

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954—55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 13th December, 1955.

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

Present:

His Honour K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*); Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. J. A. HAYNES, B.A., Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*); Mrs. E. E. BOURNE, Mr. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd November, 1955 having been printed and circulated were taken as read and confirmed.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS entered the House and took his seat amidst Cheers.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I am commanded to lay the Report on the Barbados Fire Brigade for the year 1954.

NOTICES

The Government Notices were given as follows:

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Resolution to place the sum of \$42,913 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 53, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: (for the Premier): Resolution to place the sum of \$69,815

at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 54, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: Resolution to place the sum of \$30,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1955—56, No. 55, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at its next meeting in order to deal with the Money Resolutions of which notice has just been given.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a Draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 31/1955 regarding a final conference on Federation to be held in London in February 1956. Sir, I propose at a later stage to ask for leave to proceed with the discussion of this Report in view of the fact that there may be or may not be another meeting of this House for this year.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (AMENDMENT)
BILL 1955

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 2 as the first Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the Hon. Premier:—Second reading of a Bill to amend the provisions of local government electors.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I hope honourable members have had time enough to have perused this Bill and to have studied it in addition to any first perusal they may have had of it. The fact that the amendments to the Representation of the People Bill have already been dealt with by this House will enable honourable members to follow and appreciate the points made in this Bill.

In order to refresh the memories of honourable members, I am going to read the "Objects and

Reasons" which sufficiently cover the points made in the Bill and, I will repeat, which will be easier to follow and be accepted by honourable members in as much as quite recently they have agreed to the principle of having one Register of Electors to vote for the House of Assembly and for local government elections. In view of that it becomes necessary, and provision is made for the registering of local government electors to combine with House of Assembly electors.

3.25 p.m.

If honourable members will follow the second and third paragraphs of the Objects and Reasons they will see that there is one other thing which has become necessary in these amendments and that is the portion dealing with the voting rights of a Company. Part of Paragraph 2 of the Objects and Reasons reads as follows:—

In order also to facilitate the preparation and revision of the joint registers of electors the Bill enables a company to nominate a director for registration although it may not have occupied the premises in respect of which the nomination is made for a period of three months prior to the qualifying date, and enables a person claiming registration on the ground that he is the owner of the premises on the qualifying date although not the owner thereof for a period of three months prior to the qualifying date. The requirement that a company must have done business in the Island for a period of twelve months before it can nominate a director for registration still remains and the provision that persons claiming to be registered as occupiers must have been the occupiers of those premises on the qualifying date and for a period of three months prior to the qualifying date is retained so as to prevent frauds.

Paragraph 4 reads as follows:—

To make effective the principle contained in the Local Government Act, 1954 that a person shall not, save as provided by section 26A of that Act, vote more than once in any given local government area notwithstanding that he may possess more than one qualification to be registered as a local government elector, this Bill seeks to insert into the Local Government Act, 1954 provisions similar to those contained in the English Representation of the People Act, 1949.

Honourable members will see that provision is made whereby the wishes of the electors are taken into consideration. This is explained in the concluding sentence of Paragraph 4 of the Objects and Reasons, thus:

"The new provisions ensure that persons shall in general be registered "only once in a local government area."

Mention of some of the other amendments appear in Paragraph 5 of the Objects and Reasons. The paragraph reads as follows:—

The new provisions ensure that persons shall in general be registered only once in a local government area.

This Bill seeks also to make certain other amendments to the Local Government Act, 1954 so as to ensure that the registering officers may be able to compile an accurate register of local government electors. Thus clause 6 and 7 require owners and occupiers and persons nominated as Directors pursuant to the provisions of section 26A of the Local Government Act, 1954, who desire to be registered, to inform the registering officer of their qualifications so that he may be made aware of such qualifications and clause 15 for greater clarity and to obviate administrative difficulties, makes certain minor amend-

ments to the boundaries of the local government areas and to the wards within the City of Bridgetown. Definitions have also been given to the expressions "annual rateable value", "owner", "occupier" and "premises."

Hon. members will see that it would be unnecessary for me to say more except to point out what I presume the Hon. Minister of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries has already pointed out in the case of the Representation of the People Act. Although much careful thought has been given to the Bill both before and since it has been drafted, the coming of Mr. Lightburn has shown us how much more useful as well as economical it is to have a single register for voters. As I said before, the principle has already been accepted and these amendments have become necessary only in consequence of our adopting a single register. Under such circumstances it would not be necessary for me to speak at great length on this Bill. In the portion dealing with the nomination of a Director for registration the amendment is only consequent upon the principle of employing a single register.

I beg to move that the Bill to amend the provision of the Local Government Act be now read a second time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pity that there are not more members present today who would have a more intimate knowledge of the workings of the Vestries and who would be able to assist the Government in this particular Bill. I have read it; and that means that I have gone to the very limit to which a member who is not at all familiar with the workings of the Vestries Act and the provisions of the Local Government Bill can go. I am wondering whether the Government would give some indication as to when they expect to have elections under this Act. I think we would all like to know what the Government has in mind in regard to that. If they have now succeeded in having this Bill knocked into shape, that is all right; but persons who have had experience in England should be able to give some limit so to speak as to when the freezing of the present vestries will take place. That is one of the things I should like to hear. I quite agree with having a single register. That would strike one as being necessary especially under Universal Adult Suffrage and I am very glad to see that the Government has got somebody to assist them in making it possible to have a single register for voters.

In his reply I should like the Hon. Minister in charge of this Bill to tell us when the Government proposes to hold its first local government elections under this new Bill. Is Mr. Lightburn's work sufficiently advanced that he can tell them that they will have local government elections, under the new law, for instance, in one, three, or six years' time? What I want to get at is exactly what Mr. Lightburn is doing here. I am not aware that he came here to do all this legislation that he has done and and I am wondering whether he is getting on with the job. I am not aware, also, whether he has over-stood his time; but if he is an expert in the working of local government it might be well to keep him here until after the local government election. I should like to know what is Government's idea about all these things. Have they any idea as to what is possible within the next few months?

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I am quite in agreement with the provisions of this Bill. It is a reasonable and rational way of solving this expensive question of registering electors for the local and

central government elections. As a matter of fact it would have been rather silly if it had not been done.

There are one or two points upon which I should like to have some explanation. I see in this Bill that, from time to time, registration officers will be appointed. Another point is this: what happens with the present parochial registration officers? Their job has always been rather doubtful. As far as I can see, with new additions to the voters' list, a registration officer never seems to go and look for them and get them put on. I am referring to the period after the roll is made. I have come to the conclusion that the jobs held by the present officers are really sinecures; and I am hoping that in this new reshuffle their duties will be properly designated. Surely, their job is to keep the rolls up-to-date. In some parishes, electors have been dead for several years and nothing has been done in the way of taking them off. There are many other discrepancies of that sort.

3.35 p.m.

I should like to know in future that these sinecure jobs will be abolished and men appointed who will have their duties designated to them and who will have to perform those duties. It seems rather out of date that every potential candidate either to Local Government or to Central Government will have to go around with forms and get them all filled in. I consider these parochial officers should do all that and it should be laid down that that should form part of their duties, otherwise the job is practically a sinecure.

I have not seen any of the appointments made, but I do not see the reason why one man cannot do the work of two parishes, especially the smaller parishes. However, my point is that that officer should be designated to do his duty, that is to keep the roll after it has been made up in proper shape. I do not see any reason why a potential candidate should go around and put an elector on the roll. That is out of date. I am hoping that my suggestion would catch the Government's eye and I would like to hear some comment on the matter.

As the hon. junior member for the City has said, everybody is wondering when this changeover from the Vestry system to Local Government is going to take place. At present the position is very stagnant in the rural parishes. Members do not worry to come out to the various meetings and it does not matter because they cannot be turned out; they are frozen in their jobs. Time and time again parochial meetings are abortive because nobody is taking any interest, so the sooner that state of affairs is remedied it will be better for all parishes concerned. It is very important if you are going to have a changeover that it should be done as quickly as possible. I know that it is a big somersault and would take a lot of organisation but I am hoping that some effort will be made to accelerate the movement, because as I see and experience it, at present things are very flat. It is very difficult to certain officers who want to retire, apart from the elected members for the Vestry, and so on. I think it will certainly be a good gesture on the part of the Government if they can give some idea when this changeover would take place.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reply to the last two points made. First of all, I would like to say that it is impossible to say with any exactitude when there will be an election. One thing is obvious; no local government would want an election during the crop time. Equally, there are other matters that will have to

come before the House before that takes place and those things are very necessary. I may say that Mr. Lightburn is one of the best persons that we have had in recent years; he is more than working for his money. There are amendments effecting Trade Tax, land tax and things of that sort which are coming before the House soon. I would make this explanation of doing it in bits; other amendments that will be coming as a result of the Local Government Act are of a different portion in the Act—they have no relevance to this portion. I may say that *re* the making of these amendments affecting the administration in the Representation of the People Act in respect of having a single registration (which incidentally did not arise in the brains of the occupants of the seats in the Other Place) it was a policy which was inevitable as soon as Mr. Lightburn pointed it out to us how much we could save by having it this way.

The amendments dealing with rating are now ready and they will be brought down in due course. What the Government can say is that as soon as it is possible, in view of the comparative long time that it is going to take to make a proper Assessment List, that the House will be informed of the likely date and time of the new election. It is impossible for any member of the Government to foresee that particular time. Hon. members need hardly to be reminded that our Vestry System of having a Trade Tax is almost unique. And it is more silly by the giving of remission of taxes to persons after the Trade tax has been assessed. I will again tell the House that none of us can say that within a couple of months that the assessment list will be ready and the time for fixing an election will take place. Of course, we will say barring anything catastrophic that we do not think we would have to repeat the life of the Vestries after next January.

3.45 p.m.

The Vestries have already been asked to make their assessments in the usual way for next year and if there should be a period when the new assessment rate has to come in, honourable members will have a chance of expressing their views on the sections of the Bill which deal with that. In short the Vestries will assess for the next financial year, and the Bill makes provision if there is to be any breaking in.

With regard to Registering Officers, honourable members will remember that the Act provides for Electoral Registering Officers: and there should be a Registering Officer for each constituency, provided that a Registering Officer may act for more than one constituency. This Act makes provision as to how the register is to be kept. It is to be remembered that the old Act 1954 provided that the first register should be prepared by persons appointed by the Governor and that other registers should be prepared by the Clerks of the respective Councils. It is quite possible for the Governor to nominate Registering Officers, the same persons who will be making a single list for the House and for the Council. We expect, in fact we are sure, that it would be considerably cheaper to do that. It is estimated that the cost of the first registration would be something like \$80,000; therefore you can see that if we use permanent registering officers who are Clerks of the Councils, much saving can be made.

If I understand the honourable junior member for St. Andrew correctly, he was complaining that the registering officers did not do enough work, and I think he stated that they do not go around making enquiries, the honourable member will correct me if I am wrong; nor do they correct the lists. If the honourable member did say that, he must see that a

registering officer is not a potential canvasser for a seat in the House of Assembly to go around and see whether electors are dead or not. I understand that certain honourable members drive around wearing black ties so that they can attend the funeral of any electors if they die. [Laughter.] It was said in the old days that you used to swear people to their qualifications over the telephone, and of course, if you heard the kissing of the book over the telephone the person has been sworn. It is difficult to see how after the first register you should send around again at yearly intervals or shorter intervals in order to discover who has changed residence and left the parish or who has died or who has become 21 years of age. I do not think that this is a point on which we can change our views. From the point of view of experience and convenience whereby if a man care to register — it has been said that some 7,000 refused to register on religious grounds and you cannot very well ask them to change their views and be registered. But that is the sort of thing which you are up against when you have to do your own house-to-house canvassing.

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

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the question I should like to point out that notice was given of a Resolution by the Hon. Minister of Social Services on behalf of the Hon. Premier when the Premier was in his place. According to the Rules of the House a notice for an honourable member may not be given unless that honourable member is absent. Therefore I am asking the Hon. Minister of Social Services to withdraw the notice which he gave inasmuch as the Hon. Premier was in his place.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: According to your ruling Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw that notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member has withdrawn his notice.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am taking the passing of this Clause as an opportunity to say that I do not believe that there are many members of the House who believed that there were still amendments to be brought down to the Local Government Act. I do feel that it might have been mentioned somewhere or other that these amendments were of a particular nature and that other amendments were to be brought down. Perhaps I should add with regard to the rating and the uniqueness of it, that in Barbados long before the present Local Government Act was contemplated it was mentioned in this House that the opportunity should have been taken to put rating in Barbados on the same footing as it was outside, and then during the consideration of that Bill the Government were told that this would have been a

good opportunity to see that the parochial or local government rating was on a par with what is done in other places.

3.55 p.m.

The question that Clause 1—stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 2 and 3 were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that. Mr. Chairman, before the question is put I think that in Clause 4 there is a slight typographical error. In the first line of Sub-clause (b) the word which appears as "us" should be "as". [A VOICE: That has already been corrected.]

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division,

Clauses 5 to 18 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 19 was called.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not think that this other amendment to Clause 19 which amends the ninth schedule has been circulated amongst honourable members. The particulars for registration in one respect embody some declaration which in its present form, is almost unnecessary. The form in one instance sets out your age and qualifications and then in another it gives the exact description of your age and qualifications. When I was running for election I encountered it and I wondered how they filled in that one. The actual age is unnecessary: it is therefore suggested that "E" covers everything. Clause 19 reads as follows:—

19. The Ninth Schedule of the principal Act, is hereby amended as follows—

- (a) by deleting the words "of the" in the first line thereof;
- (b) by deleting the words "Director of" appearing in the second line thereof and substituting therefor —
"a Director of the Company Limited";
- (c) by deleting the third line thereof and substituting therefor the words—
"the said Company";
- (d) by deleting the words "the ward" appearing therein parish
and substituting therefor the words—
"the ward parish/part of the parish";

Next comes paragraph (e) to which I made special reference.

- (e) by inserting immediately after the word "true" where it appears therein the words—

"I am of full age, a British subject and not subject to any legal incapacity to vote and am resident in the Island at the following address

.....
.....
.....

If he does that he will have done all; and it makes it much clearer. The rest of Clause 19 reads as follows:

- (f) by deleting from the second column appearing under the head "Particulars of Claim" the words—

"at full length and capacity in which claim is made"; and substituting therefor the words—
"in full";

- (g) by deleting from the third column appearing under the head "Particulars of Claim" the word "age" and substituting therefor the words—

"Situation of premises in respect of which nomination of company is made";

- (h) by deleting from the fourth column appearing under the head "Particulars of Claim" all the words appearing therein and substituting therefor the words—

"Full description of qualification of Company to nominate claimant for registration."

I beg to move that this be Clause 19 of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 19 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that honourable members have not got a cyclo-styled copy of another amendment which I have here with me. But after I have read it carefully and pointed out what it means they will see that although they have not got it in writing it is nothing extraordinary. I refer honourable members to 28C (2) included in Clause 11. It reads as follows:—

(2) A Revising Officer shall in accordance with any regulations made under this Act determine, in relation to the area to which his register relates, all claims for registration as a local government elector duly made by any person and all objections to any person's registration as a local government elector duly made by another person appearing to the Revising Officer to be himself entitled to be registered.

I wish to delete from the word "to" appearing in line 9 down to the word "himself" appearing in line 10 and insert the following words:—"from the electors list or lists or any special list as the case may be." That has been omitted; but its insertion now makes it quite clear which is meant. All it says at present is "all claims for registration as a local government elector duly made by any person and all objections to any person's registration as a local government elector duly made by another person appearing to the revising Officer to be himself entitled to be registered." I consider that all that part beginning from "all objections" down to "revising Officer" is superfluous. What should have been written instead is "appear to him from looking at the list".

4.05 p.m.

Therefore, "Revising Officer" comes out: but what should have been in the Bill is 'from his looking at the List with respect to when a man is entitled to go on or come off the List.'

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I have not yet asked leave to recommit Clause 11. I am asking leave now to recommit Clause 11 in order to make an amendment.

There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.

As I was saying, Sir, you will see that the Revising Officer has the right to determine who is to go on the list and whether he should uphold objection or not, but you do not say how he has to do it. You do not say whether he must do it from the normal list, the original list or the annual list. The amendment which I propose to make is for the addition of the phrase "appearing in the electors list or lists or any special lists as the case may be."

I am therefore moving that the words "to the Revising Officer" be deleted and the following words "appearing in the electors list or lists or any special lists as the case may be," inserted in their place.

The Clause will now read as follows:—

"(2) A revising officer shall in accordance with any regulations made under this Act determine, in relation to the area to which his register relates, all claims for registration as a local government elector duly made by any person and all objections to any person's registration as a local government elector duly made by another person appearing from the electors list or lists or any special lists as the case may be or by himself entitled to be registered."

I beg to move that the words "to the Revising Officer" be deleted in that Section and that the words "appearing in the electors' list or lists or any special lists as the case may be" be inserted therefor.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I beg to move that Section 11 as amended do now stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. G. H. Adams seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma Mr. Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee with amendments.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. G. H. Adams, seconded by Hon. C. E. Talma in each case the Bill was read a third time and passed.

4.15 p.m.

WELCOME TO THE PREMIER

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, before any further business is proceeded with, I must apologise, but I should say that in the absence of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, we are all very pleased to see the Hon. Premier back out. I know when I say that, I am expressing the sincere wish of the majority of the inhabitants of this island, and I do not think we should let an occasion such as this, when all of us were so much concerned with the Premier's illness, to pass without saying or recording our appreciation of the fact that he has been spared to be back with us to continue the administration of this island. This is not the occasion for flowery or flamboyant speech, but this is from the depth of one's heart; but in respect of so able and learned a man it must be appreciated that in whatever direction we differ, we do it for the betterment of the people of this island.

This is not an occasion for saying very much; the public would be pleased to hear over Rediffusion Service tonight and to read in the Press tomorrow that the Hon. Premier was able to be with us once again, and I hope that he would be long spared to tackle the problems of this country, even although there are those of us who dare to differ from him. I want to record our deepest appreciation of the fact that the Premier has been spared to be with us again this afternoon. [Cheers].

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I know that if the honourable member did not mean what he said, he would not have said it; and I am really moved not only by what the honourable member has actually said (although I fancy he has put it rather high) but it does not take anything too great to differ from an individual like myself. I thank the honourable member from the bottom of my heart. I know, in spite of the moments of heat which may arise in this House, because as human beings we must differ on occasions, the desire to make a success of representative, and may be, complete responsible government is in the hearts of all of us no matter to what party we may belong. I feel sure that any of us who has the opportunity will give of his service as long as life and health permit.

it; I wish to assure this House that as far as I know and as far as my Medical advisers know my illness was only confined to that of a certain nature and I have come back to this House prepared to continue to express the wishes of the majority of the people of this island because the majority of voters on the last occasion sent this Government here and I shall endeavour to continue as I began. I assure all honourable members that this Government has never ignored their wishes or their views even although we cannot at all times agree with them; I shall continue in that spirit and I am sure the honourable member who has been so kind to welcome me back here will continue in the spirit of doing what he considers to be the best for the community.

Mr. SPEAKER: I associate myself with the remarks of welcome to the Hon. Premier, which have fallen from the lips of the honourable senior member for the City.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, with Your Honour's permission I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$69,815 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1955-56, Part 1, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955-56, No. 54, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT TO THE ANGLICAN CHURCH (PARTIAL SUSPENSION) BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 10 as the next Order of the Day. This Order is to consider the amendment by the Other Place to the Bill to amend the Anglican Church Act, with which the honourable Premier would like to deal with at this stage.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the Hon. Premier: to move the consideration of the amendment of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Anglican Church Act, 1911.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a slight amendment which has come back to us from the Other Place and which expresses or clears up a point which to some people was left in doubt, but which to the minds of the Government was never in doubt. It just simply did not occur to us that this possible interpretation would have been made of what we propose to do by way of amending the Anglican Church Act so that future appointments should only be temporary. I will explain what I mean my "temporary"; you can appoint a man now, and you will not appoint him if he is over the age limit and the appointment will be nonpensionable. It did not occur to the Government that this would be interpreted to mean that a clergyman who is earning a Pension might be transferred to another Church and not be entitled to his pension continuing; it did not occur to the Government that people would think that if a clergyman is transferred from one Church to another that his appointment would be temporary and that he would not be eligible for a pension. That was never the intention of the Government; it would be obviously wrong for him to be deprived of any of his service continuing. What we meant was that anybody who is coming into the service for the first time would not have any pension rights. When the question was

laid in the Other Place the opportunity was taken by Government through its spokesman to assure the Other Place that it was not our intention that a man who is already in service should be deprived of his service continuing and in fact to agree to this amendment recommended by Select Committee. In short, any clergyman who is coming here for the first time would be appointed on a temporary basis without any pension, but where a clergyman is transferred from one Church to another and goes on until he reaches the statutory period, he gets his pension for the number of years during which he has served.

I take this opportunity to make clear what I believe must be clear to every member of this House, but which is not clear to everybody. Naturally, you would not expect it to be clear to every single member of the community, but I would think it was clear to everybody who is sufficiently interested in this matter as to follow what has happened under this Government's policy and its action on the question on the disestablishment and disendowment. I have taken the trouble to look up and to read some of the debate which took place when this Bill was introduced. Apart from the question of perusing the debate—I do not propose to go over that—but it is my duty on behalf of the Government to protest most strongly against what I hope to be purely a lack of proper care on the part of the Reverend Ulliyett, Vicar of St. Stephen's, in writing a letter to the *Advocate* in which he accuses this Government of breaking a gentleman's agreement and attempting to 'bull-doze' through the Legislature our proposals for disendowment and disestablishment.

4.25 p.m.

It is a serious matter for one individual to accuse another of breaking a gentleman's agreement. It is even worse than breaking the law; but for a clergyman of the Established Church to make such a reckless statement (I cannot possibly believe that it is other than a reckless statement) it calls for a reply. He declares that he is astonished at the action of the Government in the absence of the Bishop and states that he was under the impression that when the Bishop went away there was a gentleman's agreement that no action would be undertaken in regard to the matter of the disestablishment and the disendowment of the Church in his absence. But the letter goes on instead of observing the "truce" as he calls it, "the Government," according to him "has embarked" upon legislation which, not only, according to his words "seriously embarrasses the Church" but makes the filling of all future vacancies in the parishes extremely difficult.

I categorically deny that we have broken any agreement and I can only describe the second half of that sentence as being absolutely unworthy of a man, let alone a man who is a Christian and a clergyman. It is more than unfortunate that the Reverend gentleman should have made that statement when, in respect of this particular appointment, I mentioned in July of this year before the Bishop went away that at last a clergyman was prepared to come forward. Imagine a clergyman saying the Government embarked upon legislation in the Bishop's absence when all this was done after I had especially mentioned that at last a clergyman was prepared to come forward and fill the vacancy under the terms of the new Bill. I also mentioned that this clergyman was prepared to come forward, pension or no pension. He would have liked a pension but nevertheless he was prepared to come forward. Reverend Ulliyett is a member of the Committee which met the Government, and now that is what he has written in a letter to the Press. He accuses us of making

the case more difficult and causing the vacancy to hang on when, as a matter of fact, this was a vacancy which they, the responsible body in the Church, could get no clergyman to fill. It was a job which had to be filled by some clergyman who would be willing to come to terms under the new Bill. He goes on to state:—

“It is so reprehensible, as the Diocesan Synod, a responsible body, was by-passed”.

I do not, like the Reverend Gentleman, wish to make any reckless statements. It is difficult to speak calmly of the impetuosity of persons. If the Rev. Gentleman had spent five minutes on a telephone with some responsible person before writing his letter to the Press, he would have learned the truth. The Archdeacon had written the Government; and surely the Rev. Ullyett could have learned from the Archdeacon what gentlemanly agreement the Government had made with himself, with the Bishop and thereby with the Church; or at least, with a representative of the Church. Negotiations, or more properly, correspondence went on between the Government and the Bishop during the latter part of 1954; and at that time, I said on the floor of this House that as far as the financial side of this matter was concerned, the Church was not going to suffer, and on this question of the appointment of a clergyman to the cure of St. Simon and as to whether the appointee would get a pension or not, the Bishop and I had agreed that that would be considered by the Government in due course. All of that was said in much the same spirit as I had mentioned that one way of helping the Church was by giving them more than the market value for their properties. So far, the question of the Church suffering financially or otherwise, does not arise; and it could not possibly have occurred to anybody who was careful about stating the truth, to have penned that letter.

In his letter to the Press the Rev. Gentleman goes on to say: If this is the policy of the Government it bodes ill for all “discussions between Church and Government which are yet to take place, and suggests the intention to employ “bulldozer tactics.”

It bodes ill to the Church if any member of the Committee of that Church can make statements that are reckless for a civil human being let alone a clergyman to make. In that case there remain only two alternatives to the Rev. Ullyett; that is, to apologise or resign from that Committee. He owes it to himself not to sit at the same table as those other persons who form the Committee. I will repeat what I have said perhaps, several times before now; and that is, that I have no intention of joining with one single human being to put the Church to any financial embarrassment when the time for disendowment and disestablishment should come. At the same time, I cannot see how any self-respecting clergyman could want to continue under the present Anglican Church Act. It is the ultimate aim of the Government to have the Church in a position where it can manage its spiritual affairs far removed from material influences. The Government still holds fast to its avowed attitude towards disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church. Purely for the benefit of those persons who may never have read a copy of the *Official Gazette* and who may not have known the truth I will reiterate what is the Government's policy with regard to disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. The Government's policy is to disendow and disestablish the Church. At present we are only discussing the question with the Church Authorities. Now, could a Government go further than this: In a letter to the Bishop we said:—

“We invite you to appoint a Committee to meet us in order that we may be able to have the benefit of your opinion and guidance.”

Could a Government, I ask, go further than that? That was merely repeating what happened with Bishop Hughes. I told Bishop Hughes this “I put myself completely in your hands; tell me how you want the Bill drafted.”

4.35 p.m.

Do you want the British Guiana precedent repeated or do you want it in another way? Could we be fairer? We said: “guide us as to how the transition should take place” and all we get for that is members of the Committee or a member of the Committee writing that letter. I have said what I have said and I strengthen it by saying that if he feels like that he will always be the person to feel that members of the Government and those of the other side of the table are a bunch of people who cannot keep their word and who do not care whether the Church benefits or not. I particularly said, in this House when this Bill was before it that the Committee was not going to meet in the absence of the Bishop and that we are not taking any further steps until he comes back. Nobody from the Other Place suggested that we made a mistake, or — worse than a mistake — that we have acted dishonestly, as the Reverend Ullyett said. They knew that the post was about to be filled. The Other Place went on with the Bill and passed it with these amendments and with all that, out comes this what I would call ridiculous letter. The word “ridiculous” is very euphemistic for a stronger word which I had in mind.

I beg to move that these amendments of the Other Place be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is greatly a matter of regret that instead of an explanation as to the policy of the Government in the matter of the disestablishment and the disendowment and or both of the Anglican Church that the Leader of the Government should have directed this tirade against a particular Minister of Religion who is not here to defend himself. In matters of this kind I always feel, since it is purely a question of explanation and not of accusing somebody of doing anything that it would be far better to read the correspondence on any misconception by anybody on the actions of the Government. Having done that the senior member for St. Joseph could then leave it to the good sense of the public and members of this Chamber to decide where the merit really lies. The sort of speech which the senior member for St. Joseph made is one which we would not expect to hear on an occasion such as this. The honourable member is doing no better than the worthy gentleman whom he has elected to attack, because he has not placed the facts at the disposal of the House. He has only left the House to draw certain inferences from the very contentious remarks which he unfortunately decided to give vent to on this occasion. Your Honour would appreciate that the last time (and when I say the last time I meant the first time the amendments of the Anglican Church Act was before this House about nine or ten months ago) that certain honourable members of this House pointed out that the Bill which was before the House did not clarify the situation as to the question of disestablishment and disendowment and far from doing that it was the opinion of the members of this House that it tended to complicate the matter still further.

Mr. Speaker, I remember well on that occasion the honourable member who has just sat, said that they would not come to the House without consult-

ing the Synod. Great was my surprise a few days later in a discussion with the Diocesan Register to discover that they were calling an Emergency Meeting at Bishop's Court to discuss what was considered as this unexpected development because they felt that the Bill which was before the House fell far short of the suggestions which were put forward by the Diocesan Synod. That was on the occasion of the vacancy of the Cure for St. Simon's. As can be remembered, that Bill suffered the fate of similar measures which were hastily drafted and had to be modified out of all recognition to its former import. We are now merely discussing the amendments made, not to the Anglican Church Act, but further amendments to the amendments which have been made by the Other Place. The Other Place has decided to insert a further provision which is as follows:—

"Provided further that nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to prevent the appointment to any vacancy of any Rector, Vicar or Curate holding office in this Island at date of commencement of this Act and any such appointment shall be deemed to have been duly made under and by virtue of the Anglican Church Act, 1911."

As an ex-school master, Your Honour would know that this is one occasion on which Members of the Other Place who are so fond of dotting the "I's" and crossing the "T's", have crossed the line in their grammatical construction.

4.45 p.m.

The amendment says:—

"Provided further that nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to prevent the appointment to any vacancy of any Rector, Vicar or Curate holding office in this Island at date of commencement of this Act and any such appointment shall be deemed to have been duly made under and by virtue of the Anglican Church Act, 1911."

I would like the honourable member who introduced this amendment instead of telling us about personal attributes or feelings of the Anglican hierarchy to say exactly what this amendment means; because I have spent some considerable time in trying to make sense out of it grammatically and secondly to see what relevance it has to the amendment which was passed by this Chamber. At the present moment I am quite unable to see what the honourable member is introducing here today and why he is so willing to accept this stupid, garbled amendment which has been sent down by the Other Place. Of course it might be due to my lack of understanding. Section 2 of this Bill says this:—

"During such period and so long only as this Act continues in force, no appointment to any vacancy in this office of Rector, Vicar or Curate shall be made under or by virtue of the provisions of section nine of the Anglican Church Act, 1911"

That is fairly clear but I think they are trying to obviate the situation where permanent appointments will be made and a further charge placed upon the Treasury in the way of the payment of pensions. In other words, they are trying to freeze the establishment of the Anglican Church as from the date of the passing of the amendment and we are not going to incur any further liability by way of pensions after the date of the amendment.

The first proviso says this:

"Provided that during such period as this Act continues in force the Board may make temporary amendments to any such vacancy."

I feel it would have been a much happier provision if they had stated clearly "provided that until such time as the Anglican Church is disestablished".

This Act is only in force until 1956 and unless we invoke the Expiring Laws Continuance Act in 1956, it means that you will be in mid air again, and you are not stating whether you should disestablish or disendow the Church before 1956 or not. We would have felt happier and the Diocesan Synod would have felt happier if you had stated in this Proviso "until such time as the Anglican Church may be disestablished or disendowed."

This second proviso says this:—

"Provided further that nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to prevent the appointment to any vacancy of any Rector, Vicar or Curate holding office in this Island at date of commencement of this Act and any such appointment shall be deemed to have been duly made under and by virtue of the Anglican Church Act, 1911."

Can anyone disentangle that rather involved proviso which has been added by the Other Place? This is where we should be glad for some enlightenment from a person who considers himself to be a legal luminary; it would seem that the Other Place is saying that the House cannot pass retroactive legislation which would interfere with the rights of the subject. There is nothing in this Bill which would suggest that the Act will come into force on any other date than that on which it is assented to by the Governor. In the amending Bill it does not state that the Act should be deemed to come into force on the 1st April, 1954; if the amending Bill had that in it, one would have seen the wisdom of this amendment introduced in the Other Place. I really do not see that we need accept this amendment at all because we are saying that we cannot pass retroactive legislation unless it is so stated specifically.

It seems to me that this Honourable Chamber is too prone to accept any kind of amendment which is sent down by the Other Place and they are so much aware of our anxiety to accept their amendments that they inflict any kind of amendments on us. They are arrogating to themselves the right to correct everything that goes from this Chamber. I see the wisdom of the Bill, badly drafted as it is, and I accept it; but I am not prepared to accept this amendment because we have not been given any explanation as to why it should be inserted, and I feel that we should dig ourselves in and take a stand against this silly habit of the people of the Other Place thinking that we in this Chamber do not study all the legislation which comes before us.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I heard from the time that this Bill left this House for the Other Place that there was no provision in it for transfers. I must say that even a layman, upon reading the Bill, can see that if you are appointing a person to a vacancy it is regarded as being outside the provisions of the Pensions Act. If a clergyman is the vicar of a certain cure and he is being appointed to a vacant rectorship, I consider that he is being appointed because the rectorship is vacant, and therefore, in that case it would not be pensionable. So, I am a little surprised that the Government has accepted this as a transfer. The truth is that the Government did not think of transfers at the time and, therefore, did not provide for it. To have said that, would have been an honest statement to make. It has been merely stated in this Bill that if the office of Rector, Curate or Vicar should become vacant and anyone is appointed thereto, whether that appointment be temporary or permanent, the appointee will lose his pension rights.

Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the actual amendment I should like to say in passing that the Other Place is very particular to point out any mistakes that occur in Bills which go before them from this House; and I think that we should be equally particular about any proceeding from them to us. If they wanted to insert a further proviso, they, in my opinion, should have put a semicolon at the end of the former proviso. For my part, I would amend it and return it to them, because that is exactly how they would treat us in a similar case. It ought to be done, or the three provisos will not read sensibly. I am addressing this question to the Hon. Premier. Is it in order to have in an amendment a proviso beginning, "provided further" and then at the end of that proviso another proviso beginning again, "provided further" without some connecting word? I am wondering if the words, "provided further" are not unnecessary in this particular case. In point of fact, it marks the first time that I have seen three provisos to any one clause or section of a Bill. I am wondering if it does not seem to them that the correct arrangement should be, "provided that" in the second instance, and in the third, "and provided further" etc. I must say, that considering the very simple amendment that was necessary, the one they have submitted is rather clumsily worded. It did give me a great deal of trouble to understand what was meant; not that I claim to understand the peculiar phraseology of the law. This is how the proviso reads:—

Provided further that nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to prevent the appointment to any vacancy of any Rector, Vicar or Curate holding office in this Island at date of commencement of this Act and any such appointment shall be deemed to have been duly made under and by virtue of the Anglican Church Act, 1911.

I hope that what is contained in this Bill now, is what we really intend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the remarks of the Hon. Premier relative to a letter appearing in the Press from a clergyman of the Anglican Church, it may surprise the Hon. Premier to hear that even on the day the Bill was being considered by the Other Place and up to when it was on the verge of being passed, that there were hon. members present in that Chamber who appeared to have the same impression as exhibited by the Rev. Ulyett in his letter; and they got it not from talking with an ordinary figure, but from members of the hierarchy of the Church. It appears to me that the clergymen were endeavouring to solicit sympathy where it was necessary, and in so doing, they must have given this impression. While the Other Place were accusing the Government of breaking faith a certain figure was able to exhibit a letter saying at the same time that he got it from the Bishop; a thing which exposed them. Let not the Hon. Premier blame the Rev. Ulyett and say that he should not sit on that Committee. He is going to sit with some of the ones who are considered as the higher ups. The truth is that the Rev. Ulyett had the courage to speak out.

The Debates of the Other Place are at present behind hand; and I have not heard any comment or criticism from the Government or anyone else as yet. You know the Governor and the Colonial Secretary used to say that our debates are not up to date. I am hoping that those remarks accusing the Government of breaking faith which were made in the Other Place will appear in their debates.

But, to get back to the remarks of the Hon. Premier, I think he did say on the floor of this

House, though not in the same language he used to-day, that he and the representatives of the Church had seen eye to eye on this matter. However, I would warn the Hon. Premier that he should not blame any one particular clergyman because they have all been doing it; that is, giving the impression that the Government had been abusing them.

I suppose that what the Hon. Premier has said will eventually be done; that is, that the Church will be disendowed and disestablished. But if that is going to be done within ten years, the members of the clergy whom it will affect should be told that the Pension Act will be rigidly applied to them. If disendowment and disestablishment is not going to be effected within ten years it is needless to make this an act of politics. In other words, if the Government acts other than I have just outlined, this Bill will not be worth the paper it is written on, because a clergyman holding an office in the established Anglican Church of Barbados cannot qualify for a pension under ten years service.

5.05 p.m.

If anything happens to either one of them, if let us say, a Vicar goes on working for ten years and then dies, are you going to give his widow a pension? That is on all-fours with the other things and you have the Local Government Act ready to be brought into operation and as you know, you do not have anything for disendowment in it. I would have thought that the amendment in the Other Place would have said that during such period and so long as this Act continues in force, no appointment as a "first" appointment or no appointment to any vacancy shall be made. I would imagine that that would have been put in. I think that would have settled the matter, because if you are transferred, it is not the first time and you can get a case like that. However, this is a very complicated way of putting this amendment, and I hope it does not include something which is not intended and that therefore it defeats what really is intended to be put in the Act. I am leaving it to the Hon. Premier to devise some means of getting a semi-colon where I have mentioned.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is no opportunity for dealing with the principle of disendowment and disestablishment, but what I would say is this: I think it is well known throughout the island the views which I have with respect to the question of disendowment and disestablishment of the Anglican Church and that I am not in favour of it, although I may say I have great respect for the views as expressed by those who want it. Be that as it may, this whole unfortunate matter to which we have been listening this afternoon surrounding these amendments is because we do not think this matter with which we are dealing was the correct approach to the question of disendowment and disestablishment; nevertheless, this seems to be the approach of the Government.

What is amazing about this amendment (and I think the Hon. Premier should be able to see with me) is that this is not a Private Member's Bill. This is a Government Bill which should be drafted by the Attorney General or one of the Crown Law Officers. Hon. members and the public must bear in mind that it is not the duty of a Minister to draft anything, therefore, when this Bill came before this Chamber and we passed it and it was presented to the Other Place, I take it that the chief Crown Law Officer in the Other Place who should see to the drafting of it is the person by whom other hon. members of that Chamber are guided with respect to its presentation. If it is not the Attorney General

it must be one of the other legal brains up there. Surely, it must be one of those persons who have drafted this amendment. I am at a loss; I do not understand; it is nonsense; it does not make sense, and if all the lawyers in here say that it does make sense it does not make sense to me. Now, this Bill which was drafted by the Crown Law Officers and which we passed went to the Other Place, and they say what we passed was wrong; in other words, what we passed was all nonsense. That is misleading.

Actually, what I think about this matter is this: the question was raised in this House by me at the time when this Bill first came to the House. I asked, what would happen if you brought one clergyman, from a Cure and transferred him to a Rectorship where he will get some more money. I think if I recall correctly that the view was expressed that it would not affect him. What I think you want to deal with, with respect to this, is the question of transfer. I am still not satisfied in my mind that this amendment makes it clear, nor do I think that this amendment serves the purpose which the Government wants.

5.15 p.m.

I am still of the opinion of my colleague. We said that a man is not entitled to a pension unless he puts in ten years but under the Act he is entitled to a gratuity if he puts in five years. The proper way to deal with this matter is this: if it is the wish of the Government to disendow and disestablish the Church let us do that; but this method seems to be the wrong method. There is a difference in salary between Rectors and Vicars and I could decide now in 12 years how many Vicars have to be removed; I contend that as soon as you give permission to appoint or transfer people in the higher offices or higher salaries you are going to have further commitments on the pension rights.

The legal luminaries have drafted this Bill and sent it to the House; the House passed it; and when it goes to the Other Place the same legal luminaries say that it is wrong! This is all a waste of time, somebody is fooling somebody else.

I do not intend to defend any clergyman in this House; my greatest respect goes for some of the clergymen outside the Established Church. There is nothing peculiar about this Reverend gentleman writing this letter. Some years ago we adopted the attitude of arguing on an Address brought forward by the hon. junior member for St. Andrew in connection with the disestablishment of the Church and the former Bishop Hughes lambasted the House of Assembly. I thought it was perfectly right because I feel that freedom of speech is due to a Bishop as to any of us in this House. When my colleague raised the question of the Bishop lambasting this House there was a big hue and cry. If you look up the old debates you will find that the Premier said that when the matter was discussed before the Bishop left the island there was agreement on it; if he will recall, I said then that the Premier should formulate such policy that the Government should say what should be done and what should not be done, because he is the Head of this Government. The Bishop had no such power and the entire matter was to be conducted and guided by the Synod. I understood that far from the Bishop having the right to agree with the Premier, the Synod had not yet discussed the matter.

This matter seems to be under some mystery. This Reverend Gentleman is a member of a Committee which will meet the Governor as the Premier has said. The representatives of the Synod cannot be all liars; I say that if you have to call a spade

a spade, then call it a spade. If the Bishop wants to say that there seems to be some collusion between the Premier and himself then say so; if he wants to say that they are like the sons of Levi, then say so. I will swear on oath that when I raise objection to dealing with this matter in this way, when I objected to the policy of not making any further appointments being something which had been agreed upon by the Bishop and the Premier—he will correct me if I am wrong—

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: On a point of Order. I hope what I am saying now will not hurt the Bishop; but I do not know exactly what the Bishop will do with his Synod. As far as I can see the Bishop does not want either disendowment or disestablishment any more than the rampant members of the Synod want it. The Bishop has given the impression that he does not agree with disendowment and disestablishment owing to financial matters; he need not worry about the financial matters because as I said, they will not suffer. I said "I will promise you as I promised the former Bishop." I do not want it to be construed that the Bishop agreed on disendowment or disestablishment.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: The Premier has not said that the Bishop agreed with him on the broad principle of disendowment and disestablishment. When we questioned the backdoor method of dealing with this matter and the policy of the Government in respect of the disendowment and disestablishment of the Church in the British Guiana or the British Honduras way, when those remarks were made before the Bishop left this Colony, it was said that this matter was agreed upon that we have got to make a start and therefore let us make it in this way. The Cure of St. Simons was vacant; it was agreed to fill the post but only on a temporary basis. Therefore we agreed to a Bill which would not effect any pension rights.

5.25 p.m.

I invite you to look at that for a certain reason, but before I go much further in my argument, let me repeat that I have no intention of offending the Rev. Gentleman. While I am religious I am not fanatically religious. And by that I mean, that no clergyman can tell me every Sunday morning about "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild," and all that time I am conscious that starvation is present: I do not believe in that sort of religion. I believe in applying politics even in religion. When the Hon. Premier said that he had agreed with the Bishop, I drew to his attention that the Bishop had no such powers to agree with him.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Your Honour, I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member. If the House will grant me permission I should like to read a few lines by way of clarification.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member may proceed with the permission of the House.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: We were discussing the question of pensions. I will begin to read from here—

"I am glad to say that as far as the Bishop is concerned, we 'see eye to eye with respect to the financial arrangements and I do not think there is going to be any clash.'"

That is the only occasion on which I said that the Bishop saw eye to eye with me. This included all such considerations as valuing the property and giving them more for it. It took into consideration too, that if Bishop Hughes' suggestion to discard the B.G. principle of disestablishment and disendowment was followed, another would have to be put in its stead.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I am not dealing with that at all. I am dealing with the fact that the Hon. Premier said that the Bishop had agreed with this approach to disestablishment. I am telling you he said so. [Mr. LEWIS: This is a financial arrangement.] I repeat that there was no question of the Bishop having agreed on the broad principle of disestablishment.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that this whole question was raised on the occasion of the introduction of the St. Simon Bill which was withdrawn. The Hon. Premier's speech was quoted in Synod and this very gentleman was so incensed that he appealed to them not to discuss the matter while the Bishop was away from the Island. It is not a question of disestablishment or disendowment, it is a question of the approach to the whole matter as it confronts the Established Church today. I am appealing to hon. members to see that the Bishop as head of the Anglican Church in Barbados has no power to make an agreement with the Government on the broad question of disestablishment. I must admit that their idea of writing a letter to the Synod inviting them to a free discussion of the matter seems a very good and proper thing to do; but what I think the clergymen object to is that in any discussion on this question the Bishop has no right to make any decisions without first consulting the Synod. It is the Synod that should represent the opinion of the Church in this matter and not the Bishop. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Well, it must be remembered that they had their internal rows.] Or else the opinion should proceed from the vast majority of the people whose voice can only be heard through the medium of the Synod. I think that the Bishop's downfall in this respect was due to the fact that he did not allow the Synod to handle this matter in a democratic way. I have the greatest respect for him still. From the business and other points of view, he was for me, more capable of being at the head of affairs of the Church than, probably, many West Indians. But he did not have the necessary tolerance to deal with the peculiar set of circumstances surrounding such an age old institution as the Established Church in Barbados, and he could not appreciate the idea of trying to avoid the sledgehammer being brought to bear upon it.

Now, referring to this letter to the Press to which the Rev. Ulyett unfortunately penned his signature, I am wondering whether it is altogether a criticism of Government or whether he intended it to be a criticism of his Head but did not have the courage to do it. I read the letter myself and I began to wonder that. If he is a member of that committee he should know. I am going to say something to the Hon. Premier now. I am not thinking of the clergy now. I think it is universally known that before His Lordship left here matters of this kind were discussed in Committee. I think too the Hon. Premier is right when he says that one will get the impression that the Bishop is not in favour of disendowment and disestablishment. But at this time the Bishop has the right to make any agreement only after they have arrived at a democratic decision of the Church in Synod assembled. In short, the Bishop, in a particular way, can act then, and only then.

5.35 p.m.

We are resigned to the fact that it is the policy of the Government to disestablish and disendow the Church. The Government has told us that it is willing to discuss the matter and that it is willing to see that the Church does not suffer. The Synod realise that it is Government's policy to

disestablish and disendow the Church. Government has told them so, because it has said that it is not discussing the policy with them. Government has said that it would meet them and discuss how it would pay them for their schools. The Synod wrote back and said that they agreed to all that. What has happened during the interval is, that the Bishop had agreed with the Hon. Premier. [A VOICE: That is not true.] Is it not a fact that His Lordship the Bishop before he left the island discussed this Bill with you? That is to your credit. I am going to ask the Hon. Premier to tell me if it is not a fact that His Lordship the Bishop discussed this matter with him before he left the island? I can tell you now that the Hon. Premier said in here that he discussed this matter with the Bishop—not the principle of disendowment and disestablishment of the Church. We at that time attacked this approach to the matter, but the Bill was passed eventually. Immediately as it was passed by this House, the Synod called a meeting and put the Vicar General on the spot. It was a stormy meeting and the Vicar General thought the wrath of God would come down on him and he asked the men of cloth to be a little more tolerate and not to launch such an attack on His Lordship the Bishop. What they wanted to know was this: how is it that Synod appointed a Committee to discuss this matter with the Government's Committee, and now, it had seen that His Lordship the Bishop went to see the Hon. Premier and he has agreed with this amendment without consulting Synod. That was what was discussed at Synod.

It is so unfortunate. I ask again, if the Bishop did not come and see you and discussed this matter with you.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Lest the hon. member misunderstands me, I went to say that it is a vast difference between someone discussing the matter with you and agreeing with you on it. What I did tell him was that we are going on with it. I never said, the Bishop agreed with me for bringing it in. Quote anything in the *Official Gazette* to say I said that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I remember asking you if he agreed with you on disestablishment. All I am telling you is what actually happened and what caused Synod to call the meeting. The Diocesan Synod said that it cannot see how His Lordship the Bishop as Chairman has any right to discuss anything with the Government.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, my policy remains the same. If this is the wish of the Government, it is all well with me, but I counsel Government to see that it is still the wrong approach to the matter. I only rose to draw to the attention of the Hon. Premier that the whole matter arose with that letter. He should have gone straight to the Bishop and told him what was the position. The whole matter of that letter was shrouded in mystery. I think the matter of disestablishment and disendowment should take the normal course. The Synod are resigned to the fact that disendowment and disestablishment must come. If they have not, then they are a bunch of nitwits.

What I do say is this: let the Bishop of the Synod or the view of the Bishop in Synod assembled be put to the Government, and not the view of any individual Bishop or clergyman.

5.45 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: I do not think that anyone could escape not only the atmosphere but the familiarity which surrounds this debate. There has been a lot of ambiguity and equivocation and, one feels almost

familiarity, having the sort of recollection that we are now on the old home ground, so to speak. When the Premier was making his speech on this amendment, one got the impression, at least I did, that he actually neither cared nor knew about the subject matter in hand, but merely took what was for him in his situation, the earliest and first opportunity of working off a grievance which he may have had against a clergyman of the Established Church. We should not really be discussing this matter so vividly because the amendment, such as it is, concerns a purely administrative matter and one which is in itself more political and far-reaching than we appear to know about. If we take all that the Premier has said, he must reflect that there are certain questions which he must answer, not only to the satisfaction of the House, but also to the satisfaction of the public. Did he or did he not assure the Lord Bishop that he would not deal with this matter and kindred matters behind his back? Did he give the assurance to the Bishop that all matters having to do with the changes, transfers and appointments to vacancies in the Church and other matters connected with disendowment and disestablishment would be left hanging fire while the Bishop was away? That is one of the questions which he should answer because if he gave the Bishop that assurance Reverend Ulyett may perhaps be forgiven for supposing that something had gone on behind the Bishop's back. The only possible objection which the Premier could have had in the matter would be the possible delay caused in putting everything down until the Bishop came back. I hope the Premier will answer that question because if he did give such an assurance one half of what he has been saying before is completely out of place.

In the second place the Premier himself and the speakers after him have extended the range of debate on this amendment into that of the disendowment and disestablishment of the Church and I heard him say that while he and the Bishop did agree about the financial future, whatever that may mean, he has the impression that the Bishop is not yet committed to disestablishment and/or disendowment. The second question I wish to put to him is this: did he and the Bishop ever reach agreement on disestablishment or disendowment or did they not? Did they ever have any conversation about it? Because if he and the Bishop ever had any conversation on disestablishment, firstly they would have been held without the knowledge of the Synod or even of his own Executive Committee of which he is a member, and secondly, if he did that, the other half of what he said would be out of place. Therefore he must try and answer those two questions; and if the physical strain of standing is too much for him, I am sure the House would sympathise with him by allowing him to sit while he replies to those questions, because they are two important questions and the answers to them will enlighten not only the House but the public.

Did he give an undertaking not to disturb the Anglican Church behind the Bishop's back, and secondly did he ever have any conversation or agreement with the Bishop on the question of disestablishment? If the answers to those questions are "Yes," he has no right to quarrel with any member of the public, apart from that member of the public being a clergyman. If he did reach agreement with the Bishop on the question of disestablishment, then he has got to explain to the public of this island why, having reached agreement with the Bishop on the question of disestablishment, his government has

to resort to this piece-meal and backstairs method of administering the Church. He should tell us whether or not a letter was received by the Synod or the Bishop purporting to have come either from the Government or from the Governor-in-Executive Committee assuring either the Bishop or the Bishop in Synod that the Government wanted matters between them carried out smoothly, and that the conclusions reached as to disestablishment and disendowment would be reached in an atmosphere of calmness and mutual agreement. If such correspondence has passed between the Government and the Synod, they have no right to amend the Anglican Church Act in this manner. They should leave it to the Anglican Synod as an independent body to submit proposals to them, which proposals they as a Government should reject, modify or accept.

At this point I should like to go further. Listening to the Premier and we have become so familiar with him that all who have studied him closely—particularly when he has a bad case—know how easily you can be guiled by him and almost disarmed.

5.55 p.m.

It should not matter to him what the Rev. Ulyett says about the conduct of the Church if the allegation made by Rev. Ulyett that Government had stabbed them in the back, was untrue. All he had to do was to bring out such correspondence as was necessary; as has passed between him and the public or between Government and the civil section. But what is not known is this: the Premier knows that the Rev. Ulyett is very near the Episcopal Throne in an acting capacity from time to time. [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I do not know any such thing; so do not quote me.] It may be, therefore, the Rev. Ulyett's way of conveying to the Bishop what he wants the Bishop to know, but which he does not think politic to let him know by telling him outright. It is silly and senseless to attack a clergyman for having said something which you say you know to be untrue.

I should like to ask the Hon. Premier this question: did he ever come to an agreement with the Bishop concerning disestablishment? And while I am on my feet I wish to draw to the attention of this House the fact that if those members on the other side of the Table ever had a policy with respect to what should be done about the Church, they would not now be fumbling and finding themselves in such a difficulty. I think that in failing to have a policy they are not even prepared to listen to that great body which could guide them; and that body, obviously, is the Church in Synod. I think, therefore, that it is time that they should stop fooling themselves, allow the Synod to submit their plans to them, to say definitely whether they are going to disendow or disestablish, whichever they are going to do; but do not continue to beat about the bush.

While on this subject I should like to take the opportunity to state what are the views of the Democratic Labour Party on the matter of the Anglican Church. So far as disestablishment is concerned we wish to see the Anglican Church in Barbados in precisely the same situation as that in which the Church of the United Kingdom is. So far as disendowment is concerned, we are in favour of disendowment, but only on the ground that the Anglican Synod must have charge of the negotiations, must be brought into consultation and that nothing should be done to the disadvantage of the Church; that all proposals for disendowment should receive the utmost consideration of the Synod, and that a working agreement between Synod and

whatever Government is in power should be entered upon for disendowment. So far as disestablishment is concerned, our Party takes the view that it is best for the Church to remain, in precisely the same situation as the Anglican Church in the United Kingdom. We are committed to disendowment, we are not committed to disestablishment.

Now, say what you like about that. There are other people who are equally opposed to disestablishment and disendowment. Either of those two points of view may be hard to reconcile, but nevertheless, they represent points of view.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should not involve you in this, but do you think you know what the policy of the Government is? Have they never stated whether such policies as they wish to apply to the Church are to be policies of their own making, or whether they are going to allow the Church to submit policies for the change in its own status? It is all right for the Hon. Premier to becloud the issue by opposing and attacking an Anglican who is not a member of this Chamber and could not defend himself against an attack made upon him in here. It is all right for the Hon. Premier to say that he and the Bishop agreed about the financial future of the Church. But the financial future might mean anything; that is not specific. We are all wondering whether or not he did agree. Did he agree to give an undertaking not to do anything behind the Bishop's back and did he agree about disestablishment of the Church?

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order; one would expect that the honourable member who initiated this debate—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not on a point of Order.

Mr. BARROW: I am submitting that the Hon. Introducer of the amendments to this Bill should not be allowed to speak again on the first reading of the amendments to this Bill. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that you were not aware of this. This is the first reading and the Hon. Minister ought not to be allowed to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the case of an amendment, I think that a reply is permissible.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is an amendment to a Bill and that it must go through the normal stages of parliamentary procedure. There can be no question, in my opinion, whether it is an Anglican Church Act or a Rum Shop's Act. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker called for the Book of the "Rules of the House."

Mr. SPEAKER: There is absolutely nothing under these rules which deals with speeches. Hon. members will remember that the principle of this Bill has already been agreed upon by this House. The second reading of the Bill was agreed to; and we have thereby already accepted the principle of the Bill. There is, therefore, no question of first reading speeches not being allowed. At any rate, how would it be for other honourable members to give the lead and then the Hon. Premier be deprived of an opportunity of replying? It certainly would not be fair.

6.05 p.m.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that although I made it quite clear what I had said, and what I had done with respect to the present Bishop, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy gets up and thinks he can put me on the spot. He says, "I am giving the opportunity to the hon. member for St. Joseph; so he must answer this question." I said, over and over again, that far from agreeing on the question of disendowment, my opinion of the Bishop was that he was opposed to it. If it is those turbulent members of Synod who

want to push a knife in him let them push a knife in him. That is nothing to do with the question. I say, that His Lordship the Bishop is in a most unfortunate position. The mere fact that he had a conversation with me is sufficient to damn him in the eyes of Synod for ever. Who would not pity the position in which His Lordship the Bishop finds himself because he had a word with me. I say, again, that I went to His Lordship the Bishop, and he was very strong on his point. He spoke more than once about what he called the calamity which had fallen on the disendowed Churches in the West Indies. You cannot get the most ignorant agricultural labourer putting a question in the way in which the junior member for St. Lucy has put that to me. Of course, he must get it off his chest, although the whole substance of the queries he asked was answered by me over and over again. He still must get up and ask whether I had a conversation with the Bishop. Do not let the honourable member think that honourable members on this side of the Table do not keep their eyes open.

Mr. TUDOR: If the honourable member will just give way, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say this: I would not like to think that the honourable member has misinformed himself. I did not ask him if His Lordship the Bishop agreed about disendowment; I particularly emphasised disestablishment. I want to know whether they agreed on disestablishment.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I say again, that I pity the poor Bishop. The accident that he had a talk with me is sufficient to damn him in the eyes of certain clergymen and laymen. The Bishop is not in favour, as far as I can see from having a talk with him and Mr. Dermott Bynoe, over this question of St. Simon's and the letter they sent him and all of that. He has never given me the impression that he has agreed with the Government's attitude to the Church. [A VOICE: As to what? Disendowment or disestablishment?] The hon. senior member for the City repeated it more than once and gave the impression that he was accusing me (perhaps accusing may be too strong a word) of having agreed on this question of St. Simon's. Over and over again, the honourable junior member for St. Lucy appeared to be reading the *Official Gazette*, in expectation of finding a part which would support the honourable member's statement that the Bishop and I had agreed on this matter. You can find it nowhere in the *Official Gazette* that I said so.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I never questioned St. Simon's at all. I reminded the honourable member that some Bill came up about the matter, but it was never passed, and it was subsequently withdrawn.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the honourable member would turn to the *Official Gazette* he would see what I said. I am not replying to the honourable senior member for the City; I am only clarifying any misconception in the mind of the honourable member for the City or anybody else. My whole attitude to this matter of disendowment and disestablishment was that we are not discussing it, because Government has agreed on it already. I said I will do what I did with Bishop Hughes. I will leave it to you to tell the Government how you want it done. As far as disestablishment is concerned, I am prepared to write in the Act something like this: the Anglican Church or the Protestant Church is the religion of the State. On the method of disendowment, I leave it to you to decide." I repeat again, we wrote a letter to His Lordship the Bishop asking him for the opinion and guidance of himself and Synod. Could we do more? Could any human being do more?

6.15 p.m.

The suggestion made on the floor of the House that the Bishop is stabbing the Synod in the back by making arrangements of which I know not is quite an unworthy imputation to the Bishop. He has not agreed with me on disestablishment, disendowment or anything else. As regards his wanting to put up a last ditch fight that is a vastly different thing. I do not intend to make this debate a general debate on disendowment; I was merely saying that the Government agrees with this amendment which has come from the Other Place, and we agree with the Other Place in clarifying the position; I add that the accusation of bad faith on the part of the Government should not go unanswered.

To suggest that the Synod has been bypassed and that sort of thing is just sheer, undiluted nonsense. We feel that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should be on that Committee and he has consented to serve, therefore there is no question of ignoring the Synod and we have appointed a Committee to meet the Synod. We sent from a letter in September 1954, more than a year ago. We appointed our Committee and along came the accident of this vacancy at St. Simons and for that reason alone this Bill has been brought in. We were not bringing in any disestablishment and disendowment Bill in any piece-meal fashion; along comes this period of more than six months of an empty Cure and the Bishop appeals to the Government to fill it.

We say that with our policy of disendowment and disestablishment we are not filling this vacancy on the old terms. You may say that the Local Government Bill is on the Statute Book, and this Bill is not, but the principle is the same. We know that the Bill will be passed by the House because all hon. members are in favour of it, and along comes this six months' vacancy in a Cure and in accordance with the Act the Governor-in-Executive Committee must appoint somebody to the Cure. Says the Bishop, "it is very difficult to get somebody to take the job; I have approached several people and nobody is prepared to come." I have all the old files; I have the files in respect of 1923, 1925, 1926, in fact the first of these files goes back to 1901. It is not the first time that we have to bring in these Bills; the only difference between these other Bills and the Bill before us is that in this case not only did we bring in a Resolution but we had to amend the Act to the effect that we intended not to appoint anybody on the old terms.

I repeat this accusation of bad faith against the Government is absolutely unworthy from a different point of view. I am hoping to leave something for the debate on disestablishment and disendowment and I am merely saying this in connection with the accusation against Bishop Hughes. In that famous Address of his to the Synod saying that in principle an Established Church cannot be defended, he went on to tell the Synod that he had appointed four Committees to go into the matter. One was to prepare a list of property to which there were no title deeds existing, the terms of disestablishment, and he asked for ten or twelve years' support. Another Committee was in respect of Church support and there was one to prepare the Canons for the Church when it was no longer established. Just as we have asked the Bishop for the opinion and guidance of himself and Synod, the Synod has appointed their own Committee.

I will have to be most careful in future to do or say anything, and pass the Bishop on the other side of the street if I think a conversation with the Bishop will be used against him: but I have not done anything to justify the accusation of doing anything

behind his back. A day or two before I left London Mr. Bynoe, the Registrar of the Diocese, wrote a letter to the Bishop which the Synod had signed as to what they had been doing and so on. I will say nothing to cause any gap or widening of any gap between —

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order. I was speaking about the time before the Hon. Premier left here and the discussion which took place between himself and the Bishop about this approach.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a lot of this debate now which is irrelevant to the amendment which is before the House; and the Hon. Premier is indulging in going further and further astray.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I promise you that I will be no longer than two minutes more, and I mean the mathematical two minutes and not the Barbadian two minutes. For the last time I will say that the Bishop stressed this point about not having disendowment because it was knocking the Diocese to pieces. I said "do not let that worry you. We will not let the Church suffer financially." 6.25 p.m.

Even the St. Simon's Vicar will be considered, depending on the length of time. This Bill has nothing to do with it; that is the difficulty of getting a clergyman nowadays. It is as difficult to get a clergyman nowadays as it is to get a good mathematical teacher. I told him that as far as finance was concerned, they would not suffer.

There is one other point I should like to comment on. The hon. member recalled how he had pointed out to me that the Bishop would not do this. I will repeat what I said before. If the hon. member or any other member wishes to allege that I had agreed with the Bishop on any point other than satisfying him that on the financial side the Church would not suffer, then I give anybody from now until Dooms Day to try and remember what I said, or to find what I said in the Official Gazette. Bishop and Synod"—[ASIDES]

Here is what the debate says:—

"Now, Sir, on the other hand, when the hon. member says that he has had discussions with the Bishop and Synod" —

I did not say "Synod"; that word may have been added by the reporter. It might be that he became confused in some of the facts. I could only have said "the Bishop." No one here knows what these points were. How then could it be true that the Bishop had agreed on this St. Simon Bill?

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, on a point of explanation, that I never mentioned anything about the St. Simon Bill. I was talking about the broad issues of disestablishment and disendowment. The Hon. Premier was not in here then.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It is unfair to attack either the Bishop or the Governor in this matter. I will repeat myself again. All I told the Bishop was this: "We have appointed two Committees. When 'are you coming back? That Committee will not be 'able to meet for four months. I promise you not 'to do any thing until you return.'" Would you regard that as an agreement? Two people only, in this House, would think so: the hon. senior member for St. George and the hon. junior member for St. Lucy and that is because of the minds that God has given them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. This is the first reading of the amendments.

The question that these amendments be now read a first time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that these amendments be now read a second time.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I should not like the opportunity to pass without members of the public knowing what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph said on the 28th day of June, 1955. I understand, Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House—

At this stage Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker on this side of the Table it is understood that the hon. member for St. Joseph—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Which hon. member for St. Joseph?

Mr. BARROW: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph; the hon. junior member for St. Joseph has been silent on this matter. I understand that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has stated in his attack on a member of the Anglican Church Hierarchy, no less a person than the secretary of His Lordship the Bishop of this Colony, and accused His Lordship's secretary of making reckless misstatements in a letter to the Press stating *inter alia* that nothing was to be discussed while the Bishop was out of the Island. I find it very difficult to understand the artificial ruminations of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph when, according to the report contained on page 1142 of the *Official Gazette* he, on the 28th day of June last, said these words:

"I have given His Lordship the assurance before he left the Island that I am not going to do anything or discuss this matter by doing anything behind his back."

I know that the debates of this House should be discussed in the English language. The Premier would have been able to appease the feelings of hon. members of this House had he gone on to state all that he had said on that occasion.

After he had given a personal assurance that he would not do anything behind his back, he went on to say: "that would mean a delay of a few months." That is to say, to stick to his promise would mean a delay and that is why the promise was broken. He has said it about four or five times today.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. member taking that to be relating to the Bill under discussion?

6.35 p.m.

Mr. BARROW: Exactly the same Bill. The only difference is the Church's mass of nonsense which has been sent down from the Other Place. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph went on to say that he had not disagreed with disestablishment and that their minds are made up that he has never agreed on disestablishment or disendowment, or both. I understand it that way. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy asked the question at least eleven times and the Hon. Premier said "no," he never had any agreement or discussion and he kept on saying "disendowment." The hon. junior member for St. Lucy challenged him and very reluctantly he admitted he never had any agreement on disendowment. Knowing the way in which he can use the English Language, I suggested to the hon. junior member for St. Lucy to let him answer the question. He said "I may say that we have never agreed on the question of disestablishment." He went on to say further there can never be an

doubt at all about what is meant. The question of disestablishment and disendowment is not going to be discussed because that is settled already.

Now, how can the ordinary man in the street in Barbados have any confidence in the people who are supposed to lead them when a question of that sort which is controversial in one respect and uncontroversial in another respect comes up and you get answers like that? Let me say that the Church itself is divided on this question. I would venture to say that the people are equally divided on it. Here we have in the debate of the 28th June, 1955, which can be found on page 1142 of the *Official Gazette* that the question of disestablishment and disendowment is settled already and he is saying today that we have never agreed on that question.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member purports to read from the debate, and he deliberately misleads the House. The hon. member is the only person in the world who would say so. A child in an elementary standard could not read that into it.

Mr. BARROW: Why doesn't the hon. member read it? He would satisfy me whether I can read what is in the *Official Gazette* or not.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: The hon. member purports to read from the Official Debates. It is his duty not to mislead the House. On page 1142 I said—

Mr. BARROW: I am asking the hon. member to tell me where I mislead the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Wait a minute, the hon. member is going to read from the same debate.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: No honest man on earth can misconstrue me if he reads any single line of what I said then. I am going to read it.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, he is trying to stop me. I am on my feet, and I am not giving way to him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. senior member for St. Joseph is given the opportunity to read exactly what you have read, and you will not lose your opportunity to speak.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: What I said was this: "If the Government has not yet come down with a Bill to disestablish and disendow the Anglican Church, it is because we are still waiting and hoping that a more reasonable frame of mind would appear on the ecclesiastical side. The situation does not seem to be getting any better at present, therefore we say we are moving now. However, I have given His Lordship the Bishop the assurance before he left the island that I am not going to do anything behind his back. Unfortunately for us, that would mean a delay of a few months."

This is with respect to the question of St. Simon's Cure. I went on to say:—

"I may say that we have agreed on the question of disestablishment. We have made it quite clear that we are not discussing that part of it."

Nobody, even by accident can take that to mean the Bishop and myself unless he is dishonest. All through that paragraph you see "we" "we" "we" and he says that means the Bishop and myself.

Mr. BARROW: I am asking the hon. member to withdraw his remarks. I have merely read what the hon. member said, and he reiterated what I said. That is not a latin exercise; that is a plain exercise, and I am asking the hon. member to withdraw those remarks now. The public will decide what I have just said.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I will read it again. I may say that we have agreed on the question of

disestablishment, we have made it quite clear that we are not discussing that part of it. We have told them that if you send a Committee, we would deal with the question of how best to do it with the minimum of inconvenience, but that the question of disestablishment or disendowment is not going to be discussed, because that matter is settled already."

The hon. member gets up and says that I agreed with the Bishop.

Mr. BARROW: That is exactly what it says. It is a great pity that the hon. member got up on his feet at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would just like the hon. member to understand how I view it. I understand it to mean that the Government has decided on disendowment and disestablishment and therefore, no discussion would take place along those lines, but that the Government will discuss with the Church the way they should do it. Has the honourable member interpreted it that way?

Mr. BARROW: When I was interrupted, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was reading verbatim I did not put in the commas and full stops into what I was reading. The only misreading was done by the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. He read the word "part" where it says, "past". I am going to read it again, and I will put in the full stops and commas. I am doing so because I just want to make sure that he has the same *Official Gazette* as I have. I have already pointed out the page so that he can find it. How can he reconcile the statement which he made here today with that he made on this occasion? I will read it over again. "The situation does not seem to be getting any better at the present, therefore we say we are moving now. However, I have given His Lordship the Bishop the assurance before he left the island that I am not going to do anything behind his back."

That seems to me to be a lame excuse for doing something behind the Bishop's back, if you were doing it behind his back. If it is, you should be exculpated for doing something behind his back. 6.45 p.m.

That is the only interpretation I have; unfortunately that would mean the delay of a few months. He was doing it behind the Bishop's back. We begin a new paragraph now and I will read it verbatim again. It says—

"I may say that we have agreed on the question of disestablishment." Did the Premier not say here today that they have not agreed to disestablishment and the Church would not do this, that and the other? The Premier went on to say this:—

"We have made it quite clear that we are not discussing that part of it," so it is reported. "We have told them that if you send a Committee, we would deal with the question of how best to do it and how to do it with the minimum of inconvenience, but that the question of disestablishment or disendowment is not going to be discussed because that matter is settled already. That is the only reason why it has not been on the Statute Book."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I very much regret that such a great indulgence was given to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to get up and say that I was misleading the House when he read out verbatim with one correction something which was not in the *Official Gazette* at all. He changed the "s" into an "r". Does anybody in his right senses understand from the debate which I have read other than that the senior member for St. Joseph has made statements on previous occasions which by any stretch of the imagination could be reconciled with the statements which he has made today? All he

has done today is to try to extricate himself out of a difficult position, because the Ministers seem to have no settled views on any matter. They come in here without any preparation, find themselves in an awkward position and speak the first thing which come to their mouths, depending on the trend of the precipitously they say: "we are not doing it pre-debate. When we say that they are doing something capriciously; we have settled it long ago."

I fail to understand the explanation and an unwarranted attack has been made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, not only on myself but on the integrity of one of the Ministers of the Established Church. The honourable member poses now as Defender of the Faith for the past five years, but that is his faith; it is not the faith of the Anglican Church. But if the Reverend Ulliyett wrote a letter to the Press stating that the Government had promised not to do anything in the matter while the Bishop was away in England, far from being guilty of a reckless misstatement he was only reiterating what the Premier has said in this House on the 28th June, 1955. How short is human memory? I was flabbergasted and so I sent for the debate when the honourable member was ranting like a bull in a China shop through the cloisters of the Anglican Church. When the honourable member was trying to point out that this matter was all settled he went on to say this:—

"I would just like to reply to the honourable junior member for Christ Church as to the remark he made that the question of disestablishment and disendowment has not yet been crystallised. In 1951, when he came to this Chamber with a Resolution to increase the salaries of the Bishop, the Rectors and Vicars as well as something with respect to Boscombe, it was reported to the Executive Committee that there was much criticism in the House against the raising of the salaries of these Clergymen; the general feeling being Committee in 1951, so it is impossible to say the feeling was not crystallised. What was said then was: Give them more money? We want to get rid of them altogether." Therefore, it is impossible to say that the matter was not crystallised."

He went on to talk about matters ecclesiastical and made reference to Methuselah.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the hon. member should go on with the particular amendment which we were discussing.

Mr. BARROW: I do not think I need say anything more. I would only like to end up on this note at the time of the annual Estimates when the affairs of this country are gone into, we consider it our opportunity to level criticisms at the different Government Departments and the manner in which those Departments may be run from time to time. Whenever we touch on the corns of any favourite of the Ministerial Benches, no less a person than the Premier himself is wont to say that you should not attack defenceless Civil Servants. I very much deplore the present trend which has taken place amongst the Ministers; take the Minister of Communications and the Head of the Department in the Ministry of Agriculture (or quasi Agriculturalist in the sense that it is half way in the House of the Minister of Communications and half way in that of the Minister of Agriculture). The Minister has bragged that he had got rid of a Civil Servant. The Premier comes in here today and attacks a member of the Established Church for saying something which he himself has stated in all seriousness.

Hon. M. E. COX: On a point of Order. I would like to know when and where I have ever said I got

rid of any Civil Servant, and the Civil Servant whom I got rid of.

Mr. BARROW: We will have a full-dress debate on that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member again to get on with this particular Amendment.

Mr. BARROW: I had actually concluded my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I am saying that they, the Ministers, must set an example in the debates of this Chamber and not deliver unwarranted attacks on people who cannot defend themselves. It is our duty to defend Departments but not to suggest that one of the stooges in the Ministerial Office be asked to write a letter to the Press in order to vent your personal spleen on somebody who is not present to defend himself, so that the time of honourable members would not be used in coming to his defence.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. H. ADAMS seconded by Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS the Amendment was agreed to.
6.55 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the House adjourned for three quarters of an hour.

On re-assembling,

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to revert to Order No. 1.

RESOLUTION TO INCREASE SUMS PAID TO POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, there is an error here with Order No. 1. It is set down as a matter for Committee of Supply; but that is not correct. There is not one cent of expenditure that is being voted under this Resolution, and besides, it is a Resolution that has already been passed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member. Previously, I did say that it was not a money Resolution, and that therefore, it should be treated as an abstract Resolution; that is, with Your Honour in the Chair and not the Chairman of Committees. That was the manner in which it was decided that it should be done. But after the Order had been printed as it is now, I could do nothing about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I quite agree with the Deputy Speaker, that an error has crept in. It is not a matter for Committee of Supply, but just an abstract Resolution. The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks the authority to increase the sum of \$480,000, the maximum to which the Accountant General, by Resolution No. 83 of this House in the year 1944, was authorised to advance to the Postmaster General, for the purpose of paying money orders, to a sum not exceeding \$800,000. The reason for this is obvious. As is stated in the Addendum the "total remittances for the past five years has increased from \$924,663 to \$1,648,000." Undoubtedly this is due to increased emigration especially to the United Kingdom within recent months and shows that the Barbadian is mindful of those whom he has left behind. To quote a few figures by way of illustration, in the month of October, 1954 the total money order payments amounted to \$10,701; whereas in the corresponding month of this year the total is

\$78,573; and the total now due to the Post Office from the United Kingdom is \$200,260. The State-ment is effected through the Crown Agents who in their accounts include credit for Barbados in these payments. Hon. members will agree that that system *does* occasion delay and because of that the Postmaster has found it necessary to apply for an increase on the amount of \$480,000 previously authorised by Resolution No. 83 in this House.

I should just like to give hon. members an idea of the amounts which, from time to time are due by the Crown Agents to this Government and which do not reach us as readily as we would like. It might be interesting to know that at the end of September 1955, the amount due to the Post Office from the United Kingdom alone was \$125,234. For that and for other reasons, the Postmaster General has asked that the amount authorised by Resolution No. 83 be increased.

I should also like to quote briefly a few figures to show the trend of increases between the period 1954-55. The increases shown are said to be due to the result of increased emigration, especially to the U.K., as I said just now. In 1954, money orders amounted to \$17,690, and in 1955 up to the end of November they amounted to \$83,272; and British Postal Orders in 1954 amounted to \$57,830; and in 1955 they amounted to \$319,482. From those figures hon. members will readily see how and what are the increases. The maximum for advances by Resolution 83 is \$480,000, and up to last month the total advances made had reached \$440,000. It may also be of interest to note that in November 1954 British Postal Orders were \$9,425 and in November 1955 the total was \$70,000. From all those figures hon. members will see the necessity for increasing the maximum from \$480,000 to \$800,000 as recommended by the Postmaster General and agreed to by the Government.

I hardly think there is anything more to say at this stage. If there is any question hon. members would like to ask, as far as I have them at my fingertips, I would answer them.

I now beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.
8.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: This is a trend of what really has been expected as a result of the emigration to England. We have read in this Addendum that by Resolution No. 83, of the 24th October, 1954, the Accountant General was authorised to make advances from time to time to the Postmaster General of sums not exceeding \$480,000 outstanding at any time to enable the Postmaster General to pay Money Orders. The Postmaster General has reported that during the period April to November, 1955, Money Order payments on behalf of Great Britain amounted to \$402,758 as compared with a sum of \$75,520 in respect of the corresponding period for 1954. That is because of the large number of Money Orders which are beginning to come and they will grow in much greater quantities as the years go on, because we know that when Barbadians go abroad, they go to work, and they do not easily forget those whom they leave behind. Ever since the American Scheme of Emigration began, large sums of American dollars have been coming back to Barbados. It helps to strengthen the economy of Barbados and it is a large part of this island's income.

I am sure, that with the trend of emigration to England growing, the Government will come in the near future, particularly when the festival season comes around, for an increased amount to satisfy the Money Orders that are flowing back here.

This scheme pays and I only rise to point out what effects accrue to Barbados as a result of any permanent emigration scheme, or as the American emigration scheme which though not permanent (it is only contract work) is for steady employment.

Barbadians have that faculty of providing for their lesser fortunate families whom they have left behind. Let me say that this money which has come through the Post Office is only a part of what has come here because the banks themselves are getting drafts and much is coming back otherwise to help others to go over and do the same good work. That is the way Barbadians have developed, and this steady income which we are getting is a good sign and we can look forward to it for many years.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I think this is an occasion when congratulations should go to members of the Opposition rather than to members of the Government. [A VOICE. Why?] I will answer that question later. I am satisfied in my conscience that congratulations for this should go to members of the Opposition. The Addendum reads as follows:—

By Resolution No. 83 of the 24th October, 1944, the Accountant General was authorised to make advances from time to time to the Postmaster General of sums not exceeding \$480,000 outstanding at any time to enable the Postmaster General to pay money orders.

The Postmaster General has reported that during the period April to November, 1955, money order payments on behalf of Great Britain amounted to \$402,758 as compared with a sum of \$75,520 in respect of the corresponding period for 1954. Also, in the past five years the total remittances paid from overseas has increased from \$924,663 to \$1,648,000.

The Postmaster General has recommended therefore that the amount authorised to be advanced for the payment of money orders should be increased to \$800,000, and this Resolution is to provide the necessary authority.

This is an indication of what is coming as a result of emigration to England. It is what we predicted, and I am going to say no more than that this is the surest reason why the Government should broaden its policy for lending more money to people who want to go to Great Britain to work. By now, the Government should have such a policy formulated that people should be able to leave this country to go and find work in England so long as they can provide just a part of the money. The money for paying their passages should not present any difficulty at all. On one occasion I said in this House and I repeat that these emigrants should not be lent all the money. Now that I have seen this Resolution, I am more than convinced that emigrants in these days have the same mentality as those who emigrated in the past to Panama and Cuba. They will send back money to their families in the same way.

Years ago, Money Orders between the United Kingdom and Barbados were only those from a few people of the upper and wealthy classes who had their children there to send money for their education and once in a way Money Orders would come here from some rich person who wanted to send money here. How noticeable it is today to see that between April and November, nearly \$350,000 has come back here. If you were to take this as an indication of what is happening, I am sure that without any ado, or without any persuasion the Government would broaden its policy. For a long time, Government has been talking of setting up a place in England to collect money. Do you know the hearts that are made glad as a result of this money coming back here? I am awfully sorry that the Hon.

Premier is not in his place now. This is a real investment and I hope when the Minister of Labour comes back he will not be coming back with any tomfoolery or any half-baked story telling us all sorts of fancy things. We have lived to see that this scheme of emigration is no embarrassment to the British Government. This is a sign, in my opinion, that the Government should broaden its policy.

I have been getting letters weekly from England as to what is the situation there. There is still a tremendous lot of room for workers and we know that there are hundreds of young men and women in this country who are willing to go to England to find work but they are faced with the one difficulty of getting the \$360 for passage. They are leaving without warm clothes, despite the information given them by the Labour Department and Social Welfare Department. Go down at the Baggage Warehouse and you will see.

Let me say that it is the policy of the Opposition which has caused Government to initiate the policy of giving these emigrants a loan of \$360. Were it not for the Opposition there would be no loan at all. [Applause]. I know that it is the feeling of the people in this island that it is through the Opposition in this House that they are going to England and getting a loan from the Government to help them to do so. However, it does not matter to me who gets the credit. What matters to me is this \$400,000 odd that has come from England to this country between April and November. That money is going into the hands of people in this island and it will make their hearts glad.

When this question of Emigration to England was discussed in this House, the Hon. Premier said that Barbadians unlike Jamaicans were not prepared to sell their houses to go there. I can say that every week you will see an 18' x 10' or a 16' x 9' house for sale. As a matter of fact, the people to whom they belong are giving them away so as to get to England. People are buying them today for actually two-thirds of their value.
8.10 p.m.

You are actually buying them today for about two-thirds of the value and there is no money to buy them with. There is no opportunity of getting chattel mortgages any longer. A man realises that he must sell his house in order to get to England so as to work for his family. The Government has extended the principle of lending money to people going abroad in order to seek employment to more than one-half of the passage money; they have broadened their views in relation to having certain persons sign the bonds other than collateral; but I say that there are many people who are not in the collateral line. There are those who do not have anything but a small house and six or seven children; I asked the Government to see that such people have made their contribution to the country not only by their children but in other respects as well. I am convinced that 95% of the money loaned to people will be recoverable whether you have collateral or not.

This is really a healthy sign and an urge to the Government to extend the scope of their lending. I want to see a Department set up with the Labour Department, so to speak, to deal with this matter. I must say, I cannot help saying it, that the Headmaster of the Modern High School has actually got work for more people in the United Kingdom than the Barbados Government has done, for numbers of people who were going on their own. I am asking the Government just to embark on a campaign and try to get work for people. A boy who has left Combermere School or Harrison College, may tell

you that he wants to do hotel work, but as soon as he gets to England he will go into employment with the Railways. There is not going to be any shortage of work in Barbados on the waterside; you will always have a waterfront worker.

Let us lend the people money to go to England; there is so much work in England to be done that you can afford to let our people go and not merely select work for them. That is a good thing in itself, but I am not so interested in it; when people get to England they will find work. Some will gamble, it is true; but others will work; they will even go into the real estate business and try to make money. That is nothing strange [Laughter]. Do not merely say that you are selecting people to go into the hotels and so on; I am sure that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whoever occupies that exalted and lofty position will advise you that, taking the numbers who have been going out within the last three years, if you double the amount of the loan, you will see what will happen. Speaking for the Opposition, I say we feel proud that we can say that this proposal is a part of our forcing the Government into giving people this assistance. The Government has sent the smallest proportion of these people to England; the big majority of the people have gone on their own. They have sold houses, pigs, cattle, bicycles, they have pawned articles and so on and got to England. Next comes Mr. Louis Lynch and then the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. senior member for the City has suggested that the fact that this appreciable amount of money is now coming back in remittances from emigrants to Britain should spur the Government into liberalising the basis on which loans are granted. The hon. member must bear in mind that the Government's policy is only to lend money to prospective emigrants who can satisfy the Government that they are going to a job. So long as this policy exists, the number of emigrants going to Britain must, of necessity, be small because it is demonstrably difficult for the average Barbadian to remain in Barbados and procure for himself a job in Britain.

8.20 p.m.

Therefore, it is the height of absurdity for the Government to insist that a worker must have a job in Great Britain, before he can qualify for a loan to help him to get there. While, like the previous speaker, I am gratified to hear of money that is being returned to the Colony, I am constrained to look at the overall economic picture. Within the period under review (April to November 1955), the money order payments to Great Britain have amounted to \$327,000 more than for the corresponding period of the previous year. The respective figures are \$75,000 and \$402,000 for 1955, the difference being \$327,000. Now, during this same period, over \$1,000,000 have left this country by way of the cost of passages and general transportation expenses to enable emigrants to get to Britain; so, while on the debit side of the ledger we have the sum of \$1,000,000 representing a loss to the country, we can now credit ourselves with this \$327,000 which has been returned within this period. I am suggesting that a mere liberalisation of the Government's policy is not the only answer to the question.

I have already said that it is manifestly impossible for people to stay here and get jobs in Britain; so that the Government is, of necessity, demonstrating its antagonism to any large scale emigration when it lays down this as a basis. That is why the hon. senior member for the City could say, with some justification, that the number of people who have

been aided in their efforts to leave this island is smaller than those who have gone through their own help or through the help of other people. For me, the answer to the question is, not so much a liberalising of the present policy; because the only way that you can extend a policy in that direction is to be able to say to people: "Well, the Government will advance to you a loan, whether or not you have already secured a job in Great Britain, provided you can produce the necessary security." But even then, economically the balance is still on the debit side of the ledger. As I said before, the cost of getting there is on the increase; and obviously it would take a long time before an emigrant can remit money for his passage and what-not.

I said at the beginning of this scheme when we were forcing the Government to take action and the Hon. Premier asked whether they were expected to lend money to every Tom, Dick and Harry to go to England. [Mr. LEWIS: And they had already lent Harry] the policy which the Government should have adopted was the one under which people went to the U.S. That was the policy in which they endeavoured to find employment for people under contract before they left the island. So that their would-be employers and potential employers, could be called upon to make some contribution to getting them there. [VOICES: Hear, hear!] In that way, the entire cost of transportation would not fall on the prospective workers themselves. What our West Indian workers are doing in England is similar to what they did in the U.S. during and immediately after World War II. The position is, that these vacancies are there in the U.K., and cannot be filled.

It seems perfectly fair and reasonable that if an employer in Great Britain is expecting to draw a labour force from Barbados he should assist in the cost of their transportation. If the Government finds it impossible to get contracts for the people beforehand, how can the people find jobs beforehand so as to meet the Government's qualification for a loan? The position resolves itself into an absurdity. With a Labour Department, to say nothing of a Minister of Labour and the recently established Welfare Liaison Service in the United Kingdom, it should certainly be easier for the Government to secure more employment under contract for Barbadian workers than Barbadians would be able to secure for themselves. The number of people which they have placed in employment before they left here, is infinitely small in comparison with the machinery at their disposal for doing it otherwise. The position will not be improved from any point of view until the Government takes it upon themselves to find employment for workers in greater numbers (and diversified types of employment too) before they leave here. Over and above that, a case should be made out for assistance in transportation to the place of employment. While we are conscious of the flow of money into the Island from sources of employment, it is good to take a look at the over-all picture involving the number of workers that have left this Island during the period under review, and to note whether the policy is a policy calculated to redress this balance, on the one hand, and on the other, to secure more employment for Barbadians in the U.K.

8.30 p.m.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, more than once in this Chamber, I had urged that Government should provide the full amount of passage money to enable an emigrant to go to the United Kingdom; and you will recollect that I put it by way of a formal question as long ago as the 27th September, this

year. I asked then, whether Government will favourably consider lending prospective emigrants to the United Kingdom the full amount of their passage money for a group accommodation ticket to England. I think Government did increase its maximum assistance from one-half of the total cost of the passage and incidentals to the maximum loan of £75 which is supposed to be three-quarters of the total cost, but I see no reason why the extra quarter should not be given. The emigrants have proved that they have an absolutely overwhelming case for full assistance. As it is now, emigrants in order to raise the other quarter of the amount have to borrow from other people or sell the house in which their families should remain behind.

On the last occasion on which I spoke along these lines, we had the Government telling us that 100% of the money loaned had been repaid and up to date. [A VOICE: Oh no.] We were told that I am not concerned with the shouts on the Other Side, *sotto voce* or other wise. It was told to us that all monies which were due to be paid were totally repaid and up to date. Whether the *Official Gazette* said that or not, it was said at that time; I am not responsible for inaccurate reporting. It does not mean that all the loans had been repaid in full ahead of time, but that they were up to date, that is, what was due to be repaid was repaid; in other words, that the people were 100% ahead in their payments.

Today, we have seen something additional as to how strong is our case for helping our less fortunate brethren. We have learnt that over \$325,000 has been sent back to this colony from the United Kingdom during the period April to November this year. In other words, in the previous year it was \$75,000 and this year it is \$402,700 which means that we can regard the emigrants from this island as responsible for sending back \$325,000 so far. Mr. Speaker, with every English boat which is due here between now and the end of the year you can look forward to another \$50,000 and that is a conservative estimate. Nor is that taking into consideration the amount of pound notes which are coming into this island from the people in the United Kingdom who have elected to send back money by this method. A VOICE: [Is it legal?] I am told that it is not legal, but it is a fact that there has been an influx of these pound notes in our banks as a result of the emigration scheme to England. I know of many instances in which a considerable sum of money has come to this island by way of five-pound notes. The people who have business in the United Kingdom receive them from the persons who get them and exchange them for the local currency; and as a result, these pound notes have gone back to the land whence they came to settle accounts or to pay debts which persons here have with United Kingdom firms.

You also have to concern yourself with this amount which you cannot gauge which arrives by letters, registered or otherwise, which contains these notes and which is not paid through the Post Office or for which you do not have to go to any of the Banks for exchange, because it goes back to book-sellers or shoe manufacturers' firms in London to pay for goods received here.

Sir, I reaffirm that I will not be happy, so long as the present quota of work obtains in England, until you send 1,000 of our workers there per month. The number of 12,000 people is what this island should contribute to help the Mother Country in its time of want of good labour. You will remember that it was the "Ministry of Labour Gazette" for August 1955 which was quoted in this Chamber stating that

vacancies in the United Kingdom for jobs up to the 25th June, 1955 numbered 460,500. We still have a substantial contribution which we can make to that number. It is a fact that although they are going from here, when you look around, you may miss a particular person whom you know, but you do not miss the large numbers from our streets or our houses or public meetings. We can spare and continue to spare them and we are reaping a benefit untold from what they are sending back to maintain the household of the relatives whom they have left behind.

This is one of those Resolutions to which we should pass almost standing because it is an extraordinarily valuable indication of what those people who have gone abroad are not only doing for themselves but for their families whom they have left behind.

Government is now helping these people with a maximum loan of \$360 which is three-quarters of the total of the cost of the passage and incidentals. May I ask, in the light of this Resolution which we are considering now and which we will surely pass and in the light of the amount of money which has come back to this island to feed the people and to relieve the Poor Law Institution and to help money to circulate in this island, will the Government be persuaded to see that this is a case made out that the would-be emigrant who is physically fit and morally sound but who cannot raise the extra quarter of the amount, should be loaned the full amount of money, which is £100? Surely, that was Government's policy when they replied to my question No. 62. Their policy needs revision in the light of the indisputable advantages which have accrued to this colony, as a result of those people sending money back every day. It does seem to me that the cases which Government is helping are people who are going to the most poorly paid institutions in the United Kingdom. It is remarkable how the people turn to Government when they want something very badly and when they want something which they are prepared to pay very little. As the hon. member who has spoken earlier said, they should be loaned the money to go to England whether they secure a job there or not, because it is known that there are jobs there awaiting them. As I have said, in the majority of cases the jobs which are found for them in this island before hand are the most poorly paid and as soon as they arrive and hear of more remunerative employment they leave the job to which they are sent and go and take the more remunerative job, and they are described as contract breakers.

8.40 p.m.

Therefore Mr. Speaker, I am urging the Government to reconsider its policy and assist people with the full amount in every case where it is needed, irrespective of whether the person is going to a job which has already been negotiated for him in England by the local Government or not. Let the Government give the full amount of £100 in cases where people are fit and able-bodied; let them add to the £75 which is the minimum amount necessary for passage money and incidentals.

Mr. TUDOR: Sir, in a sense, I agree with the Hon. Minister of Communications because at no time did he contradict what hon. members on this side of the House have been saying; therefore to that extent I think it can be said for him that he is in sympathy with this side of the House. What struck me however as being most strange was the fact that he introduced a measure like this, which by its very nature is such a joyful thing for showing that he

appreciated the nature of the thing which he was introducing; for the Government, in asking that the Postmaster General be allowed to use more money to redeem the Postal Orders, has really admitted that Emigration is working and certainly within the last two months this House has received from the Government's side two striking admissions with respect to the success of emigration. The first is the Statement of the Minister of Labour that the emigrants had been repaying their loans so well that up to the date on which he was speaking there were no arrears on the loans. The second indication that emigration is working well is the fact that money is now pouring back so rapidly that the ordinary funds allocated for the redemption of Postal Orders are not now sufficient, and the Postmaster General has seen fit to ask the Government to allow him to have more money at his disposal to clear the Postal Orders which are coming in from the United Kingdom. This money is coming back to the relatives of the emigrants; it is nothing to do with the money which is being used to repay loans as between the emigrants and the Government and what is coming through the Banks. We are not taking those returns into consideration; if you take them into consideration you will probably discover that over \$1 million has already come back to this Island. It is now nearly \$400,000 for no more than seven or eight months; and therefore you have a clear indication that by this time next year the remittances of one sort and another from the United Kingdom will be in the nature of \$2 million. I feel that it should not be difficult for the Government to feel happy in this matter because their cautiousness about emigration was, as they expressed it, that public funds should not be jeopardised in a sort of open manner. Now they have seen, in spite of the fact that people who would like to go out cannot go out, in spite of the fact that so many restrictions are placed in the way of those who have gone out, money has come back in proportion far greater than what they bargained for.

Sometimes it takes people a long time to learn a lesson. I think the lesson which they should learn by now is that there is no risk involved in putting money in the hands of Barbadians who want to go to England. It is time that they abolish the restrictions which they have. If you tell people that you cannot lend them money until they have a job, that is a hardship; but some will persevere and use whatever means they have at their disposal in getting there. I have in my hands two letters which I have received just a short time ago from two firms both of which have expressed need for skilled and semi-skilled carpenters and masons, and one of them has expressed the need to such a clear extent that it has even stated what wages it is prepared to pay to carpenters of the necessary skill. That firm is paying 99 cents an hour and a working week is anything between 45 to 54 hours according to the seasons. One takes it that in Winter a man can work for 45 hours and in the summer he can work for 54 hours. This pay is nothing to do with overtime pay and that firm has said that it is prepared to have brick layers and all sorts of people, provided that they have the necessary skill. They do not undertake to confine themselves as to accommodation but they guarantee that they can find employment for all who have the skill. Also, this is a firm which pays at the normal Trade Union rates which are prevailing in the industry.

The other firm says almost the same thing and in addition to that it is not a case of work fluctuating. Provided that a carpenter or mason is well behaved and the standard of his work continues to be high he is assured of permanent employment at Trade Union rates with all the other conditions and terms of work which are involved therein. I am not in

England at the moment. I am just in correspondence with these firms and I do not know the conditions for myself; but they say in their letters that they are encouraging skilled workers in every trade.

8.50 p.m.

I admonish the Government to see quite seriously, whether a drive cannot be made in the U.K. for large scale employment of our artisans. I do not say, what I intend to say now, in any spirit of boasting; but if people can stay in Barbados and find out such things, it ought not to be difficult for the Minister of Labour to make an effort to discover the truth about these matters. It would not be a good thing for carpenters and masons and other artisans who want work, to discover that there is work for them in the U.K. and that no contact is being made in their behalf. I should have said, Mr. Speaker, that, as a matter of fact I have been asked to submit the names of persons known to me, in so far as their skill is concerned, whom these employers of the U.K. might think unsuitable. I have submitted to these firms eight names, and so far, they have chosen four from the list submitted, with the understanding that, as soon as they have seen them and the quality of their work, they will find employment for the other four. They have the resources over there. I cannot manage to convince the Government that, if they wish to do anything to help the carpenters, they can. There is a whole range of employment for people. The only stipulation the employers make is that the standard of skill must be a high one.

With respect to the coopers, it has occurred to me that we should not allow the displaced coopers to remain without employment. [A VOICE: You are straying now] The very word "displaced" is hard to think of. There is a large herring industry which barrels salmon and other types of fishes. The beer industry also uses barrels. I cannot imagine that they could not find employment for a few, if not all the coopers, who are out of work. This is a matter that has been engaging my attention; but I do think that some efforts should be made by the Government along those lines. As to where the actual taking of the credit is concerned, that can be left aside.

The best aspect of this scheme is this: that Government are in a position to say that they have not been losing any money and that nobody has let them down. In addition to saying that the Barbadians have not let them down, they could also add that the Barbadians are not letting down themselves, and that the Post Office must get more money to redeem the postal orders. Those are things which should cause Government to redress their policy on emigration. The people are not robbing Government. They are repaying the loans and sending back money in ever increasing abundance. The stipulations on lending money should be swept away or modified to a degree. If, Mr. Speaker, the Government takes this matter seriously, they will find that they have all the more reason to help the people of Barbados.

Lastly, whenever they report that all is going well, and that the returns, both material and moral, from the venture on emigration are so great that any effort is justified, that, in itself, should spur them to help the scheme along and to see to it that the people of this Country get greater opportunities of going abroad—especially to the U.K.—and bettering their positions.

I wish that they were asking for a million or a million and a half dollars for the Post Office to use in this matter. That would have been an even greater indication of the success of the scheme. I warn the Government that they should not sit idle. They should try to find out what opportunities exist and see to it that every effort is made to place these unemployed people without delay.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a few remarks, more particularly upon the Resolution itself. I should like to understand what is this indirect payment. Do I understand correctly that the payment to Barbados for the redemption of U.K. money orders is made to the Crown Agents and not remitted here? The repayment then is taken as being executed at the time it is handed over to the Crown Agents and not necessarily that it has to reach Barbados.

Hon. M. E. COX: This does not refer to the payment of remittances. Remittances relate to money sent over by persons to their families.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister has misunderstood me. Does the United Kingdom Post Office repay you through a remittance? I understand that they would do that normally to Trinidad. [A VOICE: No, no. When the Crown Agents send.] I just wanted to know if this delay in the payment was caused by the Crown Agents not sending it to you, or whether the Accountant General would regard an advice to the effect that it was in the Crown Agents hands as proof that he could continue to give the Post Office money. [Hon. M. E. COX: It is due to the delays of the Crown Agents.] Well, there should be no delay.

9.00 p.m.

I take it that it is done because as soon as somebody pays your amount, that is proof that the amount is paid.

The next thing is this: I do feel that since this amount has gone up by between five and six times what it was that you should ask for more money. You are really asking now for not quite half of the amount. I feel this amount should really be the round figure of \$1,000,000, and I am thinking that the hon. member might soon have to come back here to ask us to consider this amount again.

The Hon. Minister did not link this matter with emigration to the United Kingdom, but speeches of the other hon. members have linked it to that. Do you think that in another two months this money will be enough for all those repayments? It does not seem to me to be enough, and it is something which we should not be continually coming back here to augment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am going to suggest to the Hon. Minister, whether it is his Ministry or not, is that he should try and devise a method of collecting this money in England, particularly the money which is owed to Government, in such a manner as not to suffer those people in the paying of remitting expenses. They are poor people and they have to buy a Money Order to send back this money to this Government. It is true that they must have been sending back this money to their Department? [A VOICE: No, no; to their families.] If that is so, the method of collection in the United Kingdom would save these people remitting expenses. The Government might not even want that money to come to Barbados at all, therefore, I am asking the Hon. Minister to look into that matter. I wonder, whether he has the authority to amend this amount in this Resolution to \$1,000,000.

Of course, that amount is not wanted only for Money Orders from England but also for those from Trinidad, St. Vincent, St. Lucia and such places which are doing it for you all the time. We owe Great Britain for money they have paid out for us; we owe St. Lucia, Trinidad and all those places where a person can buy a Money Order. There must have been a time when the people in the United Kingdom did not owe us, but we owed them, because the traffic was in the opposite direction. It is only

now since the emigration to England has started that you have more traffic coming than going. At any rate, I am saying, that surely some method can be devised to collect this money in England, especially that which the emigrant has to repay the Government, so as to save those persons the remitting expenses, and I will ask the hon. member to try and see that something be done in that direction.

The hon member who said that this amount represented \$325,000 coming from England is not altogether correct. What the hon. senior member for St. Lucy said is true when he said that people are equally sending back pound notes in letters and sending money through the banks. This is not the way to compare it, because the \$325,000 which we see from this Addendum represents only that which has come back through the Post Office alone, and again we cannot say that has anything to do with that coming from Great Britain. Anyhow, it does seem that the vast majority has come from that source, but we must take into account that which comes from the other sources.

I am very pleased to see these figures, because I have heard people in Barbados to say "What a calamity it is that people are pawning their property to go to England and not only that but they are going in foreign ships to get there." All that is true but we do not have ships to take them there. I am glad to see so much money is coming back, and through a source which we can see directly. It is gratifying indeed.

My colleague has said that he feels that this money is not coming back for repayment of loans, but that this is money which is sent back to the families of those people who have left. That does not mean that it is not for repayment of loans also, because the families of those persons are responsible for the repayment of those loans.

If you have a Liaison Officer in England, let jobs be secured in England for them before hand. If the Liaison Officer tells you he wants 100 men and women then you should send them up. You should choose people of certain ages or of certain skills. What I want to say is, that you should try and eliminate people from having to write to England and say that they are being employed by Mr. A, and Mr. B, and Messrs A and B say that they can come. That is creating a hardship on the people here. It must be borne in mind that other islands are taking advantage of this scheme of emigration to England, and you may find that when other people from the other islands begin to go in large numbers that the people from Barbados will become a mere trickle. We are about to merge our Liaison Service into a regional one, and we do not know exactly what will be the dangers to Barbados, so what we can do now, let us do it, and do it quickly. It appears to me that there is still mass unemployment up there. Try and get our people there as soon as possible, because you do not know what your modified scheme will hold adversely for Barbados.

As far as employers paying something towards the getting of labour to them, I not only raised the question in this House, but I also raised it with the Parliamentary Delegation. At one time, as you will remember, American employers paid the fare for our workers from Barbados to New York, but when they saw that the West Indians were willing to float them with labour they said that since you are willing to send your labourers here, we are going to pay their fare from Jamaica to New York, therefore, try and get them there, and we will get them from there to the U.S. They did not mean exactly that all the labourers should go to Jamaica, but they meant that

they were only going to pay the fare from there to New York. That is taking advantage of competition.

That is all I have to say. I am very sorry that this amount is not a round figure because I believe that even that may have to be augmented in future. 9.10 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, there is not much to which I have to reply. I merely want to say that, if I remember correctly, when the question of emigration to the United Kingdom was discussed by members of this House, I think it was the hon. senior member for the City who stressed the point that the debate should be taken out of the realm of Party and should be regarded as a matter of national pride. Today I have heard some hon. members on the opposite side of the House, with the exception of the hon. junior member for Christ Church, say that it is the Opposition which spurred the Government into agreeing to a Scheme such as this. I am sure that anyone who knows this Government and knows its policy would not believe one word of what the Opposition has said. As far back as five years ago the Government started a loan scheme for persons going to the United Kingdom. I think Miss Arne whose name is anathema to the honourable senior member for the City —

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I object to that. How does he know whose name is anathema to me? If the hon. member is afraid to talk to people, do not let him say anything like that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot directly address the Hon. Minister.

Hon. M. E. COX: The hon. member knows me well enough to know that there is no question of my being afraid to talk to people. As I was saying, Sir, we started a Loan Scheme in 1950. I think I am correct in saying that we sent up 30 people and paid the passages of those people to go to the United Kingdom. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: And then came back for \$10,000 to bring them back]. Our policy has been to lend people money to send them abroad. It is true that this House has been discussing the question of sending people to the United Kingdom from time to time, but I am sure that it was not a question of the Opposition forcing the Government to do anything. [MEMBERS: Oh yes, that is true] This Government is interested in the well being of the people of this Island. It was on the recommendation of the Hon. Minister of Labour, after contacting people outside, that the Government increased the maximum amount which was loaned to people from \$240 to \$360; I repeat that it was on the recommendation of the Hon. Minister of Labour that we agreed to this increase.

The hon. senior member for the City said that some members of the Government regarded this Emigration Scheme as an embarrassment to the British people but I am definitely sure that he is not referring to any of the five Ministers of this Government. I have heard the hon. member say in his speeches in this House: "Send them up and embarrass the British people." It was from his lips that the word "embarrassment" came.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: On a point of Order. I must object to that; that is misquoting me. When it came from the Government that there was this question of embarrassing the British Government, I said no matter how embarrassing it was, send up the people.

Hon. M. E. COX: That was in the hon. member's imagination. There was absolutely no statement made from this side about anybody embarrass-

ing the British Government. The hon. member has said that we should do everything we can to increase the flow of emigrants to the United Kingdom; I am sure that if the hon. member had read the Memorandum published in the Press by the Hon. Minister of Labour a few months ago, he would have seen that every effort was made by the Government to secure employment for Barbadians in every corner of this earth, I would almost say including South Africa. I want to assure this House that no stone has been left unturned in this matter; day in and day out this Government has been, and still is, seeking avenues through which people can leave this island. Quite recently a few people have been sent to British Guiana. Wherever we see that there is an opportunity to get somebody out of this island, we endeavour to take advantage of it. A few months ago there was the question of constructing roads in Dominica and even that we have investigated with a view to seeing whether we could get some of our labourers to work in that island.

We lent people money to go abroad; [A VOICE: That they could get a job] and the position is not as stringent as some honourable members try to represent it. What is necessary is a letter from somebody in the United Kingdom or elsewhere who can guarantee employment for you. One hon. member has suggested an increase; but I am afraid that I could not commit the Government to that at this time. I must say, that I thank hon. members for the support which they have given to the Resolution and the suggestion made that the amount should be increased; but as you know, these matters have to be discussed in Executive Committee. It is a question of spending money and we are not authorised to do it. If the matter had been brought forward a little earlier I might have been able to get the necessary authorisation. I am afraid I will have to let the amount remain as it is.

The question that this Resolution be now agreed to was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

BILL TO CONTROL ADVERTISEMENTS IN THE ISLAND

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—I am asking leave to take Order No. 3 as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications: Second reading of a Bill to make Provision for the Control of Advertisements.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Simple?] As hon. members will see from the Objects and Reasons, for some time now the question of controlling advertisements has been under consideration. I think that the question was first discussed as far back as 1944. Last year the Barbados Publicity Committee and the Chamber of Commerce expressed concern over the number of promiscuous advertisements that were being spread over the Island. Consequently, they approached the Government requesting them to send down legislation for the purpose of controlling advertisements.

I think all hon. members will agree that these unregulated advertisements do spoil the beauty of this island. We have been considering this Bill for a long time and we feel that this is a very opportune time to pass this Bill especially since the Hurricane of 22nd September last has blown down quite a few of these boardings. Paragraph 3 of the Objects and Reasons states as follows:—

"Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to specify the 'several matters with respect to which regulations may be made in order that advertisements may be controlled.'"

The remaining paragraphs of the Objects and Reasons read as follows:—

3. By Clause 4, provision is sought to be made that where the regulations require the removal of an advertisement which was in being at the date of the coming into operation of this Act, or the discontinuance of the use of a site used at that date for the display of advertisements, then if a person is put to expense in complying with the provisions of the regulations he may recover that expense. Clause 5 provides a right of appeal in certain cases and by Clause 6 the Bill seeks to provide that claims for compensation shall be determined by a Judge of a Petty Debt Court.

4. Clause 7 seeks to provide for the payment of the compensation and costs awarded to a successful claimant.

I think the Objects and Reasons explain quite fully the intentions of the Bill and with those few words I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, the objects of this Bill were discussed by the Chamber of Commerce two years ago when it was felt that certain encroachments were being made upon the beauty spots of this Island, particularly by commercial firms which were bent on promoting the sale of imported commodities. The Barbadian has a pride in his homeland; but competition would drive anyone to push that aside if he feels that in doing so he can further advance the sales of such commodities. Control is, therefore, necessary among even the most considerate of merchants and traders; because although your competitor may be doing the identical thing to which you object, you, under the influence of competition, may be forced to do something even more absurd than he has done.

Hon. members may have noticed recently that there were some glaring signs in Hastings and Worthing advertising motor oils, and almost every week you notice that another has sprung up. Such signs are not only ugly and distorting to the landscape, but are also distracting to motorists. A motorist may be tempted to glance away from the principal focal point, the road, in order to get a closer view of these signs; and with our narrow roads he may find that he has swerved into the gutter or collided with some pedestrian.

The proposed Regulations will not be straight-laced. I presume that in these Regulations there will be certain concessions. I cannot, for instance, think of a Coney Island Show coming to Barbados and setting up their Show at the Princess Alice Playing Field or Queens Park without having some very flashy signs around. We are not as straight-laced as that.

9.30 p.m.

Unless we start now to protect the beauty spots and residential areas, as I have said, places like the palatial Ministerial Buildings to the left of Bay Street and probably every coconut tree opposite will have Coco-Cola signs displayed all over them; therefore, for that reason we welcome this Bill. I hope that the Regulations will be made with some judg-

ment with a view to representing in a properly and orderly manner where bill-board advertisements may be put up and what not. I will not say that the beauty of the island has already been spoilt by these advertisements, but there is a tendency to go further and further afield, and the Regulations although not overdue are due.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is purely something to give somebody else the power to make laws. There is absolutely nothing in this Bill to say where, when or how any advertisement should go. [A VOICE: That will be put in the Regulations.] I say again, that the whole purpose of this Bill is that. However, I am wondering whether this Bill is really correctly titled. It is entitled a "Bill intituled an Act to make provision for the control of advertisements." I believe what they mean is bill-board advertisements, because, Clause 1 reads as follows:—

"This Act may be cited as the Advertisement Regulation Act, 1955."

Clause 2 — the interpretation clause — reads as follows:—

2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"advertisement" means any word, letter, model, sign, placard, board, notice device or representation whether illuminated or not, in the nature of and employed wholly or in part for the purposes of advertisement, announcement or direction, and without prejudice to the foregoing provision, includes any hoarding or similar structure used or adapted for use for the display of advertisements, shall be construed accordingly.

That has nothing to do with anybody putting advertisements in the newspapers, therefore, I think the title of this Act should pertain to what is in the Act itself. I think, when you say "for the control of advertisements" that that is too wide. What I believe it should be called is the "Bill-board Advertisement Regulations Act, 1955," because that is really what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those persons who feel that the beauty of the countryside particularly should be preserved, but I really do not share the view that there is so much competition in big business for such advertisements, although I do know that these advertisements, are not only daytime advertisements but they are made luminous so that they can distract motorists at night, so at least in that respect this Bill can do a service. I really congratulate the Government on doing something in this respect. However, looking over the Bill they have not said if they had copied it from any similar Bill passed in another Island, and I hope that it is really what it says, and that when we pass it to-day, we will know what we are doing. As I have said, I do not like the title of the Act, or the short title, or the explanation at the top, because it really does not go as far as that. This is merely for what is known as Bill-Board Advertisements, and it should say that.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have in me the American way of looking at business. I feel you should not play ostrich if you have something to advertise; you should do something about it; you should advertise it. However, as I begin to think it over, I feel as the Hon. Minister has said, that there is some promiscuity about this advertisement and I think we can go in for some check on them, but I am a bit worried over the Bill itself. As my colleague has said, you have not said, if there is in existence in any other West Indian island such legislation. With great re-

spect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition let me say, that I will not vote for anything which will give anybody power to make regulations which I cannot amend. It is my belief that if we pass a law to empower, say, the Director of Transport to make regulations, this Chamber should have the right to amend such regulations, but we do not have that power; we either can accept them or reject them. I am not taking any chances. My attitude towards this Bill is going to be "No". Since I have no power to amend any regulations which will be the outcome of this Bill, what is the sense of my voting for the passing of it? The Hon. Premier has promised us several times from his seat that he will bring in something to give us power to amend regulations, but nothing has been done yet. I am not going to vote for any Bill which will give anybody power to make regulations when this Chamber cannot amend such regulations.

The short title to this Bill is "The advertisement Regulation Act, 1955." The interpretation clause reads as follows:—

2. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"advertisement" means any word, letter, model, sign, placard, board, notice device or representation whether illuminated or not, in the nature of and employed wholly or in part for the purposes of advertisement, announcement or direction, and without prejudice to the foregoing provision, includes any hoarding or similar structure used or adapted for the display of advertisements, and references to the display of advertisements, shall be construed accordingly.

The title is rather broad. You want to pass something empowering a body to prevent people who want to push their goods from putting bill-board advertisements or placards into residential areas, and on sites around street corners. If you want to stop anybody from putting on a "Ju-C" advertisement, or an advertisement for J. & R. rum on somebody's sign-board, I am not in agreement with you.

9.40 p.m.

The danger is that you will get somebody owning a spot of land in respect of which it would be dangerous to allow anybody to block off the view around the corner, especially so in the case of these signs which are being erected now. I feel that you must do something to control that; but I must confess that if any particular individual wants to have something done about that today all he has to do is to put it over. You have power under this Measure to make Regulations to tell a man, say, in Long Bay, not to put up a sign showing what sort of business he is running. These Regulations are broad. I know I will be asked: "who would make Regulations that a man should not put up a sign advertising what he is doing?" The honourable member says that this is a simple thing, but this is not so simple. The danger is in these simple things. Actually what happens in the United States of America today is that they actually control faked advertising, the type of advertisement which can create a false impression: for instance, tooth paste will control pyorrhoea. That is the type of advertisement to which we are heading. I remember once somebody advertised "SURE KILL"; that cannot kill anything. That is the sort of thing you want to prevent; you want to prevent the advertising of things and giving a wrong impression.

My policy has been, since the Hon. Premier has not kept his word in bringing down some law by which we would have the right to amend Regulations, not to vote for any Bill which allows the making of

any Regulations. However I would like to suggest that this interpretation of "advertisement" gives you the objects and reasons of the Bill. I think that in the absence of the Hon. Minister being able to tell us if this Bill is a copy of what exists in Trinidad or British Guiana or some other place,—I am afraid in the absence of this explanation I cannot vote for this Bill. I repeat that the object of controlling advertisements is to stop people from advertising goods and just get people to buy them.

In certain places in the United States of America there is the question of zoning. When you read the interpretation of "Advertisement" in this Bill, it says that "advertisement" means any word, letter, model, sign, placard, board and so on, that interpretation is very wide. There is no point in telling me that the legal luminaries have drafted this Bill; they also drafted the Bill with which we were dealing today and the same legal luminaries amended it in the Other Place. Some people follow things blindly to the letter; you have some religious fanatics who write all over the place "God is Love." That is a sign and do you know that you will have to control that too? I repeat that this wording is too wide and it is the simple things which we must watch. My own position is this: because we have not got the right to amend Regulations therefore I am not voting for any Bill which says Regulations must be made.

Let the hon. member have Regulations to control and zone Bill-boards. Nobody would like to think that if you go to St. John's Church and look over the Cliff you would see a big display "Drink Coca-Cola" or drink "J & R rum": but if a man has a shop in St. John, do you mean that he cannot put up a sign, "Buy J. & R. Rum" or things to that effect. I wonder where this Legislation was taken from?

9.50 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I should have informed hon. members in introducing this Bill, that it is based on the Trinidad Ordinance of 1932. In that Ordinance, the definition of Advertisement includes "any notice, bill, placard, poster and similar publication." [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Even a wedding compliment?] This Ordinance "is an ordinance to control the erection and use of hoardings." [VOICES: That means bill-boards.] "and all advertising." "Hoarding" includes "any structure used as an advertisement or exhibited as an advertisement." Therefore "advertisement" and "hoarding" are defined.

Hon members will see that in subclause (2) of clause (3) provision has been made for what will be known as an Advertisements Advisory Committee, and it is reasonable to assume that the Government, in appointing a Committee, will appoint those persons who are more intimately connected with and have knowledge of such things. [A VOICE: Anybody may be affected by the provisions of this Bill.] In addition to that, regulations will be coming to this House in due course, and if those regulations are not approved by this House they will be annulled as is usually the case. After all, this is a democratic House. If a minority object and a majority agree, the regulations remain in force, for the simple reason that the majority rules. Everybody knows that the hon. member objects to Bills coming to this House for which no permission is given to alter regulations. [A VOICE: Because we were promised so by the Premier.] I am not convinced as to the Hon. Premier having promised that any such Bill would come before the House. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Would you swear by the Premier?] I do not know if one can take oaths in here; but I am definitely sure that I have never heard him say that. What he did say

is this: that hon. members cannot object to what is contained in the Interpretation Clause.

However, it is absolutely necessary to do something at this stage. The Bill, as I said before, has been drafted on the principle of the 1932 Trinidad Ordinance and I am asking hon. members to pass it. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I would bet that the Other Place returns this Bill with amendments].

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that His Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into committee on this Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Clause one was called. It reads as follows:—

1. "This Act may be cited as the Advertisements Regulation Act, 1955"

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Hon. Minister is satisfied that this Short Title is what he means in this Bill. The Hon. Minister says that this is a correct Short Title for the purposes of this Bill. I hope he is absolutely sure about that; because there is no chance of evading the fact that whereas the Trinidad Ordinance of 1932 sets out definitely what form of advertisement it is controlling, this Bill does not.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that clause 1 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question that clause 1 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister would assure us that this clause 2 can stand part of the Bill. Is the definition contained in this clause the same as the Trinidad definition of an advertisement as contained in the Trinidad Ordinance of 1932? Let me tell the Hon. Minister something. He talks about comparing the provisions of this Bill with the Trinidad Ordinance; but the Trinidad Ordinance is something that we all understand. Where in places they say "Ordinance" while we would say "act", the word is adapted. But where you alter the ordinance as a whole, that is a different matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Hon. members will appreciate that the greater always includes the lesser. I said: "advertisement" includes "any notice, bill, placard poster and similar publication" Hon. members will see from that how wide the definition is. 10.00 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: In other words, our Act is wider; our definition is wider. What I want the Hon. Minister to understand is, that so far as I am concerned, I am trying to help the House and him.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague has not remembered what has happened earlier to-day. We are told that Mr. Lightburn came out here and he said, let us amend the Local Government Act, and immediately as he said so, they sent down two amendments to-day to it, and have hinted that they will bring another one shortly. I want the Ministers of Government to understand that that is the attitude which you must

of necessity adopt towards legislation. Those people are going to show you out what is wrong, and they are also going to alter what is wrong. They come down to-day and tell you that what they represented in this Act was wrong, and they altered it. That is something which we have to consider in a serious light. The Attorney General will get up in the Other Place and say that such a thing is an oversight by his Department. I have seen that in the *Official Gazette*: I have never heard any Minister in here to say that he has made a mistake. The Trinidad definition of "advertisement" pertains to something that is exempted, such as, Bill-board advertisements.

As my colleague has said, do you mean to tell me that if a man has a shop and some Coca-Cola businessman or some sweet drink or big rum shop proprietor is willing to pay him a reasonable sum to put his own name around some sign of theirs that that sort of advertisement must come under this Bill? I do not want us to get fanatical about this thing. What we have got to understand is that the subject matter of this Bill has come from the Chamber of Commerce; it has been urged by the Chamber of Commerce. So far as I know, we have got to be very careful about this thing. There may be some people in the Chamber of Commerce who might want to find a good place to advertise their stuff, and because of that some small person may be crowded out from advertising their business. We have more restrictive legislation in Barbados to-day than at any other time of our history and all of that we have put on within the last ten years. You cannot dig a well in your backyard to-day; nothing you can do without your consulting the law, and I am going to warn you that these very laws will be used against you when somebody is ready for you. The Government is at present going in for business. Do you mean to say that you cannot advertise your bus business or natural gas business without such things coming under regulations? There is no necessity for us to go as far as what is in the Trinidad Act, from what I have heard about it.

Again, I want to say that we should have been told that this Bill was drafted from similar legislation in Trinidad. It is true that it was in our hands for a long time, but if I were told that it was drafted from the Trinidad Act, I would be able to examine it in that light. Government had no right to bring this in here and say it came out of their fertile brain. This Act should come in here with recognition of similar legislation from other places.

I know it is not your intention to rush this Bill through the House. You could have said that parts of it were taken from the Trinidad Act so that somebody in Barbados could have tried to get a copy of the Trinidad Act to make a comparison, or could have asked somebody from Trinidad what difficulties there were in the operation of the Act. I do not feel that the Government wants to enact something to cripple the people of Barbados, but it may unwittingly do it. Do not let us start off too wide. If we can get the co-operation from the people without the law let us do so: we will be doing the correct thing. I am not in a position to offer any amendment to this clause, but I am asking for God's sake not to let us go too far.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY. This is really something which is too wide. We have a number of shopkeepers who pay their liquor licences at the end of the year out of what they get from some big business man putting an advertising sign on their shop. I know what has already happened. There have many business people here who were very lackadaisical in pushing their business and the younger people have come along and have been doing advertising to push their

business and that is why you get all this fuss. What we are actually doing here means that anybody who owns a shop, say in Pie Corner cannot have an advertising sign put on it without first getting consent from somebody.

I beg to move that this section be postponed.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to second that.

Hon. M. E. COX: I accept the motion.

10.10 p.m.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. M. E. COX: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: What I object to in this Clause is the inclusion of chattel buildings in respect of those things for which the Governor-in-Executive Committee may make Regulations. What I feel about it is this: if you make your Regulations in respect of advertisements being affixed to land, a person who owns land is in a much better position than a person who owns chattel buildings. These latter people are the poorest to be found in this country; and although we are much concerned with the views in the aesthetic sense, of the various people who travel on our thoroughfares, yet we must consider the poor economic position of the people who own chattel buildings. If you give the Government power to make these Regulations, it may mean that they may make regulations to prohibit the use or display on a chattel building of some poor person who stands in great need of the \$5 per quarter or so for the privilege of allowing an advertisement to be stuck up on that chattel building.

It may be unpleasant to the sight of other people, but we have to consider that if other people's rights are taken away we must consider the economic loss which such people would suffer by way of income for the display of these advertisements. If you deprive the owner of land of that source of income, we can allow them to do without that in the interest of the beauty of the countryside. However, when it comes to those who own chattel buildings, I am not convinced that these buildings should be included in these items in respect of which the Governor-in-Executive Committee is authorised to make Regulations. I therefore beg to move that the words "or chattel buildings" be deleted.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I do agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. If you get at a corner and erect a sign which will interfere with the effusion of your car lights, that can be very dangerous; but how can you say that if a man has a chattel house, say in Silver Sands or Charnocks—how can you prevent a man from erecting a sign on his house there? I am seconding the motion made by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy. I believe that you should regulate the erection of signs around corners, but if a man who erects a sign on his chattel building, which really means his shop, I do not think that he should be interfered with. We know our Barbados and therefore the hon. senior member for St. Lucy is right.

Mr. LEWIS: I take the view that nobody should be able to erect a definitely repugnant advertisement on any building; the danger is how far you should let regulating that advertisement go. Do you mean to say that anybody who has a wall building can put up any sort of sign but not a person who has a chattel building?

Mr. BRANCKER: I presume the draughtsman used the term "chattel buildings" because he felt that the owners of stone buildings would be in receipt of remuneration which "Canada Dry" would

pay for putting up an advertisement. The owners of chattel buildings are not above that little remuneration which would be paid for displaying an advertisement. The great thing is not to spoil the beauty of the landscape. That is the real reason for Regulations of this kind—to safeguard the beauty of the countryside and what nature provides for us. When you single out chattel buildings, the owners of which would very much appreciate the opportunity of having these advertisements displayed so as to get the remuneration therefor, I am not so happy with that. If you put up a sign on land, that may obscure your view, but the chattel building is already there and this Section of the Bill refers to something which is affixed to such a building. That is my reason for moving the deletion of those words.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, it seems that this Bill needs a little more studying; [*Cheers*] I therefore beg to move that the further consideration of it be postponed.

Mr. BRYAN: I beg to second that.

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

10.20 p.m.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

The question that Mr. Chairman do now report progress with leave to sit again, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Chairman reported progress and Mr. Speaker resumed and reported accordingly.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, that ends Government Business. I think there are a few hon. members who want to do some orders under Private Members' Business.

PAROCHIAL EMPLOYEES PENSION BILL

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 3 standing in my name as the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Order no. 3 was called: to move the consideration of the amendment of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to amend the Parochial Employees Pension Act, 1944, as amended.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, this order deals with the amendment to the Parochial Employees Pension Act, 1944. The amendment is made to section 2 where it was discovered that the wrong Pension Acts (*viz*: The Parochial Employees Pensions (Cost of Living Allowance) Act 1953, and the Parochial Employees Pensions (Cost of Living Allowance) Act 1954 had been quoted. It is now correct as contained in the amendment, *viz*: "The Parochial Employees Pension Act 1952." I do not think I need read the whole amendment, since hon. members have seen it. There is one little typographical error in the printed amendment; but the Clerk says that it has been corrected in the copy. I now ask that the amendment be read a first time.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Mr. GODDARD, seconded by Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY in each case, the amendment was read a second time and agreed to.

H. C. GRIFFITH PENSION BILL

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 36 standing in my name as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take Order No. 36 as the next Order of the Day; and unless there be any objection leave will be granted.

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

Order No. 36 was called: second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. Michael to pay a pension to Mr. H. C. Griffith.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill entitled an Act to authorise the Vestry of Saint Michael in this Island to pay to Mr. Herman Clarence Griffith a pension of Three hundred and fifty six Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum in equal monthly instalments from the Twenty fourth day of January one thousand nine hundred and fifty five during the term of his natural life out of the Parochial Funds of the said parish.

The passing of this Bill will create no precedent. Hon. members will recall that with the passing of the Bill to provide security of tenure for parochial employees, the respective offices of the said employees became pensionable. Mr. Griffith, before going to Christ Church as Chief Sanitary Inspector, was employed in St. Michael for approximately three years. His is, therefore, a case of unbroken service. Hon. members who may be acquainted with the Vestry Act will realise how this is done. A similar procedure has taken place with employees of St. Thomas and other parishes, and the case of Mr. Griffith having gone straight from the Parish of St. Michael into the Parish of Christ Church is in accordance with the provisions of the Law. All this Bill seeks is the authority for the Vestry of St. Michael to pay a pension to Mr. H. C. Griffith.

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

Mr. F. C. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to the second reading of this Bill; because I like to know that a man who has given his service to the Island or parish is given some reward from the Treasury; but there are one or two observations which I have made in connection with these parochial pensions. The Treasury of the Central Government has to augment the Parochial Treasuries. The Government does not collect any taxes on the Vestries. If, as happens, the Government has to grant Pensions to people outside its employ, it follows that the Vestry does not want to compensate its employees. There are other Bills on this Order Paper dealing with subjects of a nature similar to the one now before this House, and I am wondering what is being done about them.

10.30 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I just want to say that this is not on all fours with what my colleague has said. This is not broken service. Mr. Griffith was employed in St. Michael as a sub-Inspector, and he left the job one morning and went to Christ Church as Chief Sanitary Inspector the next morning. That is not broken service. I think you are talking of the case of the Reverend Coleman. That is broken service.

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

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called. It reads as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty her heirs and successors or any person except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by from or under them."

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, Clause 3 has to be put in proper order.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Yes, it needs a slight amendment. It should read as follows:—

"Nothing in this Act declared or expressed shall affect the rights of Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors or any person body politic or corporate except such as are mentioned in this Act and those claiming by from or under them."

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I accept that amendment. I only would like to say in passing that this is worded actually the same way.

Mr. LEWIS: I am questioning whether the words "Her Majesty the Queen" are absolutely necessary.

The question that Clause 3 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Preamble was called and passed.

On motion of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title agreed to.

ADDRESS re REPLY TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S MESSAGE: No. 31 ON FINAL CONFERENCE ON CONFEDERATION

Mr. BRANCKER: As I intimated earlier today when Notices were being given and I presented the Report of the Select Committee of which I was Chairman, and which dealt with the very urgent and important matter relating to a final conference on Federation to be held in London in February, 1956, I am asking leave at this stage to deal with the Report of the Committee.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: At this stage! I intimated that the hon. senior member for St. James also had a Vestry Bill to deal with.

[A VOICE: Alright, we will deal with it after this.]

Mr. BRANCKER: As Your Honour will realise, the subject matter of this Report is of exceptional importance and of equal urgency; and I am now asking leave of the House to deal with the Report of the Select Committee to His Excellency's Message, No. 31/1955.

There being no objection leave was granted the hon. member.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Draft Reply of the Select Committee be adopted. It reads as follows:—

**THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR**

The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 31/1955.

2. The House note with surprise and regret that the Reports of the Pre-Federal Commissioners are only now being prepared for publication and recommend that these Reports be laid before the Legislature at the next meeting so that their contents may be considered before the House are invited to discuss the appointment of the Barbados delegation to the London Conference.

3. The House are of the opinion that in view of the importance of this Conference the Barbados Delegation should include at least one representative from each Party in the House.

As hon. members know, the Message from His Excellency the Governor contained six paragraphs. So far as the first paragraph of His Excellency's Message, that was purely a statement and no specific mention was made in the Draft Reply except to acknowledge it. The second paragraph expresses the hope as to the final decisions of the major outstanding matters in which this conference would take, so that was not necessary for any particular mention.

The third paragraph was one which the Select Committee regarded as worthy of comment, because it dealt with the statement that the Reports of the Pre-federal Commissioners were being prepared for publication. It was felt by the Committee that the reports should have already been published and should have been for some time in the hands of honourable members for consideration and, secondly, the Committee was constrained to express surprise and regret that these Reports were being now prepared and are not yet ready for publication.

The fourth paragraph dealt with the proposal to invite the conference to set up machinery for all subsidiary questions which must be dealt with before the drafting of the constitution instruments can be completed, and that received no specific reference in the Committee's draft reply. But in regard to Paragraph five which says that the Hon. the House of Assembly will in due course be invited to concur in the appointment of the Barbados delegation to the conference, the Committee express the opinion that in view of the importance of this Conference, the Barbados delegation should be non-party.

10.40 p.m.

I might just add that as was mentioned today by the Hon. Minister of Communications when he referred to a matter being of national importance as distinct from a Party matter, that was in respect of the question of emigration, so the Committee which considered this matter of Federation, have regarded it as a matter of national importance and a matter for a non-party delegation so as to let it appear that this House from every point of view is one hundred per cent. in favour of Federation and we would do all we can to expedite it. I now formally beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. This is hardly a matter on which I can say very much; it is no question of any different views and we vote on this Address because it is a matter of national importance. All we want to show is that we appreciate democracy. For the benefit of hon. members who were possibly not members of the House at the time, I would draw to their attention that it was the first and perhaps the only occasion when the

principle of Federation was discussed, when Party differences were set aside. There was no question of Ministerial Status on that occasion and we had Mr. H. W. Springer, now Registrar of the University College of the West Indies, the Hon. Premier and the Hon. H. A. Cuke meeting on common ground and discussing the question of Federation of the West Indies. This is a matter which calls for men to pool their experience together for the common good.

Mr. LEWIS: Up to a week ago, I thought that the Government members had overlooked the importance of this Message and that a Reply should be sent to the Governor. There are many people, among whom I am one, who felt all along that they should accept as genuine a declaration by people from England that they are not thrusting Federation down the throats of the people of the British West Indies. Hitherto they have done things or everything to make us feel that that was so.

When it comes to the proposals for a final Conference on Federation, could you imagine Pre-Federal Commissions being set up to study the aspects, including the financial aspects, the Civil Service and other things, and these Reports not being made public before they arrange a Final Conference on Federation? It is now the considered opinion of some people who did not think so before that they are trying to ram something down our throats. If it is not Federation, they are ramming something down our throats in the way of Federation. It is now getting down to middle-December and sometime next month our delegation along with others will have to get up to London to start the Conference and at the same time to take up three Commissioners' Reports and study them and draft the essence of them into our Constitution. For that to be done without the people's Representatives ever seeing those Reports, without the common people in the West Indies having the opportunity of these Reports being put in their hands or printed in the Newspapers—I say that that is reprehensible action. If necessary, this Conference should be put off for a month or two so that these Reports can be put in the hands of the people. That must be of vital importance otherwise the Commissioners would not have been appointed. At the very last minute to get our delegation up there with these things private and confidential in their hands is suspicious. I repeat: this is reprehensible action of which these people should not be guilty; I cannot describe that in parliamentary language but they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

When I say that, I have to go back and say that the people who accepted that decision ought to be doubly ashamed of themselves. If I had anything to do with it, I would ask: "What is it you have got up your sleeves?" I would say: "You send your people up there and they have reported to you, not to me." At the Conference the Secretary of State for the Colonies said that he did not want to push Federation down our throats, but if you want a Federation which suits you, are you to push something down our throats? They can put up something which can be regarded as a final Conference and when something happens then you will see what was in it. I think everything should be known to the people who are going to come into this Federation; I say they should be ashamed of this proposition. These people returned from England ever since August or September. There has not been any hurricane in England; the Press has not broken down; and why did they want to keep these things secret? This Government should be strong enough to prevent this Conference from being held until these Reports come out here. Let

them be distributed in the West Indies by a certain time and let them see that you are not spineless. I think that no member of the Government should have allowed this Message to come down here saying that these Reports will be prepared for publication. A delegate is not a representative although we give delegates plenipotentiary rights; a delegate should listen to something which is said and if it is reasonable he should only compromise to the extent that he does not destroy a principle entirely.

10.50 p.m.

How can you send people to represent you, to incorporate reports in your Constitution, that have never seen the light of day in the territory? If that is the way in Kenya, let them be told that in the West Indies it is not so. One may have the 'guts' to do something; but one may not have the foresight to see when one should do it. That strikes me as very peculiar. I think the Government of Barbados should have rejected that in our interest and in their own. If they had postponed this conference, there is no man in Barbados who would not have upheld them and regarded them with the highest esteem for saying "no". This is a measure that is going to tie us down to a federation, and we should be informed of the facts through the reports. Let us have them.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but draw it to the attention of hon. members that the one man who was picked to head the Civil Service Commission is a man who has a record of which he should be ashamed; a record for beating a civil servant and kicking him out. Is he a man through whom a report should be accepted? I would have to read every word of that report. He is a man who left a record telling them to put a certain merchant of Bridgetown here, and I know that he is the cause of a certain man sitting on the Civil Service Commission who has no right to do so. These are people who have committed some of the worst acts of our Civil Service.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I could not trust anything that might be said in that report; and I cannot tell about the others; they may be better or worse. I am suspicious of the whole matter. They want us to reach an agreement to hold an official conference while they are preparing the report, and we who have been reported on, know nothing about it. I want the Government of Barbados to have more 'guts' than to do that. Try and remember some of the good things that were done by our former legislators. Show these other people that they cannot do as they like with you. I cannot understand why I have heard nothing from the great Mr. Manley or from the great Mr. Gomes. I am not saying that it has not been so. They are now talking about what they are going to put into the Constitution rather than discussing what other people are going to put in that might cut across what they want to put into it. Why have not the people clamoured for it? I think our civil servants should know what is being planned for them in the Federal setup. Recently, we contributed 50% of the cost of sending a number of delegates to Jamaica because we saw that this federated civil service was forthcoming. What are we doing now? I sincerely hope that the Government of Barbados is going to seriously consider what this means and show the other participating colonies what are their intentions. If they have slipped up, then Barbados should take the opportunity to give them a lead. All the other relevant reports have been published.

I am going to suggest an amendment to the honourable senior member for St. Lucy which I hope he will accept. I sat on that Committee but it slipped me at the time when the meeting was held. The

suggested amendment is as follows:—After inserting a comma, insert the following words:—

"in the matter of a final conference on Federation to begin in London, on 7th February, 1956."

It may be that the honourable member has not felt very keenly on the matter and that may be the reason why he has probably not generated any heat; but it is of importance to me. The method is an indication of the feelings of the people on the other side of the Table. I feel that this House could be of assistance to the Government and the members of the Barbados delegation if we got the relevant facts before hand.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I happened to be a member of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on this matter. The meeting was scheduled to be held at 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon; but I received my notice of the meeting at six o'clock on the same afternoon, which was the principal cause of my not having attended the meeting.

There is one point which I should like to criticise and it has to do with paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Message No. 31/55. Paragraph 5 reads as follows:

"The House will, in due course, be invited to concur in the appointment of the Barbados delegation".

In answer to this the Committee replied as follows:—

"The House are of the opinion that with the importance of this conference, the Barbados delegation should include, at least, one member from each party of the House".

I think we all agree in a position of this sort that the delegation should be non-partisan and comprise of as many as are possible, but that also depends on the number of delegates that will be sent from each colony. In the past we have been sending two.

11.00 p.m.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: A colony can send as many delegates as it wants.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I will not contend with the honourable member, but I do not think so. I just wanted to draw that point to the attention of the House. Heretofore we have been sending two. Subject to that I think that it should be non-partisan.

The honourable senior member for the City also made another point, but I think that the delegates can be trusted. Knowing Barbados as they do they can be trusted to do their best in the interest of the people of this colony.

There is a phrase in the reply "before the House are invited to discuss the appointment of the Barbados delegation." What I want to say is, that in recent years the delegates were appointed by the Executive Committee so I think the method of procedure in this case would be the same as that which took place in the past.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, I must confess that I am a bit disappointed as to the manner in which this matter is treated by the Barbados House of Assembly. I am of the opinion that the initiation of this matter should have been taken by the Government, and that the Government should utilise the opportunity to put before this Honourable House and the general public for deliberation its views on a number of controversial issues which are still current as regards to this matter of federation. Most of the Governments of the other West Indian islands have seen fit to approach this matter in an entirely different manner from that which we have adopted. There are still so many outstanding matters to be

settled that I am of the opinion that even before this final conference takes place in London, there should be a conference in the Caribbean of the delegates who would go to London to try and urge unanimity on these outstanding matters. That should be done before they go to London even if it needs postponing the London Conference for another three weeks.

One has noticed from reading the newspapers that the Jamaica Government is prepared to propose an entirely new innovation with regard to certain aspects of the constitution when that delegation gets to London, and there is also a list of outstanding matters which the Jamaica Government feels the delegates should be mandated on before they go to London. Apart from the question of dual ministries, some of the points raised by the Jamaica Government are diametrically opposite to those agreed upon both in the Rance Report and at the London Conference controlling it. For instance, I have seen that the Jamaica Government wants reopened the question of financial assistance by the British Government, and I was interested to hear the honourable junior member for St. Thomas say that we can expect that the Barbados delegates would do their best. They will do their best according to their own light, but what we want to know is that the case of this country will not be put by default, and that the views of the majority of the population will be heard at the London Conference.

You will remember that some time ago when this question of financing the federation was discussed, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said, that we would have to wait and see what the British Government would do, and he dilated on the question of the amount of what we should ask for being a question of what the British Government feels. That attitude is not taken by any other West Indian Government or leader, and I know that is one of the matters which is still an outstanding issue. The question of the reserved powers of the Governor-General as proposed in the Regional Report is still an issue. The composition of the Upper House is another question which is still at issue, the last of the two lists is still on issue, and there should be some exchange of views in this country as a whole on these matters before our delegates go to London.

What will happen is, that sometime late in January this House will be given a Message from the Governor saying that such and such a person has been nominated to go on the delegation and a few days after the text of that Message is given the delegation would be off, and there will be no chance of any public body meeting to discuss it, not even the House. I will say again, that some of these matters are still of a controversial issue, and you should give a mandate to the delegates to speak for the country, when they go to London. That is why I say the matter should be handled in an entirely different manner.
11.10 p.m.

It would be all well and good if this question of Federation had reached a point where it was something like unanimity in the West Indies or if there had been complete acceptance of the decisions of the Rance Report and the decisions of the last London Conference; but it appears to me in spite of whatever the West Indian Governments are saying about this matter, the entire question of Federation is in the melting pot again. As a matter of fact, the London Conference would have to settle these many important issues as we presume were settled at previous Conferences. Nobody at all is satisfied with the constitution; it is true that certain constitutional advances have been made since the Rance Report

and the insistence now is that there should be a Federal Government with no less a constitution than that advanced by the Unit Government; but when they go to London, they will have to spend as much time discussing matters which have been discussed before. Nobody would have had a chance to know what views were expressed in London. Here it is, you have to make a suggestion that the Governor General should have no Reserve Powers at all, that he should purely be a nominal figure head or rubber stamp and at the same time we are insisting on more financial assistance from the British Government: and there will obviously have to be some compromise somewhere, because I cannot see the U.K. Government agreeing easily that the Governor General should not have any say at all in these matters. If you are having a Governor General who is merely a representative of the Queen with no voice or say in the Cabinet, that almost pre-supposes that you should finance the Federation yourself. On the other hand, the opinion is justifiably held that we are entitled to the maximum financial assistance and that the presence of either U.K. officials or the Governor General may or may not act as a deterrent towards the proper development of the new Federation.

I only mention these things in passing because they are things which occupy the minds of people who would have to speak after and I do not think that with the records of the past we should sit down here quietly and expect that the Barbados delegation will do its best for Barbados. I also feel that unless this thing will be pushed down our throats, there should be the maximum information in the West Indies on all sides before it is finalised. In every island there should be given the opportunity to discuss matters of this kind and I repeat that there are too many matters still at issue for these delegations to go to England and represent a proper conclusion without some previous discussion among themselves. What will happen is that a few people will go determined on it, that the Imperial Government wants it and it will not be in our interest to have a Federal set-up which is not in keeping with what the public demands and which would never be capable of success. I am of the conviction that we are not treating this matter in the manner in which it deserves to be treated.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before you put the question. Mr. Speaker, there is only one point to which I would like to refer and that is relative to the publication of the Reports. The hon. junior member for the City in the course of his remarks, said that the British people should be ashamed of themselves and we should be doubly ashamed of ourselves. I would like to assure him, that like him, we would not be prepared to have any discussion on this question of Federation until those Reports were published [*Cheers*]. As a matter of fact, it places one in a very embarrassing position that he does not know what these Reports are. I think the hon. member will appreciate the fact that the date was fixed apparently between the Hon. Mr. Gomes and the Hon. Mr. Manley. It is not that we wanted so early a date but they fixed it and we made attempts to get that date altered but those attempts were not successful. However we stressed the point that the Reports must be published in time so that hon. members can discuss them.

We were told that these Reports were being printed in England and it is hoped that very early in January, if not later this month, they will be forthcoming. It is not a question of our taking for granted whatever is said.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of explanation. If the hon. member would read Clause 3 of the Message he would see that it is said that these Reports are being made ready for the Conference and not for anybody else.

Hon. M. E. COX: I want to assure the hon. member that the Legislature will get these Reports before the Conference takes place. I would like to strengthen what the Hon. Leader of the House has said and that is relative to the question of the selection of the delegates. Hon. members will remember that years ago delegates were selected by the House but with the advent of a Ministerial constitution the Governor-in-Executive Committee has been appointing delegates to these Conferences.

11.20 p.m.

As hon. members will see from paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Message No. 31/55, "The House will in due course be invited to concur in the appointment of the Barbados delegation. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Yes; when the Government have decided on the delegates and we do not approve we will say so.] Perhaps I should inform hon. members that as customary in recent years under our developed Constitution, the Barbados delegation will be nominated by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

The question that the Select Committee's Reply (as amended) to His Excellency's Message No. 31/55 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMISSIONERS OF HEALTH OF ST. JAMES (DENNY GRATUITY) ACT, 1955

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take Order No. 6 as the next Order of the Day; and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Order No. 6 was called—Second reading of a Bill to authorise the Vestry of St. James to pay a gratuity to Eletia Ann Denny.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, honourable members are undoubtedly acquainted with the provisions of this Bill. It is sponsored by the Commissioners of Health of the parish of St. James, and is entitled, "An Act to authorise the Commissioners of Health of the Parish of Saint James to pay a gratuity to Eletia Ann Denny out of the money in their hands for ordinary sanitary purposes."

The position is that Eletia Ann Denny is the widow of George Milton Denny who, up to the time of his death, was an employee of the Commissioners of Health of the said parish. [Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: What was he employed as?] He was employed as a Bath-room Keeper. But he died suddenly, and the Commissioners are now, through this Bill, seeking authority to pay a gratuity to his widow, the said Eletia Ann Denny.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the Bill; but I am enquiring whether it was necessary for the Commissioners of Health of St. James to request the House to pass a Bill to enable them to pay the said gratuity. [A VOICE: Why not?] If the late George Milton Denny was an employee of the Commissioners of Health of the Parish of St. James, and he had served for a period of at least five years, then his service falls under

the relevant Pensions Act, and his widow is, therefore, entitled to the gratuity without reference to the Legislature. As I have already said, I am supporting the measure; but I saw an advertisement in the press in connection with it, and I remember questioning whether such action was necessary.

Mr. HOLDER: Mr. Speaker, the point raised by the hon. member has been examined by the solicitors; but I cannot assure the hon. member that it was not necessary to do this. The position, as I have already explained, is that Denny died suddenly while still in the employ of the Commissioners of Health of the Parish as a Bath-room Keeper; but he did not complete the number of years as prescribed by the relevant Pension Act, and that is why the Commissioners are seeking this authority to pay the said gratuity.

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

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

Mr. BRYAN: I beg to second that.

The question that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. Smith being in the Chair.

On motion of Mr. Holder, seconded by Hon. K. E. Cox, the Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOLDER, seconded by Mr. BRYAN, the Preamble was passed.

On Motion of Mr. HOLDER, seconded by Mr. BRYAN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Mr. Holder seconded by Mr. Bryan, the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title agreed to.

STANDING COUNSEL FOR MR. SPEAKER

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take Order No. 1 as the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to take order No. 1 as the next Order of the Day, and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

Order No. 1 was called—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the establishment of the office of Standing Counsel for the Speaker of this Chamber.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, you will recollect that it was decided at last Tuesday's meeting of the House that this Address would be dealt with as Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business. I only gave way to those hon. members who wanted to have their minds relieved of their Vestry business. If those are to be regarded as a Xmas benefit, then this Address must be regarded as a benefit for Mr. Speaker.

11.30 p.m.

This Address reads as follows:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor*

1. The House of Assembly beg to point out to His Excellency the Governor the necessity for the

establishment of the office of standing Counsel for the Speaker of this Chamber.

2. The House request that without any undue delay, Government shall transmit to the Legislature a Bill for the creation of such a post for consideration of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that I have approached the Government by way of a question on this matter. On the 15th March this year, I enquired whether Government will initiate, without unnecessary delay, legislation making provision for the establishment of the post of Standing Counsel for the Speaker of this Chamber. You will remember that a reply to that question was laid on the Table of this House on the 26th April to the effect that consideration can be only given to this matter on the receipt of an indication from this Honourable House of its desire that such an appointment should be made. I entirely agree with the wording of the reply in so far as it tells this House that this is a matter for its consideration, and it does point to the fact that the Government will do its best for the smooth and effective running of this Chamber.

The next step was that this House should show its indication for such a need, and it happens that I have been a member for a number of years and with experience and knowledge of this House and the duties of the office of Speaker I thought that I should introduce such an Address as I have done. It will be recalled in this session, as in the previous session points have arisen for rulings by the Speaker that would take legal brains to decide. There is no point in saying that the Speaker should be a gentleman of the long robe and even if he were, it is said that the lawyer who has himself for a counsel, has a fool for a counsel. Any person who is a lawyer should not be in the position of advising himself.

I will read a short passage from the 14th Edition of Sir Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice." With respect to what it says about the Speaker's Counsel, (See page 241). This section deals with the machinery of Parliament and the officers of the Commons. The paragraph reads as follows:—

"Speaker's Counsel — The Counsel to Mr. Speaker is appointed by the Speaker. Though at times consulted on questions arising in the course of public business, his main functions are concerned with private business. He assists the Chairman of Ways and Means in the exercise and performance of the powers and duties of the latter in relation to private business, and in relation to Scottish provisional orders under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1936. The Speaker's Counsel is a member of the Court of Referees by which questions of *locus standi* of petitioners against private bills are determined; he also acts as assessor to the Select Committee on Standing Orders, to the Committee on Unopposed Private Bills, and to any committee on any opposed private bill when considering local legislation clauses contained in the Bill. He also assists the Select Committee on Statutory Rules and Orders."

Hon. members of this Chamber would know that matters crop up in which the Speaker sometimes requires legal opinion and because he is lacking in the benefit of legal opinion in this House, it happens that on some occasions he has to consult Her Majesty's Attorney General for that opinion and that in my submission is undesirable, because he cannot be advised as impartially, or in as non-partisan a manner as certainly Mr. Speaker's Standing Counsel would advise him if there were one. I think so far as this Government is concerned, it has given us a clear intimation that they are prepared to give

consideration to this matter, and they so to speak have invited us to let them have an indication that we feel that Standing Counsel is necessary, and as soon as they have received an indication from this Hon. House of Assembly they would give consideration to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to add anymore at this stage. I now beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Speaker, I have paid attention to the reasons given by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy for the appointment of Standing Counsel to Mr. Speaker, and I formally rise to second the passing of this Address. It is true that they are at present at our service the Attorney General, Solicitor General whom I think Your Honour has had to make application for guidance on certain legal matters, but listening to the quotations from "May's" as has been read by the hon. senior member for St. Lucy I feel that it would be better if such Standing Counsel was made available to Mr. Speaker.

The Mover of this Address has covered thoroughly all of the grounds and has given justifiable reasons for the appointment of Standing Counsel, so with these few words, I beg to second the passing of the Address.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I rise to say I think it is a good thing that the matter has been brought up, and I am glad to see that a member of the Government Party is willing to support it. It is really a good thing to see that all sides of this House are interested in a matter of this sort. What I would have liked the honourable Introducer of the Address to have indicated was whether or not we want a full time counsel or a part time counsel, and whether we were prepared to pay a fixed salary for this necessary service or whether we were prepared to be assessed for this service by way of fees on the number of questions submitted to the holder of that office. I do not know which is the better system, but I do feel that some communications along those lines either in the Address or in the debate should have been given.

11.40 p.m.

The honourable member who should do that would naturally be the one who brought forward this Address and I hope he will tell me in his Reply what it means. This Legislation is becoming very complex with a Ministerial System and I think that we should have some special guidance on matters which will crop up. From what the honourable member has read it would be suggested that Bills should be scrutinised. Unless some new method is going to be devised by the Government itself, the particular advice will not be of any value to it.

I am of the opinion that when the Government is introducing a Bill in which it is going to increase the Customs Duties and people can trick the Government by taking goods out of the bonds, that should be investigated. I know myself that Bills are introduced and passed through this House, which need careful scrutiny. In my opinion Government has been guilty of sponsoring Private Bills, which should have been turned down; very recently we have passed a Bill amending an Act without any due consideration by the people to whom that Act applies; the Government conceived the idea that they wanted the Act changed and in my opinion that it is not the way to do it.

I do not know unless you are going to be given some special power which is going to be backed up by the members of this House in respect of the legal opinions which you will want; on many occasions there will not be time in which to peruse them:

therefore I do not think that this House should leave the Government in the air as to the particular nature of this appointment.

If we want a wholetime person, we should say so and also give some indication of the salary which will be attached to the post. It may be that we can do these things ourselves and get the Government's acceptance of them, by introducing a Bill and making the particular person an Officer of the House. We have our Officers and if an amendment to the Act is passed we can fix the salary. Of course, I do not want the Government to send down any Bill and break the Constitution of this Island. I do not want to encourage the Government of this island to encroach upon something which has been settled since 1881; if this man is to be an Officer of the House the Government has no right with it at all. I do not want any member of the Government to be in any doubt so that you will not have any Government member interfering with this matter at all. I feel former members had the representative idea; in 1881 the Barbados House of Assembly must have fought desperately when they gave up their right to introduce Money Resolutions. However if the House want to pay their Clerk a million dollars a month no Governor of this colony has the right to sign any warrant for it. We went terribly wrong when we allowed the Governor to sign the warrant for your salary or that of any Officer of the House; I am absolutely sure about that. It is impossible to get the Ministers to see that they are elected members of the House first and then members of the Executive Committee afterwards; when the people of this island think of something which will really affect them they will have to put up a fight. I would like to say that if somebody is appointed the Governor of the colony should say: "I do not wish to have anything to do with it." I want to be absolutely sure of my ground before I support an Address of this kind. If there is any doubt in your mind, no harm will be done by postponing the consideration of this Address.

11.50 p.m.

If I cannot get any indication, I am going to ask the honourable member not to misunderstand anything I may do. I feel that if the Government is being asked to pay an officer of this House, I must try and get as far as I can from it. That is the spirit in general and I feel that it should be the spirit of the 24 members of this Chamber. If they would like an expression of opinion on the matter from us, it is this: there should be an amendment to the Officers of the House Act to provide for the payment of a legal adviser to Your Honour, and let it be a part time job.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will accept an amendment to the motion "that this Address do now pass", I should like to move that this matter be referred to a Committee of the House.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I accept that.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay a statement—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, we have to appoint a Committee first.

Hon. M. E. COX: Sorry.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Lucy has accepted the amendment of the honourable the Deputy Speaker, that the matter be referred to a Select Committee of the House, and I now have the honour to appoint the following:—

Hon. G. H. Adams, Hon. C. E. Talma, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Tudor, Mr. Brancker, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Vaughan.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Your Honour would consider being associated with this Committee. One is inclined to feel that your presence would be acceptable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do accept the suggestion offered by the honourable member.

STATEMENT ON HURRICANE RELIEF

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to lay a statement relative to Hurricane Relief.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to lay a statement relative to Hurricane Relief; and unless there be any objection, leave will be granted.

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

ADJOURNMENT NEGATIVED

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 10th January, 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that a Tuesday?

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second that. I think that that motion will meet with the approval of all honourable members of the House; and in anticipation of its acceptance, I should like to take the opportunity, on behalf of honourable members of this House, to extend the compliments of the coming Festive Season to Your Honour, [VOICES: Hear, hear.]

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, before the honourable senior member for St. George rose to speak, I intended to fix the Order Paper and to make a motion that this House adjourn until Tuesday next. There are still one or two items on the Order Paper of importance and I should like the House to continue its sitting until the end of this Year after which the Session would be followed by a long vacation. The rehabilitation of the fishing industry is a matter of urgency; and in view of that I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second that motion. In doing so I want to appeal to all honourable members to support the motion as made by the Hon. Leader of the House. The motion for adjournment until 10th January next, will to some extent, embarrass the Government.

It is hoped that a Resolution for the grant of a sum of Money to continue the repairs to houses damaged by the Hurricane of September 22nd last, will be brought to the House on the 3rd of January next. Funds for this purpose are getting low, and there are still quite a number of houses to be repaired. That is the main reason why I am appealing to honourable members not to agree to adjourn until 10th January, next. It will also throw out of work a great many people who are at present working on the repair of the said houses.

Mr. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, as regards embarrassing the Government, that does not worry me in the least. Hon. members on this side of the Table are not responsible for the sins of omission of the Minister of Communications. We on this side of the Table view the matter in this way: we were discussing the Anglican Church Act; and instead of members of the Government indulging in acrimonious debating, they should have dealt with these things, since they knew that they wanted money to continue the repairs of houses blown down by the Hurricane of 22nd September last, in order to find homes for the people now sleeping in the Almshouse. We are further of the opinion that the fishermen should have been given this money already, and we will do anything to ameliorate the sufferings of these men.

As regards this belated request it seems rather odd that he should have given no indication at all that he needed money for the fishermen and to continue the repairs of the hurricane damaged houses.

There was a long hiatus in the repair programme which up to the present moment has not been explained by the Minister of Housing. I am sure that had they come at any time within the past four weeks and said, that they needed more money for housing it would have been granted before now. I would like to reassure the Hon. Minister of Housing that we do not intend to save him any embarrassment, and I deprecate that they have procrastinated and have waited until the eleventh hour to come for this money. It is certainly the first time in the history of this House that it will be meeting in the week of Christmas, but worse even than that, apparently the Resolution which the member wants to bring apparently will not be ready until the 3rd January next. There should be no such question of urgency or coming back again next week.

However, in view of what has been said about work being delayed for two or three weeks at this stage I am withdrawing my motion, but I will only do so for the purpose that this House be summoned for the specific purpose of dealing with that Resolution for rehabilitation of houses alone; that is, that Your Honour summon a special meeting for that purpose. The honourable member has given the indication that the Resolution is not ready yet and it may not be ready by next Tuesday.

Let me say that I do not mind coming to this House even if it were Christmas day. Certainly, honourable members can forestall the Christmas lore for a few moments and attend to any necessary business of this Chamber.

Hon. C. E. TALMA : The honourable member who has just sat did not seem to follow the various proceedings of today's meeting. He made mention that the Minister may not be ready with the Bill. I have given notice today of a Resolution to rehabilitate the fishing industry and there is no question of procrastination because fishermen have been given the assurance that they can proceed with their building programme. As a matter of fact, the assistance which Government is giving is not in actual money being given to them; it is for paying for materials which will be used in such rehabilitation. [A VOICE: Therefore, you can deal with that Resolution in February next year.] Oh no, in order to expedite the fishing fleet I would not mind dealing with that Resolution now.

[A VOICE : Well, deal with it now.]

Mr. SPEAKER : I will put the amended motion first; but if members of the Government realise now that they can go on with this business and honourable members are willing to remain, then I will give opportunity to members of the Government to ask for that permission.

Mr. LEWIS : Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. Let the honourable member withdraw his motion and at the same time let him withdraw the notice he gave earlier today that this Resolution will be considered at a future date, because it was a matter of misleading members who have left already.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to withdraw my motion.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS : As regards the other matter, I think that the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 can cover that.

Mr. LEWIS : I am merely asking that it be clarified so far as the Minutes for today are concerned. The honourable member told the House earlier

that the Resolution which he proposes to deal with now will be dealt with at the next meeting of the House. Let him withdraw that notice which he gave earlier today so far as this Resolution is concerned, and it will put the Minutes of today's meeting in order.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw that notice which I gave earlier today.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 & 89

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 and 89 be suspended in order to deal with the Resolution for the sum of \$42,913 of which notice was given earlier today.

Mr. BRANCKER : I beg to second that.

The question was put and carried nem. con.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS : Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply on the Resolution for \$42,913.

Hon. C. E. TALMA : I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.
12.10 a.m.

Rehabilitation of the Fishing Fleet

Hon. C. E. TALMA : Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is a question for \$42,913 for the Rehabilitation of the fishing fleet. I must offer an apology to honourable members for not having any copies of this Resolution but I had no intention of dealing with it tonight. The Addendum sets out the purpose of the Resolution very clearly; it is proposed to assist boat owners who have suffered loss on a basis similar to that adopted after the rough seas of December, 1951. The Government will, in the first instance, provide the full cost of replacement or repair, one half of which will be a free grant and one half an interest-free loan. Persons to be assisted will be required to enter into an agreement to repay the loan, before assistance is given. Their liability in this regard will be based on the estimated cost of replacement or repair, and so will be fixed and known from the outset.

On the last occasion when we had rough seas—in 1951—there was no agreement entered into and boat owners did not know what they had to repay; sometime after the matter had to be settled. Now each party will know how much he will be given as a free-grant and how much he will have to repay.

As regards fish pots, it is proposed to verify claims for losses and to make a free grant of materials sufficient to replace half the losses. There will be no loan in these cases. I repeat that there will be a free grant of materials sufficient to replace one half the losses.

The estimated cost of replacing a sail-boat with another sail-boat is \$1,100 and the amount to be repaid will thus be \$550. Assistance will not be given in the case where the total value of loss or damage does not exceed \$30; and in the case of persons who are already in debt to the Fisheries Revolving Fund, and whose repayments were in arrear, at the date of the hurricane, by more than the minimum repayment for one year.

The estimated cost of the proposed assistance for replacements and repairs is \$42,913, the total amount recoverable being \$18,435. Details and breakdown are as follows:—

<i>Nature of loss or damage</i>	<i>Full estimated value of loss or damage</i>	<i>Amount of assistance on basis proposed</i>
	\$	\$
2 launches totally lost	5,400	5,400*
1 launch, engine only to be replaced, extensive repairs to hull	2,300	2,300*
† 18 sail boats totally lost	19,800	19,800*
15 pot and sea-egg boats and 3 small sail boats totally lost	2,765	2,400*
3 launches, repairs to hulls and overhaul of engines	950	950*
36 sail boats damaged	7,625	5,780*
9 pot boats and small tenders damaged	275	240*
Replacement of fish pots	8,000	4,000
Contingencies, for undiscovered cases etc. @ 5%	—	2,043
* 50% recoverable	47,115	42,913

Total amount recoverable, \$18,435

(† Includes 1 sail boat which had drifted to the Grenadines prior to the hurricane and was totally destroyed in St. Georges' harbour, Grenada, on the night of September 22/23.)

Repayments will go to the revenue as reimbursements.

Mr. Chairman, in the case of boats which have been damaged or totally lost the Government is giving assistance to the extent of 50% and the other 50% will be an interest-free loan. By this means we hope to rehabilitate the fishing boats which have been totally lost and also the launches which have been totally lost. These launches are actually owned by fishermen and not by private individuals. That is all the information which is really material, and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.
12.20 a.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir, honourable members are at a considerable disadvantage by not having had the opportunity to peruse this Resolution. At first glance it seems to me to be a bit disturbing to have the proviso that assistance will not be given in cases where the total loss of damage does not exceed \$30.00.

Now, it is to be assumed that a fisherman whose marine holdings were valued to less than \$30.00 would be a very poor fellow. Relatively speaking, he might be probably more in need of assistance than a man who had a boat or fishpots valued say, \$1000.00. So, I can more see the justification of putting the ceiling upwards rather than downwards. A man with a boat worth \$300.00 or \$400.00 should be in a better position to replace a lost or damaged boat than a man with a small boat or a few fishpots valued \$30.00. At the same time I am very glad to see that some assistance will be forthcoming for these fishermen. I said about five or six weeks ago when I presented the Address asking the Government to take this step—

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to interrupt the hon. member; but the honourable member is trying to give the House the impression that he had to implore the Government to take this step. When the honourable member introduced his Address, all the relevant figures had already been considered; but owing to some reason the matter had to be postponed. I will admit that the honourable

member made a pretty accurate estimate; \$20,000.00 I think it was.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, when I came in here I said that if they were interested in the fishermen, this Resolution would have been in this House before. I stated the number of fishing craft and fish pots that had been lost or damaged in the hurricane. I did not want to raise the point again; but since the Hon. Minister has adopted the attitude which he has, I will say this: the Government should not have taken all that time from September until now to get this Resolution before the House; because at that time the Fishery Officer had an accurate list of the number of fishing craft damaged by the hurricane. The Government is entitled to check the losses before these funds are paid out; but weeks had elapsed although all this verification had already been accomplished. The Addendum states that they have verified the proposed losses.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: That is relative to the fish pots.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I submit that that should have been done before. You cannot very easily tell in the case of a man who has five fish pots. Whatever steps you are going to take now should have been taken considerably earlier between September and now. They should not have waited until now to start the verification.

When I introduced the Address in the House I had no knowledge whatsoever of Government's intention to reimburse the fishermen; and I only suggested it because of the number of fishermen in St. Philip and Christ Church who drew to my attention that they had lost so many fishing boats and fish pots. One man said that he lost no less than 3 fish pots. He also said that the honourable senior member for St. George had given him two rolls of wire. "When does the Government intend to give us any help," he asked. I repeat that they have been long delayed and this attempt to verify the fish pot losses will cause further delay. The only way that you can verify this is by asking the fishermen what they had. As a matter of fact, many fishermen do not tell their brothers what happens, and many of them take up one another's fish pots by mistake. Whatever the Government is going to do let them get ahead quickly.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think that this proviso is a very silly thing to put in a Resolution of this sort. The honourable member will agree that this is not a very pleasant thing to say. It is rather odd that you should come to the House for money and know that you have to wait for a verification of facts. You should know what you are going to do before hand. This matter has been kept very much in the background because of the urgency of the rehousing of the people; but the assistance now contemplated is something about which the House should be well informed. It is worked out at \$42,913, and those are very accurate figures. It is not even a round figure, say \$43,000.

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. Talma, seconded by Hon. Dr. Cummins, the Chairman reported the passing of the Resolution in Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed and reported accordingly.

On motions of Hon. Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARROW: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th January, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second that.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: It is customary to fix the Order Paper first. [A VOICE: You can do that now].

The Order having been fixed.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Hon. members have heard a few minutes ago that the Hon. Minister of Housing needs money early in January in order to restore houses damaged by the hurricane and in view of that I am going to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 3rd January, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If the Hon. Minister of Housing was as interested as he pretends to be, certainly he would have tried to get the Resolution hurried through so that it could be done at least next week rather than to wait until the 3rd January next. It is well known when we voted the last money for the repairs to these houses that the money would not do. As a matter of fact, I told him then that he would have to come soon again for money. Seven weeks have elapsed since then. He comes in here to-day, 13th December, to tell us to come back on the 3rd January next in order to consider a Money Resolution which is very urgent and that people would be unemployed if it is not done next week. We are quite willing to make any sacrifice, but let the Government at least make it appear that they are interested in the people they represent. The Hon. Minister of Housing had a right to get the Resolution in time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the amended motion for the adjournment, permit me to call on the honourable senior member for St. Lucy to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor in connection with Federation.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 3rd January, 1956 at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. HOLDER, and Mr. BRYAN.—5.

Noes: Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BARROW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GODDARD and Mr. TUDOR.—6.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th January, 1956, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. Speaker, "I think the "Ayes" have it."

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, since we shall not be meeting again, until after Christmas, we do most heartily wish you the compliments of the Christmas season and hope that you will have a merry Christmas, and that we shall come back refreshed.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the Leader of the House in wishing you the compliments of the season.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to discharge the Committee which was appointed to consider and draft a reply to His Excellency's Message No. 25/1955, relating to the establishment of an Oceanographic Research Station in Barbados,

Also, the Select Committee to consider and draft a reply to His Excellency's Message, No. 31/1955, regarding a final Conference on Federation.

I have now the honour to accept the good wishes offered me by honourable members on both sides of this House and do wish them in return a very happy Christmas and a return to this Chamber in the New Year refreshed and ready to get on with what the New Year has in store for them.

This House now stands adjourned.
12.45 a.m.