not in its folly—can criticise and if necessary, reject the measure. I am one who believes that matters of this sort do not concern only the people who are concerned with these churches, but with the public generally. If we were giving sanction today to the raising of a similar loan to help some other religious body to carry out some repairs, and the particular Vestry was going to lay a rate against the taxpayers for it, I am sure you would have heard some objection coming from members of the Anglican body. That body would be the first to say: "No; do not do such

a thing." These other religious bodies are not in this fortunate position and as I have heard it expressed even by devout Anglicans, very often, these Anglican churches are empty when the various mission houses are full of people. These are points which I feel it is my duty to draw the attention of this House, although I shall support this Bill.

Mr. MAPP: Sir, my attitude towards this Bill is the same as with the last, therefore my motion on this is the same as that which I moved on the other Bill. When it comes to the parish of St. James, my argument is even more stronger because the poor people of that parish have been groaning for years under the taxes imposed on them. Now, by this Bill, we will be allowing more to be imposed on them, and according to it, there would be 20 years of further groaning.

The last honourable member who spoke provided the exact argument why we should either reject this Bill or postpone it until this day six months because, according to him, if you take the amount of money which you pay on interest on all these loans, it is very tremendous and a sum which if spent to the social wellbeing of the people would be better spent. These Anglican bodies do not interest themselves in the social wellbeing of the people. Although they are a privileged body, they are composed of people who take no interest in the welfare of the masses. They get on as privileged people.

As I have said, my attitude towards this Bill is the same as with the last. I am sorry that the honourable member who spoke on this Bill with regard to the careful scrutiny which this House should adopt on Bills of this sort, did not do so when this House discussed the last Bill for St. Joseph. However, I cannot see this House voting one way for the St. Joseph Bill and another way for this Bill.

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

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am in order now, but I move that this Bill be sent to Select Committee.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that motion.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you can see clearly that these two honourable members want to sabotage Bills of this sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should refrain from using the word "sabotage."

Mr. SMITH: I withdraw it. Mr. Speaker, as I look around this Chamber, I see honourable members who are taxpayers of St. James and their silence on this matter tells me that they are quite satisfied with what this Bill purports to do. These honourable members who have spoken against this Bill are not taxpayers of St. James; they own nothing in that parish, yet they are speaking against it and are saying to send it to Select Committee. When they say so, they know that this Committee will never meet. It is a first class way to sabotage this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already asked the honourable member to refrain from using that word, "sabotage."

Mr. SMITH: Sir, I again withdraw that statement.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, Someone must correct the honourable junior member for St. Joseph because he is gradually falling into the trap of—

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, What point is the honourable member speaking on?

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: All I wanted to say is that the honourable member is making the statement that because members of this House may not be taxpayers of the particular parish, they have no right to say anything on this Bill. What he is saying is the same type of argument people outside of this Chamber are using to support their argument: "Why the Local Government Bill should not be passed." What the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is saying is tantamount to their saying that because you are not a taxpayer of a parish, you should have no say in the parochial affairs of the parish. I must remind the honourable member that the function of members of this House go higher than that. We are not here as some people seem to think; that is because we are not taxpayers in a particular parish. We have no right to criticise anything that comes before us from that parish. We must scrutinise carefully these vestry matters. What is most glaring at this particular time, since the Government has re-introduced the Maude Bill, is to see all of these Vestry Bills coming before us, week after week, and honourable members who present them pressing their urgency.

The honourable junior member for the City has drawn attention to the financing of these measures. Although I am going to support this measure, I cannot help noticing how it is proposed to finance this measure. This Vestry proposes to borrow £1,000 on loan, spreading the repayment of it over a period of 20 years. This means that this Vestry will pay back this money in amounts of \$240 every year. This amount has nothing to do with the interest on the loan which will be something like \$240 for the first year.

Another thing, Mr. SPEAKER, that honourable members must bear in mind is that with the growing pressure by members of the House, there is no denying of the fact that the day must dawn when this Government will have to disendow the Church. You are now building up, by measures as this with which we are dealing, assets in the Church that you will have to pay for when that time comes. I feel that this is one of the things which has been foreseen and put into effect by those who control the Church. The Vestries are responsible for the upkeep of these churches. They cannot say that they cannot repair a church because there is a law in the Statute Book which places the responsibility on them. However, when the day comes for settlement, it is not going to be a settlement between the Vestry and the Church, the settlement would be between the Church and the Government. Honourable members must bear in mind that this is something which has to be faced.

On the question of the frequency of these Bills by the Vestries within recent times, it does seem to me that with all of them coming in one after the other in such close procession that there is something going on behind the scenes to have caused that. However, even if that may be so, what caused me chiefly to rise from my seat is to point out to the honourable junior member for St. Joseph that he should not continue to repeat the statement that because honourable members are not taxpayers of a particular parish, they have no right to criticise the functions of the parochial authorities of that parish. That is a saying of the Conservatives. I believe when the honourable member makes that statement, he does not make it with that seriousness because I happen to know that he is an ardent supporter of the principle of Adult Suffrage for Local Government. I hope the honourable member will not repeat that argument any longer.

Mr. BRANCKER: When the honourable junior member for St. Joseph made the statement, because one is not a taxpayer of St. James, one has no right or should not express any opinion about this Bill, I take it that the honourable member was merely pointing out in simple language as used by everyone that so far as a bill of this sort is concerned, so long as the people of the parish—the taxpayers whose pockets will be hit—are satisfied over the matter that the other persons who will not be called on to bear the burden should have the lesser interest. For the many hundred years that the Vestries were in operation of parochial affairs, it has been their responsibility to keep these churches and certain buildings in good repair and the obtaining of a loan is a means whereby money is obtained towards that end.

Section 53 of the Vestries Act, 1911, states:—

"It shall be the duty of the several Vestries on 'the 25th day of March in every year, or at some 'meeting afterwards, which shall be held within 'thirty days next following, to provide for—

- "(a) the repair and maintenance of the 'churches in their respective parishes;
- "(b) the salaries of the necessary church 'officers;
- "(c) the maintenance and education of the 'poor, and
- "(d) such other necessary parochial charges 'as are usually borne by the parishioners and allowed by law."

Section 53 of the Vestries Act, 1911, lays it down that these Vestries are bound to repair and maintain the churches in the parish. It must be taken that the Vestrymen know the procedure that they should adopt to carry out this law and that they are sufficiently interested in the expenditure of the parish **as not to over spend** and it must also be taken that the taxpayers of the parish read the *Official Gazette* or the newspapers to see these matters are advertised. For many years, this has been the procedure adopted to carry out extensive repairs to parochial buildings and it must be assumed that the taxpayers who are interested have kept themselves informed of what is going on; therefore, it is sound lines of argument to take that if the persons most concerned,—the persons whose pockets will be hit by these measures,—have taken no step by the issue of a counter petition to this Chamber to stop the work proposed to be carried out, or the obtaining of a loan to do so, that the other persons who have a lesser interest, those **from whom no money would be taken**, have not objected to the matter at all. What we do here is to endorse the proposal of the local government and we **should do so in the absence of any counter petition**. Why should we think that the body concerned has not taken the interest which it should have taken in **this matter?** We have no such contrary argument before us.

It is within our knowledge that the shrewdest and most astute commercial minds are to be found within the members of the Church of England; therefore, it is obvious that they are fearing, though I **may say without sufficient justification**, that disendowment is around the corner and as a result, they are seeking to get their buildings in absolute A1 water-tight condition. With this in mind, one cannot blame the Vestry because the law has laid it down that it is the duty of the Vestries to repair and maintain church property in proper condition. Sir, we can sit here and express our opinion, but in the absence of any protest from the persons who are taxed and called on to bear the burden, one should think twice if one is a mature and discreet person before voting against the passing of this Bill. The Vestries still

exist and they have a duty which they have to perform. I do not think that anybody is as strongly in favour of disendowment of the Anglican Church as I am, but the law is there; we are called upon to keep the institutions of this body in proper order.

It has not been suggested that somebody has measured the existing roof of the Chancel and can offer to do a cheaper job and as well as is proposed to be done. Nobody has been able to point out that it would cost less than \$4,800 to demolish the existing roof and replace a new roof. I am sure if honourable members had the experience of what it costs to build nowadays and what is the price for even one bundle of shingles they would hesitate to criticise this figure. No argument has been advanced that the Vestry of St. James did not give this matter their most careful consideration and was easy on the figure which they propose to expend on the repairs. It is an open secret that the honourable introducer of this Bill is a member of the minority group of that Vestry. This proposal has to come from the majority and if not only the conservative majority but also the socialist minority who are on that Vestry have given this proposal their blessing and have agreed that this thing needs to be done in order that the law might be observed, I can only vote for it and would counsel every honourable member to vote in favour of it. To do otherwise would be encouraging law-breaking by vestries.

Mr. LEWIS: I would just like to enquire of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy whether Section 53 of the Vestries Act, 1911, lays it down that if the Vestries have to make extensive repairs, they must obtain a loan for the purpose.

Mr. BRANCKER: It does not specifically state that.

The question that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill was then put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, LEWIS, BARROW, TALMA, HOLDER, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, Dr. CUMMINS, COX, BRANCKER and GODDARD.—11.

Noes: Messrs. MAPP and ALLDER.—2.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that all of the sections of this Bill be taken as read.

Mr. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman, I object to this being done, and more especially because it is a Bill which concerns the Vestry of St. James. We should scrutinise this Bill very carefully. In accordance with the rule, I beg to move that the sections be taken separately.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think at the beginning of the Session or sometime ago, our rules were changed so that instead of the Clerk reading the sections of a bill when it is being considered in Committee that the number of the section of a bill to be considered will be called. That rule has not been changed since, so we cannot change that rule now, or suspend it. It seems to me that the motion of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will create some difficulty. I am merely warning you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, There is no rule. I am breaking in asking this Committee to do this. I only ask that these sections be taken together, instead of section by section because they are all on a particular subject.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am rising at a point of order. I am again saying that the honourable member's motion is a very unusual procedure

to adopt. There is a rule that the clauses of a bill must be considered one by one. I know the honourable member has got this House to agree that the number of these clauses be called instead of the Clerk having to read the clause. That was the result of a resolution of this House.

Honourable members are now in Committee on this Bill. The House has not instructed us to do what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph wants us to do. This Committee therefore cannot take the entire Bill as read. I am saying that it will be wrong if we do that and if we cannot respect our own agreements, we should not expect other people to respect our laws.

Mr. ADAMS: Only the honourable member could talk like that; this House can do whatever it feels like doing. Last Tuesday the honourable member was not here and in Committee everybody agreed on a motion that where certain Clauses came normally under a Sub-head, the Clerk would call several Clauses together under that Sub-head. The only thing the honourable member might say is that it is not usual to take a whole Bill as read; he might have made that point although it was done on my motion some years ago. Every single private Bill which comes from a Vestry says what this Bill says; the only difference is in the amount of money. Every Solicitor just crosses out the amount and writes in a different amount and changes the name of the parish. My motion is purely for the purpose of saving time. This is an absolutely formal Bill just as any other Vestry Bill. However, I ask leave to withdraw my motion and I am moving that Clauses 1 to 13 be taken as read. We have just threshed out a Vestry Bill as to whether we should vote for it or not and now in this Bill there is only a change in the name of the parish and the sum of money and we have to listen to hear the Clauses read out! Sheer nonsense.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clauses 1 to 13 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I should like to point out that if honourable members vote against that motion we will not be able to go on with the Bill. I ask honourable members not to put the honourable member in charge of the Bill in that position.

Mr. COX: The honourable member made a motion that these Clauses be called together, which is different from the motion that all the Clauses stand part of the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will put the original motion of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. ADAMS: I asked leave to withdraw that.

The question that Clauses 1 to 13 be called together was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SPEAKER, Mrs. BOURNE, Messrs. BARROW, TALMA, HOLDER and ADAMS.—6.

Noes: Messrs. F. L. WALCOTT, MAPP, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. COX, BRANCKER, CRAWFORD, VAUGHAN, ALLDER and GODDARD.—9.

On the motion of Mr. HOLDER seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 13 inclusive and the two Schedules of the Bill were called and passed.

The Preamble was called and agreed to.

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

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. HOLDER: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

Mr. MAPP: I beg to move as an amendment that this Bill be read a third time this day six months.

By that time the Select Committee of the Other Place might have dealt with the Local Government Bill and we will avoid this imposition on the taxpayers of St. Joseph and St. James in one day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know if the honourable member is serious with his amendment, but it is an elementary thing in Parliamentary procedure that amendments following the third reading of a Bill may only be verbal amendments. Therefore I rule that the honourable member's amendment will not be allowed.

Mr. MAPP: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order; I have already ruled.

Mr. MAPP: With all due deference to your ruling, Rule 255 of the Rules of this House says this: "The further proceedings and third reading may be adjourned to a future day."

May I ask what is your interpretation of that Rule?

Mr. SPEAKER: Amendments to a Bill on the third reading are never other than verbal. There can be a postponement on the second reading of a Bill deferring it for six months as the House may determine, but on the third reading only a verbal amendment is allowed.

Mr. BARROW: There is Rule 252 and Rule 255 which says:—

"No amendments not being merely verbal, shall be made to any Bill on the third reading."

Under that Rule you can make a verbal amendment on the third reading, but an amendment which is not verbal may not be made. The point which the honourable member made as to the correct procedure should be under Rule 255 which says that the further proceedings and third reading may be adjourned to a future date, which may be this day week or this day six months. I think the honourable member was in order to move an amendment, but he would have been more in order to move the adjournment of the third reading until this day six months.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have read Rules 252, 253 and 255. It is quite obvious that in actual practice I has never been known for a Bill to have reached the third reading and then a postponement has taken place; the second reading is the normal time when a Bill is rejected or postponed. Any consequential amendments have to be moved on the occasion of the second reading; when a Bill has passed the second reading the principle of it has been assented to. Provision is made for deferring the Bill on the second reading, but at the third reading there is no question of postponing it. There is no part of the Commonwealth in which it has ever happened that a Bill is postponed on the third reading.

Mr. BARROW: I may not be in favour of the time chosen by the honourable member in moving his amendment, but Rule 252 says:

"The order of the day being called for the third reading of a Bill, a question is put 'That the Bill be now read a third time', to which amendments may be moved, as on the second reading."

That is the situation which the House has reached with this Bill. Rule 253 makes it clear that the amendments which may be made on the third reading can only be verbal amendments and there cannot be any substantive amendments. Under these three Rules it seems to me that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas can either make a verbal amendment to this Bill or he can make a motion that both the further proceedings and third reading be adjourned until a future day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have made my ruling and any honourable member who wants to question it may do so from the floor of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I should like to make this enquiry; if an amendment cannot be made on the third reading of a Bill, what would be the point of having a third reading? You send a Bill to a Select Committee after the second reading has been passed.

The question that this Bill be now read a third time was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, BARROW, TALMA, HOLDER, F. L. WALCOTT, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. COX, BRANCKER, VAUGHAN and GODDARD—10.

Noes: Messrs. MAPP, CRAWFORD and ALLDER—3.

On the motion of Mr. HOLDER seconded by Mr. TALMA, the Bill was passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to move that Orders Nos. 5 and 6 be taken as the next Orders of the day under this Head.

Mr. ALLDER: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until this day week at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative, a division being taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, BARROW, TALMA, HOLDER, F. L. WALCOTT, BRANCKER and Dr. CUMMINS — 7.

Noes: Messrs. COX, CRAWFORD, VAUGHAN and ALLDER — 4.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, seven honourable members voting "Aye," and four honourable members voting "No." I declare the "Ayes" have it. This House now stand adjourned.