

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT).

SESSION 1946—1948

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd September, 1947.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. G. B. EVELYN, (*Speaker*), His Honour Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER, (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. J. T. C. RAMSAY, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. J. A. LeV. WILSON, Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. R. G. MAPP, L. E. SMITH, M. E. COX, D. A. FOSTER, H. D. BLACKMAN, A. E. S. LEWIS, E. D. MOTTLEY, J. A. HAYNES, B.A., V. C. GALE, and D. D. GARNER.

Prayers are read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting on the 26th August 1947, have been printed and circulated. If no honourable member objects, those Minutes will be taken as read and confirmed. As no honourable member objects, those Minutes are taken as read and confirmed.

I have also had a record of the proceedings of the meeting on the 28th August, 1947.

MR. SPEAKER DRAWS ATTENTION TO RULE 60

Mr. SPEAKER: Before proceeding to call the Orders of the day I should like to draw the attention of honourable members to Rule 60 which says:—"The orders of the day are to be disposed of in the order in which they stand upon the paper....." When honourable members desire that an order should be removed from low down on the Order Paper to the position of No. 1 or No. 2 I do not think that that should be done by the suspension of Rules 88 and 89. I intend in the future to enforce the getting leave of the House to suspend Rule 60 in order that an Order may be taken out of its place.

LEAVE TO TAKE CHARGE OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. BLACKMAN asks for and is granted leave to take charge of Government Business.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT enters the House and takes his seat.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS TO THE FACTORIES BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to move the consideration of the amendments of the Honourable the Legislative Council to the Bill to make provision for the registration and supervision of factories and for the safety and well being of workers employed therein.

On the motions of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the amendments of the Other Place are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the colony.

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. RAMSAY being in the Chair.

RESOLUTION FOR REFUND OF CUSTOMS DUTY TO SIMPSON & CO. POSTPONED

Mr. BLACKMAN asks for and is granted leave postpone the further consideration of the Resolution for £873 13. 5. as a refund of Customs import duty and package tax paid by Messrs D. M. Simpson & Co. on machinery and accessories imported for the manufacture of fuel from megasse.

COST OF ENQUIRY INTO SALARIES AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE OF GOVERNMENT SERVANTS

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £1,250 to meet the cost of an enquiry into the salaries and conditions of service of Government servants and matters incidental thereto. When the authority of the Legislature was obtained for the payment of a cost of living allowance for Government Officers until the 31st March, 1948, it was stated that the Government hoped that it would be possible to prepare a scheme of consolidation before that date. The Secretary of State for the Colonies has approved of this Scheme and the Government has been informed that the services of Sir Wilfred Jackson, G.C.M.G., a former Colonial Secretary of Barbados and later Colonial Secretary

of Trinidad, Governor of Mauritius, Governor of British Guiana and Governor of Tanganyika Territory, may be available for this work. It is intended that Sir Wilfred Jackson will be paid at the rate of £100 per month and all necessary transport and secretarial expenses will be paid for him. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRANCKER: I would like a little more information than has been supplied so far. Is the term "government servants" to be taken to include all public employees, all persons who draw their salaries and wages from the Treasury, including, for instance, such persons as casual labourers of the Department of Highways and Transport and the Public Works Department? Or is this just to apply to the Clerical Service and the Police Department? I am suggesting that it should be as comprehensive as possible.

Mr. BLACKMAN: It is intended, according to the instructions I have been given, that the terms of reference will be as wide as possible, so I have no doubt that the honourable member's suggestion will be incorporated.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I somehow feel that the junior member for St. Lucy; a lawyer, should have been able to tell us whether casual employees of the government should be included or not in this proposed enquiry. We were looking to him to throw a little light on that phase of the matter. If casual employees of the Government are government servants, it applies to them; if they are not government servants, the honourable member is at liberty to include whomever he wants. I am going to move an amendment which has the object of including all government employees and I suggest to the honourable member in charge of the Resolution to accept it. I am making it as wide as possible in view of the fact that a Resolution which was passed previously to enquire into the organisation of the sugar industry was taken to mean one thing to the House and eventually to mean something else to the powers-that-be. So I am going to suggest and ask the junior member for St. John whether he will accept this amendment and let the Resolution read as follows:—"Resolved that the sum of £1,250 be placed at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to meet the cost of an enquiry into the organisation of the Civil Establishment including salaries and conditions of service of government servants and matters incidental thereto." I think we should err on the side of redundancy by inserting the words "organisation of the Civil Establishment including" rather than leave it to chance. I will ask honourable members to bear with me while I make this explanation. This Resolution obviously arises out of the fact that a consolidation scheme is to be prepared. Now, a consolidation scheme is to emoluments of the various government servants and it has nothing to do with the organisation of the Civil Establishment as by law established. What I have in mind is this. If Sir Wilfred Jackson comes here and finds that we must abolish the Audit Office or the Waterworks Department or have an entirely different system I think the terms of reference should include that. If he finds, as some people in Barbados think now, that there are certain Departments which are overstaffed, that also should be included. I am not allowing him to come here merely to tell me that clerks should have consolidated salaries instead of a cost of living allowance. I want his enquiry to be done in the same way that the Cuke Committee did theirs, that is to say, they abolished the graded system established by the

same Sir Wilfred Jackson and put forward a new system in its place and I think that honourable members would be doing a service to the community and to the Civil Servants if they made the terms of reference as wide as possible. I make these observations because it seems as if this attempt is made merely to deal with the salaries—consolidating cost of living allowance and basic salaries—and I do not want that alone done. I do not want Sir Wilfred Jackson to come here and say "these are the reasons why I have come here and these only." I want him to review the Civil Establishment of this colony and, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the insertion of those words in the Resolution for the purpose of making this survey as wide as possible, not to take one aspect,—the emoluments of the Civil Servants, and investigate that. Before I sit, perhaps I should make this point clear too. If this matter is purely one of economics, in my humble opinion Sir Wilfred Jackson will be no use to us. It would be best to wait until the Financial Secretary comes and makes his fiscal survey and see if we can afford the salaries which may be proposed; so I want to take this thing somewhat out of the realm of what the emoluments of the officers should be and let it be also the officers themselves and the Civil Establishment as an organisation. I have reason to believe that even among the Civil Servants themselves such a survey and such additional terms of reference will be welcome to them. We hear every now and again that a Department wants two or three more clerks and we want to know whether the number of clerks in the Service, whether the whole set-up of the Service is such as makes for efficiency and whether we are getting an adequate return for the money which is spent on salaries for the Civil Establishment.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to accept the amendment of the junior member for the City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: After reading this Resolution one wonders whether that amendment is really in order because the Resolution states "salaries and conditions of service of Government Servants" and the amendment seeks to amend it to read "Civil Establishment." I have heard it said, time and again, that members of the Civil Service need not be members of the Civil Establishment and if you delete "Government Servants" from the Resolution you would be restricting the enquiry to the Civil Establishment.

Mr. LEWIS: I have not deleted anything from the Resolution but have put in the Civil Establishment as an organisation. I have not attempted to take out anything. I am only saying that "salaries and conditions of service of Government servants" is one aspect of the matter while the enquiry should be made in respect of the Civil Establishment as an organization.

Mr. BRANCKER: What possibly the junior member for the City does not fully appreciate is that any phrase in a law book, a Resolution, a Bill, or an Act may be subjected to different types of interpretation by persons who are equally in a position to give an authoritative interpretation of it. What one lawyer may regard as a proper interpretation of the phrase "Government Servants" another lawyer may not regard as the correct interpretation. Interpretation is a very highly debatable thing and that is why I asked the honourable member in charge of the Resolution if he could tell me what is the Government's interpretation of this particular phrase regardless of anybody else's.

I am suggesting—and I welcome the honourable member's assurance that he will endeavour to see that the terms of reference are as wide as possible—that even such government servants as may be regarded as only casual labourers of the Department of Highways and Transport and the Public Works Department be included—all persons who draw their emoluments from the Treasury.

Mr. COX: I think that this is the appropriate time to draw to the notice of the Government that at least some members of this House feel that the time has come when female employees should be paid the same salaries as are paid to male employees, so long as they do similar work. I have raised that question on more than one occasion on the floor of this House and I feel that I should seize this opportunity to raise it again. It has been argued by the opposing parties that men have greater responsibilities than women but, Sir, I am not prepared to accept that as a statement whereby women should not be paid as much as men because if it is carried to its logical conclusion, every man should be paid according to the size of his family. What I feel about the matter is that as long as an individual occupies an office which is worth a certain amount of money, that individual should be paid that amount of money. In the schools to-day female teachers have to do the same work as male teachers; the subjects are the same and the responsibility, as far as giving results is concerned, is the same and I feel that all salaries should be the same. It is high time that the Government pay people for the work they do, irrespective of whether they be males or females.

Mr. BLACKMAN: I do not think it is right to say that the Government makes a difference between women and men as regards salaries. If the honourable member means that women should not be taken on, for instance, as stenotypists at salaries which are lower than those which are paid to men when they first enter the Service, then I can understand him; but if he means that women are paid less than men are paid I am in a position to state that that is not so. If a woman is in the same grade as a man she gets the same pay.

Mr. COX: The honourable member has spoken only about women employed in certain Departments of the Service. Those whom I dealt with specifically were the teachers who are now Civil Servants and I have before me a list which shows that the male Headteacher of a school which has an attendance under 201 receives a salary of £200 x £12. 10 to £250 per annum, while a female Headteacher of a school with a similar attendance receives only £150 x £10 to £190 per annum; so that you can see there is a vast difference in the salary paid, as far as the teaching fraternity is concerned, even though the male and female Headteachers are asked to produce the same results.

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

SUBSIDIZATION OF FOODSTUFFS.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £18,500 to provide for the subsidization of flour, salt fish and salt pork from the 1st to the 31st October, 1947, in order that the prices of these commodities may be fixed by the Competent Authority. The amount we have been voting is £56,000 for a half year and this £18,500 is needed to carry us on until the end of October this year. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman,—We have got quite accustomed to these Resolutions for subsidization. The most amusing thing about this matter is that these sums of money used to be for a period of six months, then for three months and now this is for one month and as far as I remember the remarks made by the junior member for the City some meetings ago, it looks as though the average amount for the three-month and one-month periods respectively is soon going to be as much as it used to be for the six-month period. We are continually being told by the members of the Government that this matter of the subsidization of foodstuffs imported into the island is going to be reviewed and each time that statement is accompanied by one of these Resolutions. Now, there is nobody in the island who would more like to see living conditions cheapen than I but at the same time the most ambitious person would hardly consider that this subsidization is keeping the cost of our food down. The Government has promised us that it will review the matter and it should carry out its promise. There should be a full review of the subsidization scheme and if the Government finds that it cannot improve living conditions, it should realize that it is time to put an end to the scheme. I shall not oppose this Resolution as it is to subsidize for only a month but I hope that the junior member for St. John will carry the remarks which I have made to the proper quarter.

Mr. LEWIS: I, to a great extent, share the views of the senior member for St. Andrew but undoubtedly I think we will all sympathize with the Government again to-day. Its members have been a little busy—the majority of them being out of the island—and as far as we know they will need this money to carry on for another month before they can really present a review of the situation. In the circumstances, therefore, I am willing to sympathize with them once more. But it is still gratifying to find that the warning that flour will be taken off the list resulted in a decrease in the price. Well, Sir, I hear that the result is a shortage of flour. That only shows that they are at liberty to play any tricks with us and what we should do is to see to it that we make a proper review of the situation and let them know where we stand. I sincerely hope that the Labour Congress in Jamaica is going to deal with the matter of the food of the people of these colonies as well so that there can be concerted action. If they act in a concerted fashion in this area, it is bound to bring good results. I have another suggestion to make to the Government to-day and it is this: If it does not see its way to stop the subsidization of these articles all at once, at least it should let them come to the correct price gradually to the people. By this method we are subsidizing the wages which the employers pay in this country. If the food of the people costs a certain amount, they should be paid wages commensurate with the purchasing of it and the taxes in the Treasury should be used in supplying them with the amenities that they have done without for all these centuries. That should be the purpose of taxation in the postwar period. You can only justify action like this in an emergency like a War. Some honourable member remarks that an emergency is on now but what is really on now is a trade war which we ourselves do not understand. There is one thing which we can understand, that is, that there are people willing and ready to sell us goods and if we are ready and willing to take them at any price at all we cannot blame those people for

selling them to us at high prices and thereby maintain a high standard of living in those places from which we buy while at the same time we depress the standard of living in this country.

Mr. GARNER: I am very glad that this Resolution has come down because I understand that the money which has been allotted for this purpose has nearly all been spent and this amount is required to help us to carry on, at least at the prevailing prices, for a short period of time. But if the argument of the honourable member who has just sat down was carried to its logical conclusion we should get more for sugar if we are to pay people what they are worth. On the other hand, the fellow who did not work would not get anything at all because only the fellow who worked would be able to get a living wage, and the person who did not work would not be able to eat. I do not think that some of the things which have been said here to-day are quite fair. For instance, the price of flour has dropped a bit and I agree with some honourable member who said that that is due to the caution which was given. It is not because flour was short that nobody could get any. There was a little bit of flour in stock but it was rationed severely, so that one shopkeeper should not get more than another shopkeeper. I am glad to see that flour began to drop because the Government was paying too much on a pound of flour and I hope that it will see to it that it pays a fair price. It is unfair for this Government to pay a subsidy of 5 cents on each pound of flour when there are so many other commodities that should be subsidized. Only last Sunday I was struck to see that items that are manufactured here have again taken a higher stand; the prices have risen tremendously. Of course, we have no control over that but the prices of soap, cotton seed oil, margarine, and lard have gone up again tremendously. That bears on the cost of living and I am wondering whether the policy which this Government is pursuing is really a subsidization of commodities in truth. The Government promised, on the last occasion we dealt with subsidization, that it was going to think the matter over and review the scheme and come back with a more consolidated scheme. Somebody said that he was willing to give the Government more time but how much more time shall we give? There should be some definite policy to keep prices at a certain level. Even when prices go up they are not maintained at that particular level. When the first cost goes up the cost of living will go up because the Government is only subsidizing to a certain extent and that does not help a fellow very much. If you are going to subsidize at the 1939 or 1944 level, say so. Every time you give a labourer five cents more, he has to pay a shilling for an article. It is not really subsidization when you give a labourer twenty cents more a day and he has to pay twice as much more for his foodstuffs. The Government should subsidize at a certain level, not wait until a fellow gets 5 or 6 cents more per day and then up goes the cost; that is not subsidization. Either the Government is not spending enough money on subsidization or it is not thinking enough about the matter. Again, if we are to solve our meat problem we must have stockfeed and that should be subsidized to a certain extent. People cannot rear stock now because the price of stockfeed is too high and the quality is inferior. It would take to-day four or five pounds of oilmeal to give the results which one pound gave years ago. The Government should do something in regard to stockfeed, otherwise after a time we are going to find ourselves short of meat in this island because it is becoming an unprofitable thing to people to keep stock. It is

a very serious matter. Those of us who keep stock are losing money. Some of us are keeping them only as a hobby; if we keep an account of what we spend on them we should discover that we have not done as well as if we were members of a Friendly Society because a Friendly Society gives a bonus to its members every year. I think that if it is only to meet the milk question, stockfeed should be subsidized. We do not intend to subsidize milk but if the dairy keepers could obtain stockfeed cheaper they could sell milk cheaper. I hope that the Government will take heed of what has been said to-day. Some of its members are not in their places to-day but we still have one of them present with us. Let the people know that you are going to subsidize to a certain level because the cost of living is going higher every day. Last Saturday night the price of lard oil was 20 cents per pint and the following Sunday morning it rose to 23 cents per pint. Something is wrong. The people must know where they are. The Government is either going to subsidize or not subsidize; it is either going to have a policy or no policy. At present, it has no policy; it is just moving with the wind; it is not doing the job thoroughly.

Mr. WARD: What the honourable member for St. Philip has said may be true but it may not be as easy to solve as we may think it is because we in this country cannot grow sufficient stuff to feed our population. It must be borne in mind that we must import stuff from outside. Well, this government has no control over prices which are fixed outside; therefore, when the goods come with higher import prices, automatically the local prices go up and with the limited amount for subsidization at its disposal it would be impossible for the government to keep prices at any particular level. The government has said that it will subsidize up to a certain amount and if we increase the subsidization vote three or four times as much to meet the increased prices, we have to bear in mind that the same people would have to pay the taxes to provide that amount; we would be giving them fire in one hand and water in the other; Unless we can grow sufficient food in this island to feed our people we cannot stop the subsidization vote and as things are now, it would appear as if we have a much worse time ahead because owing to the lack of rain and to certain pests it seems that the food crop this year will be shorter than it was last year. All of us feel that it is hard on individuals to have to pay more for their cost of living but circumstances sometimes arise which cannot be avoided and I feel that although the government may be a little bit lax in their effort to review this scheme, the problem is not so easy and it is still a long time before it can be solved.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Chairman,—I must say that I appreciate very much the note of realism struck by the last honourable member. I think that rather than indulge in any loose talk we should make people in this country realize the seriousness of the situation. On the one hand we are a small island importing much and on the other hand we are exporting only sugar and much of what we import consists of vital necessities—food, clothing, and so on. That the situation is grave, there is no doubt. The cost of living figures which are published from time to time do not even come near the real cost of living we have to put up with in this island. Cost of living figures, as published by any government, always fall short of what the real cost of living is and this island is no exception. I will say this: This Government's policy of hiding such figures as would require a rise in the prices of articles such as clothing, rent, and fuel has always been a surprise to me.

I have never failed to comment on it and I shall always comment on it. Figures of that nature are published in other colonies, why can't they be published in this island? Why don't they tell us the figures that cause the rise in the prices of clothing and rent? I say that that should be done. All the facts and figures should be placed at the disposal of the people of this island and if there is one thing we need to know at this time, it is the facts and figures. Tell us what effect the dollar crisis in Britain will have upon our economic life. Initiate immediate and far reaching measures to meet the situation that has developed—and it is a serious situation, the crisis which Britain is now passing through. Tell the people the truth. Tell them where they stand. Take wise measures to control any emergency that may arise. I will say "subsidize as much as possible." I do not agree with the policy of raising wages to meet any rise in the cost of living; it is a policy that will lead to serious inflation. I think it is a dangerous argument which was put forward in this Committee to-day and I could not let it go by without saying something about the seriousness of the situation. It is the Government's business and the government should take all necessary steps to meet this crisis.

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

GRANT TO H. W. CLARKE.

Mr. BLACKMAN: The next Resolution is for the sum of £250 as a grant to Mr. H. W. Clarke to enable him to take a Course at the London Institute of Education. The addendum says:—

"Provision of £250 was made in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1946-47 under Head XX, Education, Item 27, Barbados Scholarship, as a revote of the sum required for the fourth year of Mr. H. W. Clarke's Barbados Scholarship which had lapsed owing to war conditions to enable him to return to England to resume his studies. As Mr. Clarke was unable to proceed to England during the financial year 1946-47, the sum of £250 was revoked for the purpose in the current year's Estimates. His Excellency is advised, however, that the inclusion of this sum in the Estimates is in error and that it would be improper to incur this expenditure from the item 'Barbados Scholarship' since the award is an *ex gratia* grant and not a Barbados Scholarship as there is no legal provision for an extension of the award of the scholarship beyond the limit set out in the Education Act, 1890. Mr. Clarke has now been awarded a scholarship by the British Council, but in fixing the amount for this scholarship the grant of £250 previously voted in the Estimates for the fourth year of the Barbados Scholarship was taken into consideration. This resolution seeks to provide the necessary funds to enable Mr. Clarke to take the course on the understanding that the £250 provided in the Estimates under Barbados Scholarships will lapse."

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of three Resolutions and the postponement of one in Committee of Supply.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. BLACKMAN, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the three Resolutions which are passed in Committee of Supply are read a first and a second time and are agreed to.

PRISONS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Philip but the honourable member is not in his place

REPLIES LAID.

Mr. BLACKMAN: Mr. Speaker,—It is not intended that any more Government Business should be done at the moment but with your permission I should like to lay on the table of the House Replies to Questions Nos. 53 and 61.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 61 (a) AND 61 (b)

Mr. SPEAKER: The position now is this: The Government has intimated that it has no intention of doing any more Government Business. Under Rule 61 (a) Questions cannot be taken before a quarter to three o'clock; therefore, it seems to me that Questions cannot be taken now without Rule 61 (a) having been suspended. (After a pause) Do I understand that no honourable member wants to proceed with any questions?

Members' Voices: No.

Mr. TALMA enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. HAYNES: I ask leave to move the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) in order to proceed to Private Members' Business.

Mr. BRANCKER: On a point of order. I am raising no objection to that but I am wondering whether, if the motion is carried, we would be debarred, after luncheon, from discussing Questions. My position is this. I am supporting the motion to deal with Private Members' Business now but I want to know whether we will revert to Questions at a quarter to three o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member wants to deal with Questions, he should do so now. Is the honourable member taking objection to leave being granted to proceed to Private Members' Business?

Mr. BRANCKER: Yes, Sir, if the result will be that we shall not be able to revert to Questions at a quarter to three o'clock and for no other reason.

Mr. SPEAKER: Objection having been taken to leave being granted, I shall take the feeling of the House on the matter. The question is that leave be granted the honourable senior member for St. Andrew to move the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) in order to proceed to Private Members' Business. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division is taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. RAMSAY, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, BLACKMAN, LEWIS, HAYNES, Dr. WILSON. and Dr. CUMMINS—9.

Noes: Messrs. GARNER, BRANCKER, TALMA, MOTTLEY, GALE, S. A. WALCOTT, and WARD—7.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, nine honourable members voting "Aye" and seven voting "No" but it requires a vote of twelve to suspend a Rule.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WARD: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 5th September, 1947, at 1 o'clock p.m.

Mr. S. A. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion for the adjournment of the House cannot be made before a quarter to three o'clock, except with my permission. The difficulty which has arisen is this. The Government has intimated that it has no intention to proceed further with Government Business and I was given the impression that no honourable member wants to proceed to any Questions. Leave to suspend Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) has been refused; so I have given permission to make the motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. RAMSAY: Before the question is put I should like to say that I understand that the motion before the House is for the adjournment of this House until next Friday. When things are insulting to my manhood and intelligence I cannot sit idly by and let them pass. This is a momentous time in the history of Barbados. Fortunately or unfortunately certain members are not in this Chamber and if we attempt to adjourn this House, as we are about to do now, we would be knocking the bottom out of the bucket so to speak. We would be admitting that we are incapable of carrying on the work of Barbados. I represent a constituency in the northern part of the island—St. Peter. I am an ordinary carpenter, not a Gamaliel, but I am standing on my manhood nevertheless. Do you mean to say that we should adjourn this House until Friday? It is unfortunate that we are talking about federation in the West Indies and between ourselves we cannot federate. I am saying that there are two questions of vital importance before this House to-day. The senior member for St. Andrew has a question before this House about the Church, a vital institution. Whether I am going to vote for it or not is an entirely different matter. I also have a question which is a vital necessity to the people of Barbados and I am warning honourable members not to adjourn this House in this blatant and lackadaisical manner. Stand up on your legs and be men. Because the senior member for St. Joseph and the senior member for St. Philip happen to be at Montego Bay, because the senior member for St. George and the senior member for St. Peter happen to be also in Jamaica, must Barbados die? Must we stand by and allow our manhood and integrity to be flaunted? Stand up and do the business of this House and prove that you are worthy of your heritage. Do not hang on to anybody's apron strings. I am objecting to it and am asking honourable members not to adjourn this House in such a manner but to carry on with my question or the question of the senior member for St. Andrew. If honourable members realize that they have made a mistake, it is their duty to correct it and continue to do the business of the House. I am warning honourable members that there is more in this than what they can see on the surface. Mr. Speaker, I need to be sympathized with. It is unfortunate for me that I am not as conversant with the procedure as I should be. My intention is that the House should not go out and wait until next Friday for the prorogation. We are so to speak admitting our demise. We should not bring in the coffin before the corpse is ready. I am going to move that we adjourn until 2.45 p.m. and I want honourable members to stand by me. We are striking at the fundamentals of our political existence. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I appear to be dis-

playing any warmth but I really dislike the idea of our going out in this manner. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 2.45 p.m. and we will come back and resume some other business.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I am at a loss to appreciate the heat generated by the junior member for St. Peter. The position seems to be a very clear one. Honourable members will agree that the principal reason for being here to-day is to do Government Business. The member in charge of Government Business intimated to Your Honour and this House that he has no intention of proceeding further with Government Business because, as far as I could see, there will be no time for the Other Place to get through any more measures which this House may pass. A motion was made to suspend certain Rules in order that the House may proceed to Private Members' Business but that motion was lost. That motion having been lost I cannot really see any other alternative than to adjourn the House. There is no justification in saying that because certain members are absent to-day we are unwilling to carry on the business of the House. The presence of us here to-day makes it clear that we are willing to carry on and do every bit of business that is necessary to be done. To say that because certain members of this House happen to be absent we are incapable of conducting the business of this House is beside the question. Everyone of us gave the utmost cooperation to the member in charge of Government Business to-day; therefore, when the junior member for St. Peter generates that heat and alleges that we cannot go on because certain members are not in their places, I say that is beyond the point. Unless some other reason is given I shall be bound to support the motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. COX: I rise to second the motion made by the junior member for St. Peter. First of all, I would like to say that I take strong exception to the remark of the senior member for the City that we have met here specifically to do Government Business. I think he should say that on his own behalf and not on the behalf of other members who are present. For myself, I will say that I have come here to do the will of the people of Barbados, more especially the people of St. Michael who sent me here, rather than to pass any specific measure or do anything like that. What I cannot understand is this. Members of the House who are disinterested in the welfare of the people of this colony as a whole come to this House time after time but with absolutely no time to spare to improve conditions in this colony and when other members who look upon it as their duty and responsibility to try to change those conditions for the better you get those members disapproving and endeavouring to put all kinds of obstacles in the way. I would suggest again, as I did last week, to any member who has no time to devote to the work of this House to stay away from it and let us get on with the work, rather than attend and throw a monkey-wrench in our efforts. There are many important matters on the Order Paper of this House to be dealt with and which stand in the name of honourable members under Private Members' Business. If the member in charge of Government Business has no more Government Business to do, there is plenty other work which would keep us in this House for another six months trying to get it through. There are 84 items on the Order Paper standing in the name of honourable members under Private Members' Business and I am definitely sure that we can find very much to do later in the afternoon

in the interest of the people who sent us here. It is wicked to come to this House and force an adjournment merely because, as the junior member for St. Peter said, some of the members happen to be out of the House. It shows that we feel ourselves incapable of carrying on, hence we want to run out and shirk our responsibility. Members should realize that they have a duty to perform and that they owe it to their constituents to perform that duty. In a few days' time this House will be prorogued for four or five weeks so that honourable members will have plenty of time to spree. I would suggest to honourable members, when they leave their homes to come to this House, that they do so with the understanding that they are coming to do work. The haphazard system which existed in the past cannot be observed in these days. In the past, there was no question of thinking about the people as a whole; it was a question of thinking only of a few merchants and planters. To-day, the people are demanding a different treatment; the people have come into the limelight and there must be some planning on their behalf. You must be prepared to work, not just come here and speak glibly on a few Resolutions and then go about your business. When we come here we come to work and not to filibuster. Because the *Advocate* newspaper makes certain statements, are we to follow the *Advocate* as our guide or look upon it as a criterion? Not! I know it is the instrument of the Conservative group, an instrument of despotism; it has never tried to do any good for the people as a whole. I shall never take it as any guide. It is a matter for those who look to it for guidance. If the *Advocate* states that there are few questions on the Order Paper in the name of the Government, is that any reason why we should go out in this manner? I say "No". We have work to do. The electors sent us here and we are not to be guided by anything a newspaper cares to write; a paper cannot write anything that is contrary to its policy.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I believe I can shed some light on this situation. As I understand it, the Legislature is about to be prorogued shortly and it is no use going on with certain Government Business like Bills which will have to be considered by the Other Place and which will not be considered in the short space of time before the prorogation takes place. The Other place is likely to pass the Resolutions which we have just passed but no contentious measure will be passed by them and, therefore, it is useless for us to proceed further to-day with Government Business. Leave was asked for by the senior member for St. Andrew to move the suspension of certain rules in order to proceed with Private Members' Business and I understood Your Honour to enquire whether any honourable member wanted to proceed with questions but no honourable member intimated that he intended to proceed with questions; therefore, the House proceeded to consider the request of the senior member for St. Andrew to be granted leave to move the suspension of Rules 61 (a) and 61 (b) to proceed with Private Members' Business. The request of the senior member for St. Andrew for leave to move the suspension of the Rules was granted but a motion for the suspension of the Rules has not been lost. If the senior member for St. Andrew had made a motion to that effect it is likely that it would not have been lost. The position now is this. An honourable member has moved that the House do now adjourn until next Friday. That is a motion with which I cannot agree, for reasons other than those given by honourable members who have fallen into the same error which they criticized. If we adjourn until one o'clock on Friday we may have an abortive meeting for the

simple reason that there is no work to be done. The House will be prorogued soon after and it will go forth to the world that we had no quorum. I am appealing to the senior member for St. Lucy to withdraw his motion. The junior member for St. Peter and the senior member for St. Michael have fallen into the same error. If we adjourn until any time to-day or until next Friday I have a feeling that we will not get a quorum and we are going to appear to the taxpayers as though we are not taking our business seriously. Whereas the circumstances warranted a reasonable consideration of the situation we have not given it that consideration to-day. That is all that has happened and I am appealing to the senior member for St. Lucy to withdraw his motion for the adjournment of the House until one o'clock on Friday next because another abortive meeting is likely to be recorded during this session as the result. I am merely asking him to do so; he is not obliged to do it.

Mr. WARD: On a point of explanation. After the suspension of the rules was not agreed to I saw nothing else to be done but that the House should be adjourned. I came to Your Honour and intimated to you that I would like to deal with a certain Bill on Friday before the prorogation of the House takes place and that is why I moved the adjournment until one o'clock on Friday, otherwise we would have adjourned to no specific date.

Mr. TALMA: Before you put the question, Sir, I should like to say that I am somewhat in agreement with the motion made by the junior member for St. Peter. It is not because the Government has dealt with a few Resolutions that we should now adjourn. It is a very sad and bad reflection on us and I feel that although the Government's Business has been dealt with, yet the fact remains that there are 84 items on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business—84 things certain members have attempted to do and have not been done. We will be blamed for having done nothing and everybody will be dissatisfied. The senior member for St. Andrew has been attempting to have an Address passed in connection with the disestablishment and disendowment of the Anglican Church during the past four weeks and I thought that we would have used up the balance of the time, until 2, o'clock, discussing Questions and proceeded to Private Members' Business after the luncheon interval. If we continue I may be able to get through my Trade Union Bill, a Bill which is very much needed in this island in the interests of the workers.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this House do now adjourn until Friday, 5th September, 1947, at 1 o'clock p.m. To that, an amendment has been moved that this House do now adjourn until a quarter to three o'clock. The question is that the words proposed to be deleted stand part of the motion. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

A division is taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. GARNER, MOTTLEY, GALE, S. A. WILCOX and WARD—5.

Noes: Mr. RAMSAY, Dr. WILSON, Messrs. HAYNES, BRANCKER, SMITH, COX, FOSTER, MAPP, Dr. CUMMINS, Messrs. BLACKMAN, TALMA, and LEWIS—12.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question has been resolved in the negative, twelve honourable members voting "No" and five voting "Aye". The question now is that the words "a quarter to three o'clock" be inserted in the blank. Honourable members in favour will please say "Aye"; those against will

please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. This House stands adjourned until a quarter to three o'clock.

DISSATISFACTION AMONGST COUNTRY SHOPKEEPERS OVER MARGIN OF PROFITS ALLOWED.

On re-assembling,

Mr. SPEAKER: At Question Time on the last occasion the House was debating the replies given to Question No. 19 relating to country shopkeepers and the honourable senior member for St. Michael was speaking.

Mr. COX: On the last occasion I said that I was well aware of some of the grievances existing among the shopkeepers. I have here a few figures to show that the position of the shopkeepers is worse to-day than it was before the War. I find that before the War kerosene oil was bought at 20 cents a gallon and sold at 28 cents a gallon; nowadays it is bought at 28 cents a gallon and sold at 4 cents a pint. Salt used to be bought at \$1.30 per bag of 190 lbs. and sold at a cent a pound, nowadays it is bought at \$3.14 per bag and sold for \$3.70 a profit of 4 cents less than what the shopkeepers used to get. When we come to cotton seed oil we find that heretofore the shopkeepers used to get a profit of 21 cents on the gallon they get only 16 cents to-day, before the War oleo margarine was at \$2.50 per 25 lb. tin and sold for \$3.50; to-day it is bought at \$6.75 and sold at \$7.00 a profit of 75 cents less than the pre-war figure. As regards flour, that used to be bought at \$2.20 per bag and sold for \$2.94; to-day it is bought at \$6.12 per bag and sold for \$6.86 per bag so that the profit on it is also less than before. There are many other items which I have here too numerous to mention but they all go to show that the shopkeepers to-day are working at a greater disadvantage. I am not for a moment prepared to say that in order to allow the shopkeepers a greater profit the cost of living should be increased to the consumer. I feel that as a means of adjusting this situation, the profits made by merchants should be reduced. I hold in my hand some of the returns made to the St. Michael's Vestry by some of the merchants and, they show that in one case a firm made a return of \$104,267 as profit for the year 1946-47. Well, Mr. Speaker, you can realise that that profit is the result of the exploitation of many of these shopkeepers. I am not saying that a person should not get a reasonable profit from the money he invests; what I do say is that I consider \$50,000 is sufficient money for any firm to declare as profit for a year and the remainder should be given to the people who have to distribute the goods to the last $\frac{1}{2}$ cent. It is a fact that shopkeepers have to undergo a very serious strain; the margin of profit allowed them under the control system is too meagre. We all know that at the risk of being reported shopkeepers have to keep their business running all night until early morning in order to try and pay their rent and feed their families. The people who carry on the firms finish their work at four o'clock in the afternoon and enjoy themselves at the clubs afterwards. They have no worry over financial conditions. I feel that if the Government wants to assist these shopkeepers, instead of increasing the cost of food to the consumers it should reduce the margin of profit allowed the merchants and allow the shopkeepers a greater profit. There is another firm which made a return to the St. Michael's Vestry of \$101,572 as profit for a year. Nobody knows whether these

figures are accurate or not. As I go down the list I find \$55,000, \$65,000 and so on, as the profits made by firms for a year. The poor shopkeeper has to distribute the items to the last half cent; he works throughout the year and at the end of the year he has to borrow money so as to pay his taxes. Vestrymen know that because shopkeepers go to them and ask that their taxes be remitted. That is because of the inadequate method of taxing these people.

The honourable junior member for St. Philip as well as his colleague raised the question of merchant shops. I cannot subscribe to the idea that these shops should be abandoned because I realise that they have been very useful to many people in the colony. Many people who worked as attendants in these shops have been able to own them and so were able to feed their families, educate their children and so forth. If we limit the activities of these merchant shops and allow other private shops to continue at the expense of the people, that would be a wrong principle. Our principle should be the securing of the greatest good for the greatest number. I am aware that very often these merchant shops can supply the commodities which many other shops cannot supply, and which the people need very much; many of these merchant shops have been able to sell commodities to the people more cheaply than other shops and so help the community in a greater way. What I feel is that we should try and see that the food which is being passed on to the people through the shopkeepers is sent to them at as reasonable a rate as possible; and that the shopkeepers get an adequate profit for the work they do and risks they take. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has said that he did not pay much attention to the question put by the honourable junior member for St. Joseph because the honourable member limited it to the country shopkeepers. To my mind, that is a very vague reason for not paying much attention to the question because if you are really interested in the well-being of the people as a whole you should not allow any small matter like that to prevent you from doing your best for the community. Constituted as we are now I take it that the members of the Government, at least the majority of them, are in sympathy with the shopkeepers in their plight and they will take up the question and see that the profits made by the merchants are reduced. I have said that \$104,000 a year is quite a lot of money for one firm to declare as profit; that amount of money should be more evenly divided amongst the people who have to distribute the items to the last half cent. I hope that the Government will take note of what has been said and will set up a Committee to go into the cost of these various items and tell the merchants this: "We cannot afford to increase the price of food to the people because it is already at a high rate; your profits are too high and we will reduce them so as to pass on a little more profit to the shopkeepers." Many of us ought to know that the merchants get the commodities under the Bill of Exchange system; they get down the commodities and do not pay for them right away. They pay the duty on the commodities and pass them on to the shopkeepers. Where the actual cash comes into play is when the shopkeepers go into the stores and bring out the commodities. The merchant pays for them after a lapse of about 60 or 90 days whereas the shopkeepers pay down the amount of money they have or mortgage their homes and take out the goods from the stores and pass them to the people. On Mondays or Tuesday the shopkeepers go in to the merchants and pay the money; the merchants give the shopkeepers a ten days' citation whereas they get a sixty

or ninety days' citation, and when they collect the money from the shopkeepers they pass it on to various firms. I think therefore that the difficulties and hardships which the shopkeepers have to suffer should be realised; as the honourable junior member for St. Joseph has said, they have to give credit without any security while on the other hand the Shopkeepers have to pay the merchants otherwise they will lose their homes. They take great risks and they should be properly compensated for these risks. I suggest to the Government that they go into the question of the profits made in this business and say what the shopkeeper should get and what the merchant should get. I feel that that ought to be done now that the facts have been brought so forcefully to the notice of the Government. The position was a bad one before the War but it is worse now that rents have been increased, the cost of labour has also been increased and as I have already pointed out, the profits allowed the shopkeepers are less than before the War. It is therefore incumbent on the Government to do something immediately in order to relieve this unhappy situation which exists amongst the shopkeepers. I have much pleasure in supporting this motion.

Mr. SMITH. This question has been thoroughly debated in this House as honourable members know. I think that quite a lot has been said about it so that the Government should open their eyes more widely in relation to it. The honourable senior member for St. Philip has remarked that he paid very little or no attention to this question because the City shopkeepers were not included. I should like to say that on the last occasion on which I interviewed Dr. Saint he told me that it seems as if the City shopkeepers have no complaints about the matter because they have not made any to him. Up to now we have not heard any complaints from the City shopkeepers. I feel that there are some merchant shopkeepers in the City, but I would call those from Hindsbury Road upwards merely shopkeepers. The honourable junior member for the City as well as the honourable senior member for St. Michael spoke on this question and I am sure that if there were any complaints amongst the City shopkeepers those honourable members would have aired them on the floor of this House. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for St. Philip is not in his seat; I cannot say now what I intended to say because the honourable member is not here. I should like to say, however, that we can fool the people sometimes but we cannot fool them all the time. The honourable senior member for St. Philip is the Leader of a Party; he has his constituents to represent and he tells us that he has not paid this question much attention because the City shopkeepers were not represented. That means that he cares more about the City than about the country. Now, going back to the question as to the increase in the number of shops as mentioned by the Government, they seem to think that owing to the increase in the number of these shops, the country shopkeepers stand a rosy chance. My reply to that is that the Government look at the increase in the number of shops but they do not look to see how fast the shopkeepers are dropping out of business. I know the pinch of it; the other man may say: "Smith is getting through and I am going to try and follow him." He does not know how many merchants Smith owes or if Smith has mortgaged his house. Mr. Speaker, you have had to do with the shopkeepers' business and you know how many convictions could be recorded where the poor shopkeepers have had to over-sell their goods; there are those who know the law backwards

and yet they had to increase the price of their articles. I say that the Government should not encourage people to steal in order to obtain a living. I know that there are avenues which can be explored and it is a sure case that the shopkeepers can be allowed a little greater margin of profit. Even if a poor shopkeeper is allowed a profit of, say, \$2 on a barrel of meat, it must be remembered that he has to cut up that meat and he will lose about 10% of it by way of bone; but when you allow a wholesaler a profit of 50 cents on a barrel of meat, he can sell 10 barrels per day and make his \$5, but the poor shopkeeper will lose. I feel that the Government should have their eyes wide open: they should not only look at the increase in the number of shops but also at the decrease in the number of these shops. People have to borrow money and there are other things which are done—things which I will not mention on the floor of this House because they will open the eyes of the Police. (Laughter). The price of goods is going up daily and the profit allowed is less than before. If a person is allowed 2% on articles some consideration should be given to him. There are 101 things which the shopkeepers cannot get to sell but they still have to face their expenses; the wages of the shop attendants and so forth should be considered by the Government. In my opinion, a Committee should be appointed to go into the whole question, see where the wrong is existing and try and do something for the country shopkeepers. In 1938 you could give a certain amount of money for an article and you could get a certain amount of profit on it; today the profit is less but when you are repairing the shop the carpenter has to be paid \$2 a day, the mason has to be paid the same thing and the materials are expensive. The taxes have also been increased; there are shopkeepers who do not keep any books so as to know whether they are losing or gaining on their outlay, and the assessors work by whatever they feel. I am sure that country shopkeepers are paying taxes on losses, not on gains; but the fault is theirs for not keeping any books. This is how the country shopkeeper keeps his books: to-day he will sell a pig which he has reared, next week he will borrow money to make up an amount and eventually the bell is ringing at his door. He has gone out of existence! I feel that as a result of this debate the Government should open their eyes and try and do something for the poor country shopkeepers who are suffering materially. I am speaking to honourable members now, but it is another thing to experience what I am saying. I hope that the Government will do their utmost to remedy the conditions under which these poor shopkeepers are suffering. I now ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

DEFECTIVE SCALE BEAM AT SPRING HALL FACTORY

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes so as to comment briefly on the replies given to my Questions No. 45. Honourable members will recall that those questions deal with the scale beam at Spring Hall Factory, St. Lucy. The first question was: "On how many occasions during the previous crop season has the scale beam at Spring Hall Factory, St. Lucy, been inspected by

- (a) A Member of the Police Force.
- (b) A Justice of the Peace.
- (c) Officers of the Department of Science and Agriculture.
- (d) Itinerant Cane Inspectors?"

The answer to that question is as follows:

- (a) Four.
- (b) Nil.
- (c) Nil.
- (d) Fifty-nine.

I will just digress here to say that this alone is an indication of the valuable services which are rendered to this colony by these itinerant cane inspectors. Of the 63 visits paid to this Factory during the previous reaping season, 59 were paid by these tireless, indefatigable workers—the itinerant cane inspectors. My second query was: "Has any complaint been made or error found in the weighing of canes at this Factory on 17.4.47 or any other date?" The Government replies "Yes," a plain, unqualified "Yes." The third query was: "If the answer to (2) is Yes, will the Government give particulars, and also state what steps have been taken or are contemplated to make good any loss to these persons, if any, who may have suffered as a result of errors?" The reply to that question is as follows: "On the 17th of April an itinerant inspector found that the weighing machine at Spring Hall Factory had developed a fault. Weighing was suspended and the Police were informed. On examination by the Police a mechanical defect at one corner of the platform was discovered and corrected. The defect was of such a nature as to affect only the weighing of particularly heavy lorries and then only when the wheel of the lorry was directly over the part of the platform that was defective. The Crown Law Officer advised against the institution of criminal proceedings.

It is not possible to ascertain whether any persons have suffered loss as a result of the defect." The last query was: "Whether there was any delay in the arrival of the Police called to inspect the Spring Hall scale beam on 17. 4. 47." The reply to that query is this: "The Superintendent of Police arrived at Spring Hall Factory about three hours after the discovery of the defect. The delay was due to the fact that the Police Officers were at the time attending a large cane fire and had to return to headquarters to collect the standard weights."

As regards the reply to the third query, one wonders on how many occasions the wheel of the lorry was directly over the part of the platform that was defective. Time and time again when canes are being weighed at Spring Hall the wheel of the lorry was directly over the part of the platform that was defective I do not say that the Government were wrong in that they did not institute any criminal proceedings according to the advice of the Crown Law Officers because as far as the supervision of the weighing of sugar canes is concerned, when we passed the Bill in 1939 we did not envisage the appointment of these itinerant cane inspectors. We made provision for the inspection of the scales at sugar factories by Members of the Police Force, Justices of the Peace and Officers of the Department of Science and Agriculture. None of these persons was present when this lorry load was weighed and perhaps the legal opinion of Crown Law Officers was in this instance right. This particular lorry was weighed by the cane weigher who alleged that the weight was 16,130 pounds; one of these itinerant cane inspectors shortly afterwards saw the lorry there and he "smelt the rat". He said "I want this lorry weighed again" and when it was weighed again the weight was found to be 16,695 pounds—a difference of 565 pounds on a single lorry. Mr. Speaker you will see that my voice which in this House has been crying in the wilderness for many years

in connection with the supervision of the weighing of sugar canes particularly at the St. Lucy factories has at last found a substantial echo as a result of the activities of this Government officer. As long ago as July 19, 1938, I asked the following questions:

"Is the Governor-in-Executive Committee aware of the existence of dissatisfaction among the peasant proprietors concerning the manner in which the canes of the small holders are weighed at the sugar factories?"

Will the Governor-in-Executive Committee cause legislation to be introduced with the aim and object of making provision (a) for the appointment or (b) for the licensing of cane weighers by the Government?

If the answer to question (2) is in the negative, will the Government in order that the protection of the peasants' interests at the scales can be adequately secured provide for a more regular system of inspection by inspectors appointed by the Government for the purpose, such inspectors being required (as is suggested in paragraph 17 of the Report of the Disturbances Commission of 1937) frequently to check the scales and certify their accuracy and to verify the recorded weights of canes which at the time of their visit may have been weighed but not yet unloaded from cart or motor lorry?

As a result of these questions, we placed on the Statute Book an Act to provide for the weighing of sugar canes, and at my instance that Act was amended in 1942 giving the power to every policeman to inspect the scale beams at sugar factories and verify the recorded weight so as to ascertain whether the people had been robbed or not by the factory. It will be seen in this case that the Superintendent of Police arrived at Spring Hall Factory about three hours after the discovery of the defect. Imagine a thing of that importance taking place and the Superintendent of Police arriving three hours afterwards! We have three or four Superintendents of Police and one can only arrive on this scene after three hours have elapsed! If it had been a case where a shopkeeper's scale was defective the Police would have been there within half an hour. It takes them three hours to arrive on this scene and, according to the reply to my query, the delay was due to the fact that the Police Officers were attending a large cane fire at the time and had to return to Headquarters to collect the standard weights. But what about the Sergeants-Major, the Commissioner, the N.C.O.'s? I have been informed by people on the spot that it was because of the itinerant inspector that they did not weigh any more canes. When they refer to going to collect the standard weights the Police did not bring the adequate weights on the spot at all. It was not sufficient unless the scale was tested loaded to capacity. The scale which is used at Spring Hall Factory is a Pooley scale. The Manager up to that time was boasting that his Factory had the best recovery in the parish of St. Lucy and one of the best in the island until then. You can well see why the Factory there is so good. (Laughter) An engineer has told me that it is almost a matter of impossibility for a Pooley scale to go wrong; it is a question of manipulation if it appears to go wrong. I understand that before this season, the scale at this Factory had been compared with the scale at another factory in the same parish; this factory was selling megass to another factory and I understand that when the megass arrived at the second factory there was an appreciable difference in the weight. I have

not heard of the second factory making any row because when it was a case of the first factory namely Spring Hall selling and not buying, a different system of weighing was in use. The buying factory on this occasion was getting more megass than what it was paying for; but when the other factory was buying peasants' canes that was a horse of another colour. This is a matter which requires the urgent attention of the Government. With regard to the penalty under the Act, I thought that it was too small, and that is why I suggested that the penalty for a breach of the Act should be a fine of £500 together with a term of imprisonment of not less than twelve months. You are really encouraging a factory manager to manoeuvre his scales because the penalty, if he is found out, is only a fine of £50. The sum of £50 is something which a factory can get in half an hour from the peasants. If the penalty for a breach of the Act were a term of imprisonment together with the fine, the people at these factories would take care to see that the scales are correct. The Police did not carry any proper facilities for making this test; I repeat that it is not sufficient to test these scales except to capacity. I cannot see the justification for the Police having to delay for three hours before some responsible person from the Government could arrive on this scene to carry out an inspection of this scale beam. That gives colour to the suggestion that although the Authorities are there to protect the people, they are not so jealous and energetic in rendering to humble people the assistance to which they are entitled. Of course, the Government say that they cannot ascertain whether any persons have suffered loss as a result of this defect. It is difficult to do that with accuracy, but they can give a very strong intimation to this Factory that they will submit the scale beam to a daily test during the next reaping season. When this particular inspector drove into the Factory yard in a different car from his usual one they did not realise that he was a cane inspector. Anyhow, they were caught on account of the vigilance of this itinerant inspector to whom every peasant farmer in this island feels that he owes a debt of gratitude, for having discovered something which honourable members in the past in this House suggested could not have happened. We used to be told that a thing did not happen and we have lived to see that this grievance which has been voiced in this House by one since 1938—it was the peasants, grievance and they supplied me the information—has been proved to be not without foundation. I am commending to the Government the exercise an exceptional amount of vigilance in respect of these scales. The canes in this parish are alleged to be some of the poorest canes in this island; they are bought at a low rate and there is this amazing recovery at this Factory! This question of the weighing of canes at the St. Lucy Factories must be threshed out so that justice might be done to the seller.

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

ADDRESS NOT PROCEEDED WITH.

The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business was called:—To resume debate on the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the decrease in Dairy Farming in this island, etc.

Mr. RAMSAY: Mr. Speaker,—It is not my intention to continue with this Address. Certain honourable members have suggested that it should

be amended and as the year is fast approaching its close I do not intend to carry on with this Address. I ask leave to be allowed to discontinue the debate on it.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member to discontinue the debate on the Address.

ADDRESS RE DISESTABLISHMENT AND GRADUAL DISENDOWMENT OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is to resume debate on the motion that the Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the Disestablishment and gradual Disendowment of the Anglican Church in Barbados do now pass. On the last occasion when this Address was being debated the honourable senior member for the City was speaking and moved the postponement of the debate. That motion was seconded by the honourable senior member for St. John and agreed to. The honourable senior member for the City can continue his speech now.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On the last occasion I had started to finish the point I was making relative to the disendowment of the Anglican Church in this community. I had reached what I consider to be the cultural benefits which the community enjoy from an endowed Church. I pointed out that with the well-to-do section of the community apparently not having any more interest in religion and their contribution to this religious organisation apparently nil, if by the stroke of a pen we say that we would like the Government to send down legislation with a view to the disendowment of the Church, I see quite plainly the hardship which must be effected. So much for dealing, as I think, at length with the cultural side of the matter. None of us in this House can really judge what are the religious and other benefits enjoyed by this community from the endowed Anglican Church. While dealing with this point, it comes forcibly to my mind that we have seen many changes in the established diocese and we have seen much of the benefits, despite what honourable members who support this Address might think, enjoyed by what, in my opinion, is an appreciable proportion of this community. Even although some of us can attribute to individual incumbents of various cures such misgivings and such acts as would not be conducive to the religious teachings of the Good book, it is an undeniable fact that there is still a great majority of these gentlemen of the Cloth who contribute to the cultural and social process for the benefits of the people of this community. I think, Sir, that honourable members will recall that throughout the ages we have been kept by this religious faith, and although there are those of us who think to the contrary, there are still some of us who feel that an endowed Church in our community, having regard to the present economic position of the people, would be in the interest of the community. I observe that with the changes which have been made, young local priests have, for the past 25 years, been able to speak out and even dispute such authors as write for the Hymn and Prayer Book. I observe today that they even omit certain passages which they themselves feel are not in the interest of a down-trodden community. While I do not want to tire the House with reminiscences, I know that Your Honour will give me permission to recall the words of that hymn which, from a boy I appreciated and

many of us will appreciate stung us very hard when we heard them:—

"The rich man in his castle,
"The poor man at his gate;
God made them high and lowly
And ordered their estate".

It is very pleasing to find that young local priests in our community now refuse to have any such words sung in any church in this colony. The point here is that these younger gentlemen of the Cloth appreciate that there should be more than just the mere teaching of the ritual and Prayer Book; they are mindful of the condition and the plight of the under-privileged. If honourable members took time off to look up the question of the disendowment of the Church in Great Britain, they will appreciate that quite some time was spent in discussing the matter. The more I speak on this matter the more members of the public are willing to agree with me, those who are able to judge for themselves, will appreciate the point of view which I am taking. People in the humblest walk of life have expressed disappointment over the contribution made by the Government of Barbados to the Anglican Church being so small as compared with the benefits which are derived from it. The matter as to whether people have no real desire for the Church can only be proved if a plebiscite were taken, not merely by saying that people have lost faith in the Church. There is no real desire among the masses of this colony to see the established Church disendowed. As I have pointed out before, the Resolution for which the Clergy voted at the meeting of the Synod had absolutely nothing to do with asking that the Church be disendowed; but I wonder if they took into consideration that with a disendowed Church, not receiving any Government funds, it must follow as night follows day that all funds contributed by the various local authorities will also cease. I was at a loss to find that one very eminent clergyman was not able to appreciate that that would be the result. Some clergymen seem to think that although, with a disendowed Church, they would not draw their salaries from the Treasury, the funds for paying the various organists and for assistance in the dedicated edifice, the fabric, etc., would continue. Some honourable members seem to have very little patience in dealing with this question of disendowment; my conscience as far as this question is concerned is clear and I feel that I have made my contribution in connection with it. (Cheers).

Now, if it is going to help honourable members, I shall proceed to deal with the question of disestablishment. This Address is asking not only that the Anglican Church be disendowed, but also that it be disestablished. This is an Institution which has been with us, or rather which we have found, and no one amongst us at present can give us accurately the time when the Anglican Church in this community was established. Members of the public on reading the speeches of very responsible members of this Chamber have come to the conclusion that the Church of England or the Anglican Church as we know it in Barbados is a disestablished Institution in Great Britain; and those of us who are not learned in the law, especially the constitutional side of it, are apt immediately to follow the more intelligent or informed in matters of this sort. I say that from the speeches of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew and the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, you cannot come to any other conclusion than that the Church of England is disestablished. You would therefore say that if Great Britain where the established Church is founded has seen fit to disestablish the Church then what is more reasonable

than that little Barbados should fall in line and disestablish the Church here. Now, Sir, the first point which I will make to show that there is absolutely no reason to believe that the Church is disestablished in England is this: Every day you find yourself with any kind of money it must be obvious to you that the inscription of His Majesty the King is there as Defender of the Faith. Therefore, as the honourable junior member for St. John has pointed out, we will not be able to say that the State or the Head of the State must take second place to the Head of the Church. It is not so in Great Britain and it must be acknowledged that we are still a form of Crown Colony. It is not absolutely correct to infer that the Church is already disestablished in England and therefore we should disestablish the Church here. Sir, in the absence of the legal members of this House, I take it that you will grant me the undeniable right to quote from such celebrated authorities as Halsbury on the Ecclesiastical Laws of England and Wade and Phillips on the Constitutional Laws of the Church of England. To-day the appointment of bishops is still vested in the Crown; whatever be the process of nomination, the right to appoint bishops is still reserved by the Crown. Really, when it is suggested—and I am quoting the words of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—that a body of persons who are to be told—

Mr. COX: After all, the honourable member cannot quote from any speech in a debate during the same session of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is entitled to make the quotation inasmuch as this is really the debate continuing.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member is still young and he will learn. I was quoting the words of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph; the honourable member said this: "When a body of persons who are to be told what their spiritual thinking is to be by 24 haphazardly-chosen laymen, none of whom is bound to be a member of any Church let alone be a member of the Anglican Church, that is a position of which any self-respecting man should be ashamed." That will give the impression right away—it must give the impression that when 24 laymen who are not bound to be members of any Church and who have been haphazardly chosen by the people, must enact legislation by which ministers of religion and gentlemen of the Church are to be guided, any self-respecting person should be ashamed of that. Everyone well knows that if remarks like those go unchallenged it will be felt that the Church of England in England is really and truly disestablished. Sir, if you give me permission to quote from this Authority—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the honourable member can quote from memory he can do so; I am afraid that I cannot allow the honourable member to quote from that Authority.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It seems to be a very hard job to convince honourable members of what I am saying and I most respectfully suggest to Your Honour that I would be in order to quote from the Authority. It may be helpful in convincing honourable members. If I am in order—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not in order unless he is putting in that book as a document of the House. The honourable member can quote from memory and give the substance of what he wants to quote.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not prepared for that. The point which I made just now as inferred from the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph was that no self-respecting person would

really remain a clergyman when 24 constitutionally-chosen men who might not be members of the Church could tell him what to do. Well, it is laid down in the Ecclesiastical Laws of England that the authorship of the Prayer Book which is used in the established Church of England and also in the established Church in Barbados though not of Parliament the authorisation is that of the House of Commons and any change must of necessity pass before the House of Commons. Honourable members are mindful of the fact that only as far back as 1927, although the Ecclesiastical Commission made certain recommendations for a change of the present Prayer Book, the House of Commons turned it down. How then can you be given the impression from the floor of this House that the established Church, as we know it here, is not established in England? Honourable members will see therefore that the authorship, the type of prayers, and so forth, must necessarily come before the House of Commons and that only a few years ago they refused to accept an amendment. Anyone who reads the debates on the matter will see that the House of Commons was very strong on it; any change in the religious affairs of the people should be carried out by the people. The point which I have just dealt with, was the strongest one made by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, for disestablishment. History records that more wars have been caused on questions of religion than on any other questions affecting social evils. The honourable senior member for St. Andrew has said that the Church is a man-made Institution. So much for his regard and knowledge of the Church. As far back as 20 years ago it was felt that this question of disestablishment was one which should be discussed by the people. We cannot merely say that the Church should be disestablished; I cannot subscribe to anything like that. Honourable members will remember that it was said in this debate that this is the only country in the British Empire which has an established and endowed Church.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Andrew will have the right to reply.

Mr. MOTTLEY: It is true that in other parts of the British Empire, even in the West Indies the Church of England is disendowed but no where can it be found that the method which this honourable Chamber will adopt possibly in another hour or two, is a method which has been adopted for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. I am not in a position to challenge Your Honour's ruling as to quoting from the Authority but I shall remind honourable members that even in India, where there had been a voluntary disestablishment of the Church the Crown still maintained a percentage of the Anglican Church and they are presently established; and are still endowed. An Address is a serious weapon which an elected member has at his disposal; an Address passed here to-day according to our set-up must carry some weight whether it is passed unanimously or not. In this case it is a question of riding on the crest of the wave; all the arguments or most of them point to the fact that some of the gentlemen selected for the Cure of Souls are really not of the correct type. I must agree that they are arguments for an amendment of the Anglican Church Act, giving the Bishop more authority for the discipline of the Clergy and such other authority that may be necessary. Up to now I cannot find any argument at all to show that the Church as established and endowed is effecting so great a hardship upon the lives of the people of this community that it should be disestablished and disendowed. I have listened carefully to honourable members and the arguments used are the same as

those that were used about 25 years ago, in the days of the Democratic League. In those days the honourable junior member for St. Peter was a champion for the disestablishment of the Church: I do not suppose that the honourable member wanted the death of the Church but that they should turn away from some of their practices. I agree that in those days some of the gentlemen in charge of the Cure of Souls could have been engaged more profitably outside the Church. I am not in entire agreement that the threat of disestablishment or the use of it as a weapon behind these gentlemen has caused them to turn face about; because honourable members can see that the attitude of some of the priests in charge of the Anglican Church to-day is the same as it was when the majority of us were boys. It has been said that if the Clergy were relieved from the trammels of the State, the evils which exist in the colony to-day would not exist. That is the most illogical argument which I have heard. To say that any man who draws his stipend and depends on the State for a living, that he has not got to please any individual and that he has not got the courage to speak against wrongs---

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member has already made that point; you are now dealing with disestablishment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The two things are so much interwoven that it is somewhat difficult not to refer to one when dealing with the other. However, I know that there are several other honourable members who want to add their contribution to this debate whether it is for or against the Address; but whatever honourable members think or however they feel, history will record this Address as one of the most important Addresses which have been discussed in this House. Man is a religious animal by nature; but merely because some people have absolutely no use for religion, merely because some people accept other things for their religion, it is not fair for us to sit here and pass this Address which will have the effect of taking away from the people something which for generations they have built up. I say that the question of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church was discussed 25 years ago and one wonders if at that time the honourable senior member for St. Andrew would have even allowed the Democratic League to come near him to suggest the disestablishment or disendowment of the Church. Before any attempt is made to do something for the social upliftment of the people, you hear it suggested that the Church should be disendowed; but when you come down to facts you see that those who really wanted to do something did not waste any time about the Church because they saw their folly and suggested that first things should come first. I have dealt with the economic and the cultural phases of this matter and with every point with which I in my limited ability have been able to deal; and I say in conclusion that the point of view which I have taken is the point of view of the majority of the people of this colony. (A MEMBER: One in ten thousand). Somebody has said one in ten thousand: I am sure that anyone who thinks so knows nothing about it. I have taken as keen an interest in the working of the various Parties, of what they stand for and what they do not stand for as any other man in this colony. I hope never to follow any man blindly, least of all anybody who really, in my opinion, has absolutely no interest in the people of this colony in attempting to do a thing like this. This Address is not in the interest of the people.

Dr. WILSON: I have listened very attentively to the views as expressed by honourable members on this question of the disestablishment and dis-

endowment of the Church—a question which seems to me to be of great importance in the history of this island. The remark has often been made that because the clergymen are paid by the State and the Bishop has no effective power, they do as they please and as a result the people are not sufficiently spiritually awakened. I should like to remind honourable members of this Biblical injunction, "Many are called but few are chosen." I believe that these ministers give of their best; I think that the Anglican Church has done very good work for a long number of years and there is no certainty that the clergymen can do any better if the Church is disestablished. and disendowed I do not think so. It is true to say that some Anglican clergymen with whom I have discussed this question have told me that disestablishment has been working very well in British Guiana, in Trinidad and in other places and it would be a good thing for Barbados; but, strange to say no one has ever given me any tangible reason as to why it would be a good thing to disestablish the Church in Barbados. I am thinking of the country parishes where I find that the people are still in a condition of dire poverty through no fault of their own, and I am wondering whether they will be able, and to what extent, to subscribe to a Bishopric's Endowment Fund. There is also the question of increased fees for marriages, baptisms and what not. I consider that the Salvation Army, the Methodist and Moravian Churches and a large army of small missions have to depend upon the people for financial help in order to carry on Church work; and I do not think that now is the time for the Church to be disestablished. *(Cheers)*. It would not be fair to the people. It seems to me that the time for the disestablishment of the Church has passed. What I am thinking is that if the Anglican Church Act could be so amended as to give the Bishop full power to deal with the Clergy, there would not be any need to go so far as to disestablish the Church. If you are allowing the Clergy to remain as Civil Servants without any power being vested in the Bishop then I say that something should be done. I would suggest that regard be taken of all the religious bodies in this island and that the people's representatives place themselves in a position to see not only that the Church is supported by the State, but that all churches be given a measure of recognition and consideration by the Government.

Mr. RAMSAY: Such a momentous question as the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church is worthy of very great consideration. I think it is considered in various quarters to the extent of being a constitutional matter and it should not be dealt with flippantly. During the earlier stages of the debate on this Address the honourable senior member for St. Thomas referred to honourable members who spoke against the passing of the Address as being sentimental. I agree with the honourable member that there is sentiment, but I would rather err with an illustrious personage who is a great writer than follow the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. That writer in that wellknown book *homo sapiens* says that sentiment taken away from human nature is like a motor set up without an electrical system. The majority of things done in this world, except scientific things, are done from sentiment. I have an open mind on this question of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church; there has been no argument attempted to be adduced that would appear to me to be worthy of consideration as to why we should abandon such an illustrious organization as the established and endowed Church in Barbados. Throughout this

world you will find that the people for whom the most has been done have been the most ungrateful. I emphasize that. Looking around this Chamber, I say that the people for whom the Church has done a lot are now letting it down. The Church is an established and recognized Body throughout the world, and of course, there are malpractices in the Church in this island of 21 by 14. There are many who have done much for the Church—men like Archdeacon Skeete, Archdeacon Shankland, Rev. Grayfoot Browne, Canon Reece, Rector Thorne and several others whose names I cannot remember have done good work for the established Church and for the Sunday School children. If I happen to recapitulate anything I have said, it is not that I am filibustering; I have not made any plans in this dissertation. I take it that I am entitled to look at my notes, not being a gramophone. When the State was against the people of this place except the rich, it was the Church which took the people from the lowly walks of life and taught them to read and write and made them teachers. It was the Church which took care of the strays and waifs much to the objection of the wealthy people of whom a certain part exists to-day. It was the Church which brought in the slaves and taught them the fear of God. There is always a black sheep in the family; there is always a low-down fellow in the family who has to be dealt with; but do we look on the entire family and throw it down? Mr. Speaker, there are certain people of the Cloth who occupy the rostrum, but they are not fit to go into the Church not even as grave-diggers; on the other hand there are great, illustrious people who have laboured among the people and when they died we mourned, and I am not a church-goer. I have never been confirmed except I am a confirmed rebel; *(Laughter)*. I went to Church so as to hear the organ and when they were getting to my soul I walked out. I took great note of what the honourable senior member for St. John has said; he has given us the essence of this spiritual teaching which most of us need. Some of us are sadly lacking in spiritual teaching, some of us lack even moral teaching. But we must not discuss this question too closely otherwise we will get in trouble. In years gone by, the clergymen were the counsellors: people did not call the solicitors or barristers to make their wills; the reverends were called in. When a recalcitrant boy was giving the family trouble, the reverend was called in; and when a girl became wayward the reverend was also called in; the Church used to be the counsellor for everybody. When I was a boy pitching marbles and breaking canes and saw a reverend gentleman, I was more afraid of him than of the watchman because he took an interest in the people. However, there arose a new king which knew not Joseph, and I say that before some of these priests were born I was clamouring for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. There was a lot of wisdom in my doing that; not that I rather the death of the Church but that they should turn from their wickedness and live; there is a lot of wisdom in madness. If I do not say what I am saying now I would be consistently letting down my grandmother, who, whenever the bell was rung had me sent to the Church when I preferred to go to the cricket ground. I can never forget that when talking about the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. In truth and in fact much more consideration must be given to this question before we can even attempt to discuss it. About 50 years ago if this Address had been brought up it should have been passed overwhelmingly. It is true that the Church did not appear to be taking

any interest in the community; I well remember that in the parish of St. Peter there was a reverend gentleman called Jessamy who died from starvation; it was a disgrace that a christian gentleman such as he was should have so perished. What is the position to-day? I say that honourable members should not allow their zeal to overrule their discretion. Do not let us follow the honourable senior member for St. Andrew in connection with the disendowment of the Church which has been so useful to us. I do not want to call any names, but I mention Rev. Taylor, Rev. Hall, a very bad specimen, and there is Rev. Wilfred Montague Worrell at St. Matthews who, instead of being Chaplain of the Prison, should be confined therein. Rev. Jones is a specimen of shining light and there is Rev. Pemberton whose preaching I once ran into the Church to hear. There are clergymen to-day of whom we could not have any grouse; we have some first-class men to-day. Instead of honourable members adopting this attitude, I think that they should go into the Church and see how these clergymen conduct their affairs. We are like the dog in the manger; we prevent other people from doing what we should do ourselves. Fifty years ago the Church had disintegrated, but I challenge any honourable member to say that it is not making a bid for recovery. Every morning the incumbent at St. Barnabas has the bell rung and will not allow me to sleep, and I have said that if I were a young man I would not allow my wife to go there. Mr. Speaker, within the past 10 years some new wine has been added to the Church of England and you have to dance. I have sat outside the portals and listened in. I am not a Pharisee; I am a Publican, and there is room for me within. This is no joke as it may seem; I am serious about this matter. Years ago we had to go to Bishop's Court and ask for permission to bury someone who did not belong to the Church. Have not honourable members heard that? I say that the Church is doing almost everything to recover lost ground and we should, in truth and in fact, do everything to help them. As a matter of fact, the Church is not endowed; the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that an endowment is given when you take money and buy property and the money derived from that is handed over to be carried on. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph delivered a beautiful address; he was strong but smooth; deep but clear; full but did not overflow. He did not go into the law but he stuck to his points. The clarity of his speech was such that it would profit honourable members to keep a copy of it and try to attain such heights: he was full but he did not overflow. The more he talked, the more confirmed I was in my opinion even when he talked about the 24 rebels in this House who live their lives. There is no one who is worthy to judge ecclesiastical bodies; let us not presume to follow the line of judgment. In carpentry it is a recognized thing that before a house can be made better it must be made worse. If the roof is bad you take it off and that is making the house worse; but you have to take off the roof so as to make things better. If you are taking away the bread and butter from the clergymen what provision are you making for them in the interim? Clergymen are human beings; most of them have their wives and their children, some of them have been insured, some of them have taken out insurance policies so as to educate their children and in fairness to them what are you going to do for them in the interim? The majority of them are poor in human substance although they may be rich in

spiritual grace. We can always see through the glasses through which we are looking; I cannot say that our view is jaundiced but it is a little yellow. What provision has been suggested for these people by any honourable member who has spoken so glibly about the abandonment of this Institution? These people have their wives and children and certain responsibilities; some of them are looking after their parents who have sacrificed for them so that they might attain their educational status. Mr. Speaker, Sir William Herbert Greaves, an illustrious Barbadian, said that when you are going to judge an individual you must first put yourself in the place of the individual. If those who are saying that we should get rid of the Church were clergymen would they like that for themselves? It does appear to me as if the hands of the clock are pointing backward; we are undergoing a change but in the change we should still maintain our equilibrium; we should still maintain justice, reason and fairplay. Justice demands that the Clergy be given a square deal. You may call them miscreants or mischief-makers; some of them have preached against socialism; I say: "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." When you come to the christian dispensation there is bound to be a change:

"Change and decay in all around I see,
O Thou who changeth not abide with me."

It appears to me as if some of us are begrudging the poor clergy the £13,000 which is being paid to them. We have been told about religious education and I ask: what will it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul? There is also the doctrine that to whom much is given much is required. The principles which I have enunciated this afternoon have been neglected. I was taught in my early years that I should not lie even if it cost me a whipping and that came to me through the Church. I remember much of my Sunday School teaching. These are not the days of miracles; we want to make provision for the clergymen for the work they have done. I suppose that honourable members would put the crime wave that has taken place in this country to the blame of the clergy and they will be charged with failing to do their duty in spite of what they have done. Every honourable member, I take it, is entitled to his opinion and despite what honourable members may feel, however they may be impressed by the manner in which I enunciate these principles, there is absolutely nothing which is intended to be personal in what I say. I owe a duty to this country. I take it that one hundred years from now the youth of this colony and the West Indies will read this speech which was made in this House on this 2nd day of September, 1947, and if honourable members have thrown it to the wind I am not responsible for that.

Now what about the Church property? I am not saying that we can have everything in detail, but I should like to ask the honourable senior member for St. Andrew if he has given any consideration to the material welfare of the Church. In whose hands will the property be? Are we going to put all this money in the hands of the Bishop? I am saying that it is our duty to view this matter from every possible angle. What is going to become of the Church property? Let us go a little further back; where did the Church get this property from? The majority of the wealthy people made money out of their slaves and they gave land and schools to the Church. I feel that the wealthy people can yet give. The property is ours; the owner of somewhere in St. Joseph, the owner of somewhere in Christ Church, and so on, gave

away property and we owe a duty to the people to see that this property does not fall into the hands of strangers who may misuse it. It is for us to see that this property is maintained for the use of posterity. I cannot give a silent vote against the passing of this Address; if I say anything which any honourable member feels is harsh, I am quite willing to take it back or explain it. It is not a matter of malice: as a Barbadian, as a representative of the people and as a descendant from these same people who stand to benefit from this property, I am entitled to look into every nook and cranny of this matter. I want to know not necessarily in detail, in the abstract or in the concrete, what is going to become of this property which has been given to us by virtue of our sweat and toil? I am a builder and valuer and it is my opinion that the Church property in Barbados, setting up a conservative valuation, is worth over £2,000,000. Are we going to throw away property worth £2,000,000 at a conservative valuation, especially when property cannot be bought to-day as was the case before? I ask again in whose hands are we going to put this money. I appreciate that Church money should be put into the hands of Christians; I remember that when our Saviour was here he had twelve disciples and one of them sold him for 30 pieces of silver: it is not impossible that those of the Church who will be given charge of this property may sell it for more. It is therefore our bounden duty to see to it that everything possible is done so that this property may not fall into disrepute.

Quite a lot has been said about the Bishop and I want to say that I know nothing about the present Bishop. As a matter of fact, I do not like reverends. I have no dislike for any member of the Church, but I do not like to go near these reverend people. I have been a rebel from a child; I hid from the Brethren because they confused me with my politics. My father and mother were in the Church carrying around the plate and I was not even in the choir. Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Bishop whoever he might be, not having enough power or authority, I remember that when Rev. Taylor came to St. Barnabas it was not on account of the Bishop; it was on account of the agitation of Mr. C. A. Brathwaite who got around the Bishop and the Rector and made them appoint Rev. Taylor to the cure. I feel that the position is the same today. The Bishops have failed because they misused their power; even in Barbados today the Bishop's power is being misused. Three or four old men—it was nearly time for them to be put in their graves—have been put into this See as against several young men. I am not saying whether they were apt or not, but an explanation should have been given to the public as to the appointments. The power of the Bishop, I repeat, has not always been used for the promotion of happiness in this island. I am giving a case in point as to why this Address should not be passed on the ground that the Bishop has not got enough power. The Lord Bishop has said in no mean words that when the Church is disendowed he will have the pensions of the members of the Cloth used as part stipends. He goes further and says: "If I do not want you I will not have you." if honourable members can contradict or deny that, let them speak now or hold their peace forever. The Bishop is a bully in capital letters underlined and italicised. I am going to read something now and I am prepared for it to become the property of the House. I like to have things above board. This is a clipping from an English newspaper: I hope that the Reporter will not leave

out anything. (Laughter). The clipping reads as follows:—

Barbados—

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the honourable member reading from?

Mr. RAMSAY: It is a clipping from an English newspaper in which the Lord Bishop has put an advertisement. It reads thus:—

"Sir,—We have been asked by the Bishop of Barbados to explore the possibilities of forming a Barbados Association. As the Church in Barbados is likely to be disendowed in the near future, there is special need for such an Association which would pray and work for the Church there.

We shall be pleased to hear from priests and laity who have any interest in Barbados and from others who are willing to help in any way.

The Bishop needs for priests immediately for urgent work, and if offering a house and £275 per annum. Applicants should be unmarried.

W. H. Orton, Christ Church Vicarage, Luton.

A. C. Norledge, All Saints' Vicarage, New Eltham, S.E.9."

We have here people who are unemployed. I am only showing that we cannot entrust everything in the Bishop's hand. Has he utilised all the clerical talent here before bringing in all these old people? I cannot understand it; it does not seem to me to be above board. You would have thought that he would have taken the children in his breast and done the best for them. The Bishop is too much of a politician. I have been taking into consideration the things which I have said here to-day and they are true. I would be the last person to use my position in this House to say things that are not true. Fancy the Bishop telling clergymen that if they want to work with him their pensions would be used as part stipends! We are a democratic Association: the voice of democracy cries out for justice for these people, the voice of democracy shrieks for justice for these people. Taking this Address on the surface, naturally we would think that the best possible thing to say is that many a man has been incarcerated because the jurymen got tired. Gentlemen, if you are tired, go to your homes; I will resume next Friday. Many a man has been sent to prison wrongfully.

Mr. SPEAKER. Really, that has nothing to do with this Address.

Mr. RAMSAY: Very well, Mr. Speaker. Before an Address of this sort was brought on the Table of this House, I think that the people ought to have been consulted. Mr. Speaker, I still live in the slums; but I do not live in a gap so that I cannot be told what has happened in the road. They have the Church Army, the Sisters of Mercy and the Church Lad's Brigade. I hear people talking about disestablishment in the road; I challenge any honourable member who is pressing for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church to say that the people have been fully apprised of their ultimate position. I say that the ultimate responsibility is that of the people because they have to pay for their religion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will not continue to debate that point because it has already been made.

Mr. RAMSAY: By me, Mr. Speaker? I think I will have to crave Your Honour's indulgence.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope you will not repeat anything which has already been said.

Mr. RAMSAY: What is obvious is most often needed to be said. Sometimes you tell children something and you constantly have—

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is not treating honourable members as children.

Mr. RAMSAY: I am making a direct analogy; I have to impress things on the memories of honourable members lest they forget.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have said it already and do not say it any more.

Mr. RAMSAY: I shall not say it any more. I think that honourable members will agree that the Church has a lot of school property. I am not confining myself to any particular class or type of schools; I am speaking of the secondary schools as well as of the elementary schools. Honourable members will know that quite a number of these properties belong to the Church entirely and the State has been keeping them in repair. Quite a number of them belong to the State; and it is only in recent years that we have spent large sums of money on the purchase and maintenance of these schools. I go off at a tangent just to show where my thoughts are running. With these tremendous matters of social reform brought before us, does this House in its wisdom or otherwise think that the Government should immediately aim at the gradual disendowment of the Church whatever sums of money we will be called upon to extend for the Treasury? Do honourable members think that we are capable of doing that at present? I will go on to show the repercussions, the things that can take place if we are not careful in passing this Address. You cannot take away this property from the Church; you have to buy it from them. I do not want them to be filched of it; this property should be purchased in the open market and they should be given the most for it as the intention of this Address is to abandon the Church. Suppose we started to rent this property instead of purchasing it would that be a wise financial policy? That would cost us much more. When I was nominated for membership of this House the Governor issued a writ calling for two able and discreet men in the various constituencies to represent the people; I wonder if honourable members would consider themselves able and discreet if they passed an Address without knowing what it will entail.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to point out the honourable member that this Address asks the Governor if he sees fit to do so, to take steps to send down legislation to carry out the purpose of this Address. Surely, if what is sent down is unjust or unfair, it would be open to honourable members to deal with it at the particular time.

Mr. RAMSAY: I agree with Your Honour entirely.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am suggesting that the honourable member should not attempt to discuss something which has not yet come down.

Mr. RAMSAY: We must indicate our policy to the Government. It is our duty to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that the honourable member is out of order in discussing something which has not yet come down to the House. The honourable member will have ample opportunity to debate it when it comes down.

Mr. RAMSAY: I do not want to bandy words with Your Honour, but I may not be here then.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will be very sorry if you cannot be here.

Mr. RAMSAY: I must take time by the forelock; I must make hay while the sun is shining. This Address says: "The House has the honour to

draw to the attention of His Excellency the Governor the fact that the disestablishment and gradual disendowment of the Anglican Church in Barbados is long overdue." I would like to see some facts, where are the facts? As a member of this House, I contend that no facts have been put before me so that I can say that the disestablishment and gradual disendowment of the Church is long overdue. I am not moving the deletion of anything. Honourable members must bear with me; this is a momentous occasion. The Church has assisted me in telling my children not to keep bad company or stay out late at night. Quite a lot of people will not be Christians because they are ashamed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable member that it is nearly six o'clock—

Mr. RAMSAY: I take it that Your Honour is indicating that the further debate on this Address should be postponed. Honourable members are apparently getting tired and I am not prepared to let this opportunity slip.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot stop you; it is a matter for you. You can move that the further consideration of the Address be postponed and have another meeting.

Mr. RAMSAY: If honourable members feel worn out, I sympathise with them but I do not feel worn out for this cause. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Address be postponed. If that motion fails I shall continue my address.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: In accordance with Rule 79 and in view of the fact that this is likely to be the last meeting of the House for this session, I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER: Rule 79 says this: "A question may be superseded 1st by the motion that the consideration of the question be adjourned, 2nd by the previous question, viz 'that this question be now put' being proposed and negatived." Your point is that the question that this debate be now adjourned can be superseded by either one of two motions: either a motion for the adjournment of the House or one for putting the previous question. I think that you are in order.

Mr. LEWIS: I think that this is a matter which should be decided one way or the other by this House and we should abide by the decision. I do not think that this is a matter of abolishing a religion. It is not clear in my mind whether we can disestablish the Church or whether it is endowed; but I disagree with the principle that of all the religions one particular religion should be fully State aided.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member can only speak on the motion for the postponement.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to move that the previous question be now put, that is, that this Address do now pass. I understand that if this question is negatived, the debate can continue. If the House disagree with this motion then the discussion continues; on the other hand if honourable members feel that sufficient debate on the matter has taken place and it is their wish that the question be now put, the question can be put. It is quite obvious that there will not be any other meeting of the House to deal with Private Members' Business this session.

Mr. SPEAKER: The difficulty in which I find myself is this; the honourable member has a perfect right to make that motion in the interim between one honourable member having spoken and another honourable member getting up to speak. The honourable member did not do that when the honourable junior member for St. Peter got up to speak and I do not think you have any right to intervene in that

speech. Before the honourable junior member for St. Peter got up to speak you could have moved that the previous question be now put. You are really now interrupting the honourable member

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable junior member for St. Peter made a motion that the debate be postponed. That motion was seconded by the honourable senior member for St. Lucy and both honourable members took their seats. I Then made the motion that the previous question be now put and I think that that is quite in order. It is a matter as to whether we will agree to decide the question to-day or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. Peter made a motion for the adjournment of the debate on the assumption that if the motion was not passed he would have the right to continue his speech. If the honourable junior member for

St. Peter is continuing his speech, you are not in order to make the motion which you are making.

Mr. LEWIS: The point is that if an honourable member moves the adjournment of a debate and that motion is negatived he has no right to go back in the debate. If the debate is adjourned or if the motion is agreed to, he can re-start the debate or he may lose the right to continue; but if the motion is negatived he has no right to go back in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are only ten honourable members present and I will ask the Clerk to have the Bell rung.

The Bell having been rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are only ten honourable members present, the Bell has been rung and there being no quorum this House stands adjourned to this day week at twelve o'clock noon.