THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 1, 1950.

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS (*Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. D. A. FOSTER, O. T. ALLDER, T. O. BRYAN, R. G. MAPP, M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, F. C. GODDARD, F. E. MILLER, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., E. L. WARD, and W. W. REECE, K.C.,

Prayers are read.

Messrs LEWIS, ADAMS and BETHELL enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of meetings held recently are not yet ready for confirmation.

DOCUMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Report and Accounts of the Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank for the year ended 30th June, 1950.

Messrs. CRAWFORD and BRANCKER enter the House and take their seats.

PAPER LAID

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to lay on the table of the House a Paper as follows:—

Post Office Advances for the payment of Money Orders to the 30th June, 1950.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution for $1,539 to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950-51, No. 13, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution for $2.280 to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, No. 14, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the money Resolutions of which I just gave notice.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. ALLDER: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly is of the opinion that the distribution of the landed area in this Colony has not been kept in line with the growth and expansion of the population,

2. The House of Assembly observes that unless a policy for the re-distribution of the landed area in this Colony becomes practical, any attempt to implement the programme of the rehousing of the people, (to which the Government has already committed itself), would be met with difficulty.

3. The House of Assembly is aware that the Tenantry in the parish of St. John, known as Rosegate, (and comprised of thirty acres, more or less), is on the market for sale.

4. The House of Assembly is aware that many of the present tenants have lived most of their lives on this land, and would find it difficult to obtain land elsewhere; further, that they have not the means to purchase the spots on which their houses now stand without Government's assistance.

5. The House of Assembly would give favourable consideration to a Resolution sent down by Your Excellency for the purpose of acquiring this Tenantry to be used under the scheme for rehousing the people, as is being done at the Bay Estate.

6. The House of Assembly therefore, respectfully requests Your Excellency to take immediate steps which would give effect to this request.

Mr. ALLDER: Of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

WHEREAS the road known as Featherbed Lane in the parish of St. John has become impassable to vehicular traffic, and whereas residents travelling to other districts of the parish have to take a circuitous route of five miles through the parish of St. Philip to get to their destination.

WHEREAS, the House of Assembly view with much concern the inconvenience caused to the residents of this district, they, therefore, respectfully request Your Excellency to take the necessary steps to have this road taken over by the Department of Highways and Transport for the purpose of giving a through passage from Halton in the parish of St. Philip to Kendal corner in the parish of St. John.

Messrs. GILL and E. K. WALCOTT enter the House and take their seats.

MR. F. L. WALCOTT CORRECTS A STATEMENT OF MR. CRAWFORD

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Before you proceed to call the Orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to correct a statement that was made in the House by the junior member for St. Philip during the debate on the motion for the adjournment of the House by the senior member for St. Philip to discuss the question of lack of transportation for school children from the country districts to the City of Bridgetown and *vice versa*. The junior member for St. Philip said that he asked a question in December last year about the running of buses by concessionaires and that the Government had not replied to his question. That statement is incorrect and I should like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the Minutes of the 20th March this year which state that a Reply to the honourable member's question was laid.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker,—If it is correct that the Reply was laid when I made that statement, that fact was entirely unknown to me at the time.

THE DOG LICENCE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the Dog Licence Act, 1902.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, — I am sorry to have to ask the House again to postpone the consideration of this Bill. I am suggesting that the particular Rule be observed and that it be placed at the bottom of the Order Paper. That does not mean that the Govermnent is shelving the Bill completely but rather than having to ask that it be adjourned week afer week, it is better that it be placed at the bottom of the Order Paper. I will ask the House to replace it in a higher position when I am ready to deal with it.

The further consideration of this Bill is postponed.

THE SEPARATION AND MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume debate on the second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to Separation and Maintenance.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I regret to ask that the further consideration of this Bill be also postponed. The learned Attorney General is drafting changes which the senior member for St. James drew to my attention and which should be included in this Bill.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) NO. 6 ORDER, 1950

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1950" made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 13th day of July, 1950, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Mr. MOTTLEY enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the Resolution to approve the "Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) No. 6 Order, 1950" do now pass.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,—Before the question is put I should like to say a few words in respect of Item 31, "Fishery Officer, $2880 x 144—$3456, one of the items to be added after item 24 under Head XVII, Department of Science and Agriculture. Some years ago, Sir, I was instrumental in getting an Address passed in this House to His Excellency the Governor relative to the erection of a fish shed at Tent Bay, Bathsheba. Only last week, Sir, a fisherman was convicted on the complaint of the sanitary inspector before the Police Magistrate of the District for making a mess on the beach by cutting up fish there and, Sir, I think that it is a pity when an honourable member of this House devotes his time to the drafting of an Address to the Governor, introduces it into this House, gets it discussed and passed, presents it to the Governor and then nothing more is said or done about it. Sir, a fish shed is really needed at Tent Bay because, as I have already said, the fishermen have to cut up their fish on the beach, flies and all sorts of insects are there, dogs evacuate on the beach and it is definitely unclean to have fish exposed for sale in such circumstances. It is very insanitary. There should be a fish shed with concrete counters at this particular Bay. I do not know who is responsible for the erecting of this fish shed but since the Address, to which I have referred, has been passed I notice that a building with a W. C. and a bath has been erected in that vicinity for the tractor driver. Both are essential; the tractor driver must live somewhere and there should be a fish shed at that Bay for the benefit of the people of the island. It is hardly necessary for me to remind the Government that the fish is caught not for the benefit of the people in the Bathsheba district alone but for the benefit of the people in the whole island. People from all parts of the island live at some time or other in the Bathsheba district. Only this morning I saw some people going to Bathsheba to spend their vacation. We appeal to the people to try and keep themselves as cleanly as possible and to shun that dreaded disease, tuberculosis; we appeal to the people to sleep with their windows open in order to let in fresh air and to keep clean houses and while we are doing that, we are allowing dirty fish from the Bathsheba coast to be eaten in the people's clean homes. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the terms of the Address to which I referred be implemented. A Resolution must come down for money to erect this fish shed at Tent Bay. The last Governor landed on a Tuesday and on the following Thursday I went to Government House with a copy of that Address and the residents at Bathsheba have been continually asking me, since then, when they are going to get this shed. I feel that something is wrong with this fishery business or

the Fishery Officer, because I will mention an incident which I am sure that my colleague, the Leader of the House, will bear out. The Fishery Officer launched a tractor down at Bathsheba and he cares so little about the representatives of St Joseph in this House, he cares so little about the Leader of the House that he did not invite them to the function down there. I repeat that there is something wrong about this fishery business. The senior member for St. Peter is a member of the Fishery Committee and when I asked him about the erection of this shed, he knew nothing about it. When honourable members take their time to draft Addresses, have them debated and passed by this House, some action should be taken as soon as possible after on those Addresses. I do not think that the people who elected us expect us to come here Tuesday after Tuesday and do nothing to help them. It is our duty when anything is wrong to try to get it put right and when we have tried to get it put right we cannot tell the people what has resulted from our efforts. At any rate we have the satisfaction that we did our part. I only hope that the Authority responsible for this Fishery business will see to it that a Resolution is sent down to this House for the erection of a fish shed at Tent Bay, Bathsheba, so as to remedy the defect up there and not allow the fishermen to be hurled before the Police Magistrate and charged with making a mess on the beach by cutting up their fish. It is not fair to them; they cannot do any better unless the Government provides some convenience for them in this respect.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker, —There is a great need in this island for more fish sheds. I am thinking now of the beach at Silver Sands. It is common knowledge that the parish of Christ Church is a big parish, that the greater part of the sea-egg industry centres around Silver Sands and there is no gain-saying the fact that when the sea-egg season begins and is in full swing the breaking of the shells on the beach in that locality creates a very insanitary state of affairs. If there were proper fish sheds and a plentiful supply of water at those sheds I think that the sanitary condition of those beaches would be very much improved; so I am supporting the remarks of the junior member for St. Joseph I know that through his instrumentality an Address was passed by this House relative to the erection of a fish shed at Tent Bay beach but no Address has been passed in connection with the beach at Silver Sands in Christ Church, although the senior member for Christ Church has on the Order Paper an Address for that purpose. Whether an Address for this purpose is passed or not, some effort should be made to improve the conditions under which people who are engaged in the fishing industry carry on their business. Mr. Speaker, you live in the parish of St. Peter where the sea-egg industry does not exist to any appreciable extent and a large number of fishermen is engaged in that business but in the parish of Christ Church, the broken sea-egg shells and the stench from them make it impossible at times for persons to go near the beaches.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,— I will not talk about fishing but I notice that—

Dr. CUMMINS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What is the object of this debate? The point is whether these officers who are set out in the schedule to this Resolution should be members of the Civil Establishment or not. There is nothing in this Resolution about the erection of fish sheds and the time will come for a discussion on that subject.

Mr. MAPP: With reference to the officers that are to be added to the Department of Science and Agriculture, I notice that we are to have an Assistant Veterinary Officer, an Irrigation Officer, an Assistant Livestock Officer, a Farm Manager, Central Livestock Station, a Farm Overseer, Central Livestock Station, and a Co-operative Officer. I think that that is sufficient indication that we are attaching to this Department the importance it deserves and I venture to express the hope that more alacrity will be shown in respect of such schemes as the irrigation scheme and the scheme for the establishment of a centre for the pasteurization and distribution of milk which the Government had under consideration sometime ago. I am not now going to debate any such scheme. I suppose, as the last speaker rightly observed, that these schemes do not come within the scope of this Resolution but before we agree to the creation of these offices we are quite in order to express the wish—we know that the details of these schemes are worked out by them—that they will go into these matters with greater despatch than in the past. We know that the four members of this House who are members of the Executive Committee will decide the policy in respect of these schemes but these officers will have to go into the details, hammer them out, and present working projects to the Government, not to the four members of this House who are members of the Government; therefore, any member of this House is quite in order to suggest that these officers go into these matters in a more efficient manner than we feel they are doing at present. There is, for instance, a Co-operative Officer and as you have already heard in this House, it is not known whether he spends half of his time in Barbados or outside Barbados. We can only express the hope that that will not be the case with other officers such as the Irrigation Officer and these other officers connected with this Department. I am glad to see the Principal of the Evening Institute included in this schedule. There again, I think that it is time that a broader policy be worked out with regard to this Institute and that evening classes should be worked on a more practical basis than is being done at present. Take item 14, Assistant Organizer, Housecraft Centre, under Head XVI, Education. I do not know if the Leader of the House can tell me if she will be posted at the Centre in Bay Street or if her duties will be concerned chiefly with setting up Centres in other parts of the island. I hope that the latter is correct. I hope that she will be concerned with going into the country districts and finding out how the work of the Centre in Bay Street can be spread and branches established in the country areas. This Housecraft Centre is doing a lot of good work in Bridgetown and I hope that the principal part of her duties will be to try to extend this work to the rural districts.

Mr. ADAMS: If other honourable members have any other points to make I would like to reply to them at one and the same time, otherwise I shall have to ask leave to reply to any honourable member who speaks after I have spoken. Mr. Speaker, honourable members may have grievances about matters which they would like to get off their chests but I would like to suggest to them to choose the appropriate moment and do so in the right way. While I expect the junior member for St. Thomas frequently to choose the wrong way I do not expect the junior member for St. Joseph to choose the wrong way. I have said on a previous occasion—

it is no laughing matter—that as far as Government policy is concerned, the four members of the House of Assembly advise the Governor of this colony, that according to the present Constitution, the Governor considers it his duty to accept our advice and that on matters of policy an attack on the Government of this colony is an attack on the four of us. If I reply to the junior member for St. Joseph as I should, his constituents would have questions to ask him and the same remark applies to the junior member for St. Thomas. The junior member for St. Thomas knows quite well —he has been told so by us—that the Government has everything cut and dried and is waiting on Colonial Development and Welfare in respect of the whole question of production and distribution of milk, yet he comes in here and in his petty, parochial, small-boy style, makes an attack on the Government which has already told him what the Government is doing. I keep quiet sometimes only because they are members of this Party who make these attacks. This Order is merely putting in the form of a Civil Establishment Order what the House has already, in principle, approved, namely, that these posts should be included in the Civil Establishment. Perhaps the honourable member feels that this is an occasion for him to make a speech so that his constituents may read it or hear about it and say that this Government is too slow and that if it were not for him, nothing would be done. As regards the Evening Institute, the information is clearly set out on page 138—Appendix 10—of the current year's Estimates and it states that there will be a full-time Principal—with salary attached —for the Evening Institute. All these officers have been already approved. This is merely putting in a proper way in a Civil Establishment Order these posts which the Legislature itself has already approved. Owing to the Civil Establishment Act, it is necessary to make an Order establishing the old posts and any new posts which we are creating. If the honourable members feel so juvenile that in the month of August when normal human beings try to keep cool, they still find it—though supporters of the Government — necessary to make these silly schoolboy remarks I will promise them—just a mere statement of fact—that one of these days I will talk to them the same way as they talk to the Government of the Country and they will be sorry for it.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1950

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, —To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1950," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 13th day of July, 1950, under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—This Order seeks to put the Lecturer in Agriculture for Erdiston College in the Civil Establishment List and his emoluments are set out in Clause 3 of the Order. This has also been before the House already and is no new post, the principle of which the Government is now asking the House to accept. For those reasons I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) (AMENDMENT) NO. 3, ORDER, 1950.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) No. 3 Order, 1950," made by the Governor on the 13th day of July, 1950, under the provisions of Section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the senior member for St. Peter be allowed to take charge of this Order.

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—This Resolution seeks to make pensionable the officers whom we have just added to the Civil Establishment List. As soon as you establish an officer he automaically becomes a pensionable officer and this Order is to make pensionable those offices which have just been established. I beg to move that this 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.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) (AMENDMENT) NO. 4 ORDER, 1950.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) No. 4 Order, 1950," made by the Governor on the 13th day of July, 1950, under the provisions of section 2 (1) (a) of the Pensions Act, 1947.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask that the senior member for St. Peter be allowed to take charge of this Order also.

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

Mr. F. L .WALCOTT: This. Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is similar to the one we just passed. It seeks to make pensionable certain offices which have been added to the Civil Establishment under the Medical Department and the Waterworks Department respectively. I beg to move that this 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.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE OF THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT BATHSHEBA

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of 1ac. 3 rd. of land adjoining the site of the former Railway Station at Bathsheba.

Dr. CUMMINS: In the absence of the senior member for St. Joseph, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take charge of this Order.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—The Government, in order to acquire some land at Bathsheba for the establishment of a playing field, contacted this lady, Miss Vera M. Hinkson, who owns this land which adjoins the site of the former Railway Station. She wanted what is considered an exorbitant price for the land and refused to accept a lower price; therefore the Government thought it wise to deal with the matter through this channel, that is, to acquire the land compulsorily under the Land Acquisition Act and this Resolution seeks the approval of the House of the Government's action. For the benefit of the junior member for St. Joseph I would like to say that no part of this land will be used for the erection of a fish shed. This land, if purchased and developed, will afford bathing and recreation facilities for the people who go to Bathsheba on holidays and other days. I beg, Sir, to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I am very pleased to see that the Government has taken this stern action to get a playing field and a community centre at Bathsheba and I hope that it will not hesitate to use this method wherever necessary and whenever necessary for the same purpose elsewhere. In this connection—I do not know if I will be deemed out of order—I should like to enquire from the mover of this Resolution what is the position in the constituency which he and I have the honour to represent, in respect of acquiring land for this same purpose—the establishment of a Community Centre and a Playing Field. I have been informed—it is with some trepidation I make the statement because I have been accused of being informed about many things—that there is no land for sale in the parish of St. Thomas for this purpose and that at any time the price asked for land in that parish for similar purposes has been exorbitant. I do not know if my colleague can tell we which of these two reports is accurate and correct but I hope that if an exorbitant price is asked for land in the parish of St. Thomas for similar purposes, the Government will not hesitate to put the Land Acquisition Act into operation to acquire that land. I shall await with some anxiety the reply of my colleague because it has been published that I have made the inaccurate statement that no person in the parish of St. Thomas has offered land for sale to the Government to establish a Community Centre and Playing Field. I have heard that and, since then, I have also heard that the price asked for is exorbitant; so I hope that the mystery will be cleared up to-day.

Mr. REECE: I am supporting the Government in this proposal because I think it is a correct step to acquire land, especially land that gives access to the sea. Recently land along the sea-coast has been purchased at exorbitant prices and residences have been erected, with the result that it is very difficult to get access to the sea; so that it is very necessary that the Government should acquire land in circumstances such as these, especially when the added interest of the establishment of Community Centres and Playing Fields is taken into consideration. There are sea-coast lands which had been used by people in the surrounding districts as playing fields —I can speak with knowledge of Dover, Christ Church,—for many years but owing to the law it was impossible for those persons to erect any kind of shed for the convenience of the players and the spectators. I do not know if the senior member for St. Thomas can tell me if there is any danger of infection from the use of the cholera grounds after these long number of years since the epidemic of cholera in Barbados. If there is no danger I can see no reason why the Government should not erect pavilions on those grounds, so that the people could use them for amusement in greater comfort. I know that in this country we are slow to change but if we are assured by someone with the technical knowledge that there is no danger of infection by using the cholera grounds I repeat that I see no reason why the people could not use them and if they cannot afford to erect pavilions or sheds for their convenience then the Government should assist them in so doing. Personally, I do not think that there is any danger. The mere fact that the cholera grounds have not been used for a very long time does away with the possibility of infection and I hope that the matter will be taken up by the Government and permission will be given to erect pavilions or sheds on these cholera grounds. For some years this question of access to the sea has been uppermost in the minds of the people of this Country. Some years ago, the Government acquired certain spots of land for the purpose and those spots of land have been used by people in this Country with a great degree of comfort. I know that the senior member for St. James will be able to speak on that subject with authority, and that the tendency has always been to assess the particular land at a figure whereby the owner does not suffer. In any case I think that this is a move in the right direction and I heartily support the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think a few more facts should be given in connection with this Resolution. My views on the compulsory acquisition of land are well known. I am one of those persons who do not believe that you should put the Land Acquisition Act into operation until you have explored every avenue and made every possible effort to get land from people otherwise. But, Sir, with regard to this question of playing fields, long before the Welfare Fund came into existence enlightened public opinion felt that there is the necessity for playing fields in the several parishes of the island. I have expressed privately my views—I think I have expressed them publicly also—on the subject but I do not think I have had the opportunity of expressing them in this House. I am going to do so now and I know that they may not be approved by quite a number of persons. Mr. Speaker, I feel this way about the matter: Before we even attempt to acquire land compulsorily for this purpose, some sort of co-operation should be sought between the Government, the Vestries, and other people, because, Sir, I am of the considered opinion that persons in this Country who have many acres of land in several parishes should not even think of selling some of it for the purpose of establishing playing fields but that they should give it free, gratis and for nothing or give it on a lease for 99 years at what is known as "a pepper-corn rent". I make no apology for saying that. I was much surprised when I read somewhere that a certain landowner in the parish of St. Thomas had been asking a price of £400 an acre for land for a playing field. I am one of those who believe that land should fetch what it is worth but I think that it is an outrageous thing for a landed proprietor in St. Thomas to charge such an outrageous price for land that is required for the establishment of a playing field. I feel that large companies who own land and individuals who own a certain amount should give part of it on a 99-year lease for the establishment of playing fields. I do not advocate the taking away of land from small plantation owners who have to use it for their livelihood but we have people in this Country—I am thinking of landowners in parishes such as Christ

Church, St. Thomas and St. Lucy—who are making a serious mistake in not showing the people of this Country that they are willing to co-operate. If these landowners give up portions of their lands for the purpose of playing fields they will discover in the future that it pays great dividends because you cannot expect people to work only. People are entitled to have a certain amount of recreation and undoubtedly the scope for recreation in this island has been limited for years. Now, Sir, this Resolution merely deals with 1 ac. 3 ro. of land belonging to an individual who is a small landowner in the parish of St. Joseph but I may mention quite seriously that there are some landowners in St. Joseph who could give up 4 or 5 acres of land for a playing field in that parish and let this lady keep her acre and three roods of land. There are persons in St. Joseph who have done well in this Country and they could well afford to give 4 or 5 acres of land each for the purpose of playing fields. It is unfortunate that the Vestry of the parish of St. Joseph who are the people responsible for the selection of the site for a playing field in that parish, did not select part of Joes River plantation. I ask honourable members to consider very seriously whether the Government should be asked to take away this lac. 3rd. of land from this poor individual which may be all her life's savings. There is no wonder that an agreement has not been reached in respect of the price for this land. Now I say this: If I were a member of the Vestry of the parish of St. Joseph I would have fought to the bitter end to see that my colleagues at that Vestry acquire land from those persons who could more afford to give up land. If you put the Land Acquisition Act into operation in this instance, you may be doing this small individual a great deal of harm and I throw out the suggestion to the Vestry of the parish of St. Joseph that it is their duty to reconsider this proposal and select as a site for a playing field part of the land of people who can afford to give 5 or 6 acres of land for the purpose. I am hoping that the senior member for St. Thomas, in his effort to convince us that we must pass this Resolution today, will tell us that the Vestry of St. Joseph has done every possible thing, that this is the only possible site to be obtained in St. Joseph for this purpose and that the Vestry cannot do otherwise than take away this poor woman's land when there are large plantation owners in the parish of St. Joseph. To me it is not fair to this lady. The junior member for St. Joseph is a member of the Vestry of the parish of St. Joseph and he should be able to tell this House if this is the only proper site for the establishment of a Community Centre and a playing field in the parish of St. Joseph. I do not pretend to know the parish of St. Joseph as well as he knows it but I know that you cannot tell me that Bathsheba is the only place in St. Joseph where you can get land for this purpose. I wonder if the Vestry of the parish of St. Joseph would have agreed to this proposal if this land belonged to one of the Vestrymen of the parish! I understand that the senior member for St. Lucy—I am throwing a bouquet at him — who owns vast acres in the parish of St. Lucy has given land for the establishment of a playing field. The junior member for St. James has done the same thing. Why can't other big landowners do likewise? There is, for instance, Mr. "Josh" Haynes who owns broad acres in the parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph and who could very well give 5 or 6 acres for a playing field and the sooner members on this side of the House get up and say so, the sooner there will be more harmony among the people in this Country. You do not bring in a Bill to compulsorily acquire some of Joes River land but poor Vera Hinkson's acre and three roods must be acquired compulsorily. I repeat that I do not think it is fair. I would welcome the Government coming here to take away some of Mr. Williams's land if he refused to let the Vestry of St. Joseph have it on reasonable terms for a Community Centre and Playing Field and I hope that other landowners will follow the example which the senior member for St. Lucy and the junior for St. James have set. Knowing the junior member for St. James as I do I say that it is not only a political gesture on his part because you only have to attend meetings of Boards with him and see how quickly he could see the turn of things and what should be done. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are colleagues of mine on this side of the table, with whom I spoke privately on this matter, who agree with what I have said but they might not want to get up and support what I have said. I suggest to the Government to reconsider the matter before this Resolution is passed.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I cannot see with the senior member for the City in this instance. I, for a moment, do not see that you are taking any advantage of this landlady. The landlady is quite willing to sell this land but she is asking an exorbitant price. I have had an interview with her. She wants to sell the land; therefore, I do not see that the Vestry of St. Joseph is doing her any wrong. The Vestry is perfectly right in getting as central a site as possible for the establishment of this Community Centre and Playing Field at Bath sheba. You are not depriving this lady of anything; she wants to sell the land but she is asking a price which I consider is exorbitant.

MR. SMITH: I sincerely hope that when honourable members are desirous of speaking on any subject that arises in this House they will satisfy themselves that they know something about what they are going to talk. Now, Sir, the senior member for the City asked us to-day why Joes River Company or Mr. Williams could not give a piece of land for this playing field and leave this poor lady with her acre and three roods of land. Sir, if Joes River Company had given us a whole plantation it would not suit the purpose of a playing field. This is a spot that abuts the old railway property that belongs to the Government. You will notice that the addendum to the Resolution states that the plot of land required for this purpose is just over three acres, of which an area of 1¼ acres is government land and 1¾ acres the property of Miss Vera Hinkson. The members of the Vestry of St. Joseph, of whom I am one, selected this site for this Community Centre and Playing Field, and while up to now I am not satisfied in my mind that it is a suitable site for a playing field yet it is an ideal site for a recreation centre. If the senior member for the City knows Bathsheba and ever went to that part of the island on a bank-holiday or on occasions when the Churches are having their Sunday School excursions, he would say "Oh yes; this is a suitable place for a Community Centre." Sometimes I believe that every resident in St. Michael, and St. James and Christ Church is at Bathsheba. You will see the buses lined up practically from Powell Spring bay house and on the morning after a holiday or an excursion you could not see a greater mess at any other site in this island than at Bathsheba. It is the only site in St. Joseph that is suitable for this purpose. If Joes River Company gave us 40 acres of land it would

not be as suitable as this site. The members of the Vestry of St. Joseph asked Miss Vera Hinkson to meet them on the spot and we negotiated with her for the purchase of this particular land. She told us that she would have to take the matter up with her people and give us a reply but that she was quite willing to sell the spot. If this lady built a bay house on this spot I would not be the person to rent it from her. I would not be able to sleep in it at night. It is not arable land and it abounds in manchineel trees. The only use to which that land could be put is a playing field. I feel that we are doing this lady a favour when we buy this spot from her. As I have said, it abuts government land but the Vestry would not be able to build a dance hall and have sufficient space for a playing field on the land that the government proposes to give us, This particular spot is not for a playing field only. We would be erecting bathing cubicles so that persons could have a fresh water bathe after a sea water bathe and the children from the other parishes will be able to amuse themselves in the dance hall. I thought that there was something about which the senior member for the City wanted to see me in a conversation over the telephone but he would not come to me and to-day he finds himself floundering and speaking on something about which he knows nothing. If he wanted the facts he should have communicated with me, although I do not think the *Advocate* would publish them to-morrow morning. This lady is asking too high a price for this land; it is the opinion of the Playing Field Committee of the Vestry, including myself, that the price she asks for is too high but we still want the spot for the benefit of the people in the island as a whole; this playing field will be for the use of the people of the whole island and not of St. Joseph's parish alone. This lady refused to take less for the land and the only thing that was left for the Playing Field Committee to do was to refer the matter to the Government and if the Government sees its way to pay her that price, then it is O.K. with the Vestry of St. Joseph, but we shall have done our duty. It is quite possible that appraisers may give her more than what she has asked for; we have to rely on them for their valuation and I hope that they will arrive at a very reasonable figure because the residents of Bathsheba and all over the island are badly in need of a Community Centre and Playing Field of this sort.

Mr. ALLDER: My only regret is that this Act is going to be used against what is termed a small landowner but the argument adduced by previous speakers is that the desire to own this land is based on the fact that the Government already owns a piece adjoining it and that the two pieces would enable them to establish a Community Centre as well as a playing field on the site. But, Sir, I am hoping that this is the insertion of the thin edge of the wedge to control, direct, and redistribute the land in this colony. If a similar occurrence takes place in the parish of St. James, that is to say, if an attempt is made to obtain a specific piece of land for the establishment of a playing field in that parish and the price asked for is exorbitant, this incident gives me greater hope that this Act will be applied. As regards the question of playing fields I know that we are going to meet with great difficulty in getting land in the several parishes suitable for the purpose, and I am glad that we have started to act on this particular piece of legislation so as to meet the future with greater assurance in regard to the actions of certain land owners in this colony.

Mr. FOSTER: I am not making a second speech but I would like to draw to the attention of the mover of this Resolution that this lady's name is now—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

Dr. CUMMINS: The point which the junior member for St. Andrew wants to draw to the attention of this House is a very small point. I have discussed it already with one or two legal men that is, when the Executive Committee or the Vestry of St. Joseph first dealt with this lady, her name was then Vera Hinkson, but she has since married. However, that is a small point. But what amuses me is the ease with which some honourable members of this House get up and elaborate on a subject about which they know nothing. The senior member for the City was most fulsome on this matter and he knows nothing about it. The history of this land is that it adjoins 1¼ acres of land which is already owned by the Government, and the Vestry wants this piece of land to add to what the Government already has for the purpose set out by my friend, the junior member for St. Joseph. The senior member for the City said that we are taking advantage of this poor woman who has to depend on this land for a livelihood. Nothing is farther from the truth. This land is barren land. As the junior member for St. Joseph said, nothing but manchineel trees would grow on it and this lady asked £500 an acre for the land. The Vestry of St. Joseph thought that price was too high and offered her £400 per acre for it; that she also refused and even that price was too much. The Vestry knew that it was too much but they wanted to get the scheme going and inasmuch as this lady refused the £400 per acre offered her, the Government thought that this was the only means of obtaining the land. Now as regards the point raised by the junior member for St. Thomas, my honourable and worthy colleague, and supported by the senior member for St. John, I will say that the Government intends, wherever and whenever necessary, to use this means. The Vestries of the several parishes are requested by the Government to select sites for Community Centres and Playing Fields in their respective parishes and after a Vestry has bargained for the purchase of a suitable site and is unable to come to a decision, the Government, wherever and whenever it thinks it is necessary, will take steps to acquire land compulsory for this purpose. Those are the main points I want to answer. I cannot add anything to what has been said by the junior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, there is only one statement I want to make. It may be true to say that £500 an acre is excessive, considering that only manchineel trees will grow on this land, but one has to bear in mind that this land is situated at what, as the junior member for St. Joseph said earlier today, is known as a seaside resort *par excellence* in the island. Six cents a square foot is really not too high for seaside land at Bathsheba. As a seaside resort Bathsheba certainly outranks Dover, Silver Sands and some parts of Maxwell Coast. Spots at Dover are being sold now—spots on which only manchineel and grape trees grow—and from what I understand that land is sold at $8,000 an acre A ¼ acre spot costs around $2,000. I do not think that the remark that the owner of this land depends on it for a livelihood is meant to suggest that she cultivates it for a livelihood or her income. What is meant is that being a woman of limited means she may

have been looking forward to this land as a nest-egg when she disposes of it; that it may bring her some money which would be of some use to her in years to come. I agree with the idea of the Government acquiring land wherever and whenever at the cheapest possible rate and that is why, when we bought the Central Foundry's land at over £3 per sq. ft., I objected to it most strongly. As a matter of fact I voted against it and even though this woman may be a woman in moderate or poor circumstances, if she was trying to exploit the situation I would also express my strong objection at any attempt on her part to exploit the Government. But I defy any member of the Government to go to any part of Bathsheba today and purchase land, even 200 yards from the seafront, for building or for this purpose for less than £500 an acre. Land on the whole is being sold at 12 cents per sq. ft. Even on Cleavers Hill a small residence was sold not so long ago and the land fetched a price in the vicinity of ten cents per sq. ft. The person who bought it is a well known businessman and he bought it for the purpose of erecting a seaside house. If a private individual was going to buy this land from this lady for building purposes, she would not be offered less than £500 per acre. There is land adjacent to this land and owned by the Government which it refused to sell but which it leased to a Mr. Cardy. I forget the figure, but he paid the Government a high rental value for the land on which his hotel stood and if the Government was selling this land, it would not sell it for less than six cents per square foot. I do not think that the demand is excessive if the owner of this land demanded six cents per square foot for it. The junior member for St. Joseph knows that when the Vestry decided not to pay the price asked for, at least two of the same vestrymen would have paid more for it if they could have bought it privately. If the honourable member does not know that, I am sure that the owner of the land would tell it to him. While, I repeat, the Government is in duty bound to endeavour to get this land as cheaply as possible, I do not think that the owner would be robbing the Treasury if we paid her the six cents per sq. ft. which she asked for.

The question that this Resolution do now pass is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: DR. CUMMINS, MESSRS. SMITH, FOSTER, ALLDER, MAPP, MILLER, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, MOTTLEY, E. K. WALCOTT, WILKINSON, and WARD — 16.

Noes: MESSRS. GILL and BETHELL — 2.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the House is adjourned until 5.30 o'clock p.m.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Replies to Questions No. 6 standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

EXPENDITURE *re* PROPAGATION OF TREES

Mr. ADAMS: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman is a Resolution for $4,500 to supplement the Estimates 1950—51. Part I, Current, as shown in the the Supplementary Estimates 1950-51, No. 11, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

As honourable members will see from the Addendum, this amount is required in connection with the planting of trees; it is to meet the purchase of 50,000 pots at 6 cents each. $3,000, and the cost of labour in connection with the collection and sifting the mould, and with the sowing, potting and care of the seedling trees, $1,500. The question of the planting of trees is fresh in the minds of honourable members and therefore it is unnecessary for me to do more than move the passing of the Resolution. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

EXPENSES *re* CULTIVATION OF TREES

Mr. ADAMS: The next Resolution, Mr Chairman, is one for $1,600 to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part II, Capital Estimates, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950-51, No. 12, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

As honourable members will see from the Addendum, this amount is needed for the purpose of extending the existing potting shed so as to provide more room for planting especially the 50,000 young plants the purchase of which is mentioned in the Resolution which has just been passed. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolutions passed in Committee were read a first and second time and agreed to.

STATEMENT *RE* VESTRIES AND JURORS (AMENDMENT) BILLS

Mr. ADAMS: As regards the next two Orders—Second reading of a Bill to provide for the qualification and registration of voters for a Vestry, and second reading of a Bill to amend the Jurors Act and to set out the qualifications for Jurors—I would like to make a statement which arises from the fact that a misunderstanding has arisen in the minds of some members of the Other Place on reading a rather inaccurate version in the *Advocate* newspaper of what I said about these Bills in the House. It is to be understood that one realises that a newspaper even of the size of the *Advocate* cannot publish verbatim what honourable members say and I sympathise with Reporters who find it difficult always to hear what honourable members say and who must of necessity make a *precis* of what is said: but it is unfortunate that as that version read, it gave the impression

that either the Government or myself was trying to threaten the Other Place. I said that I had intended when I came into the House to ask leave to deal with these two Bills in all their stages, but it occurred to me that to have proceeded with these Bills would have been an attempt to restore something which has not yet been repealed. I feel that Your Honour will not be offended if I say that if Your Honour advises, and if after consultation with some hon. members who might have been for a long time members of this House, it is felt that it is in order to proceed with these Bills, I am perfectly willing and anxious to proceed with them; but it appeared to me that the Act has not yet been changed, which would change the qualifications for Vestrymen or jurors, and until that was done it seemed illogical to make an amendment to put back something which has not yet been removed. I wish to make clear what the Government's position is. It is up to the Other Place to do anything they like with the Bill which has been sent up to them; no one would be so impertinent as to dictate to the Other Place what they should do or what they should not do. When the Other Place amends the law, then the occasion for putting back the qualifications for Vestrymen and jurors will arise. I give the absolute assurance that it is not the policy of the Government to attempt to alter those qualifications by the proposed alteration which affects the qualifications of members and voters in respect of the General Assembly. When Your Honour intimates to me what is Your Honour's view, I shall act accordingly. As regards Order No. 11—Second reading of a Bill to provide for the regulation of Public Utilities—I understand that that Bill has not yet been printed. I ask leave to postpone the consideration of these three Orders.

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

ADDRESS *RE* PURCHASE OF ROSEGATE TENANTRY

Mr. ALLDER: I ask leave to proceed with the Address of which I gave notice earlier this afternoon as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I want my objection to be noted: if any honourable member wants to bring forward anything as a matter of urgency, I think it is but fair to other members that they should be made aware of it in proper time. If it is a matter of life and death, by all means we can proceed with it; but otherwise the procedure of the House would be destroyed if an honourable member can bring forward a matter affecting his constituency and have it debated right away. The House is not a place for convenience.

Dr. CUMMINS: I too, want to have my objection noted. I heard the honourable member read an Address earlier this afternoon and he showed me the Address. It is an Address of a serious nature. In my opinion it should be printed and circulated so as to allow honourable members to have time to study it.

The question that this Address be made the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business was put and resolved in the affirmative, the following division being taken:—

Ayes: Messrs. SMITH, REECE, ALLDER, MILLER, MAPP, E. K. WALCOTT, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, MOTTLEY, GILL and GODDARD—(11).

Noes: Dr .CUMMINS Messrs. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, WILKINSON and WARD—(6).

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. John:—To move the passing of an Address to His Excellency the Governor relating to the acquisition by the Government of the Tenantry known as "Rosegate" in the parish of St. John.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker, — This Address reads as follows:—

The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly is of the opinion that the distribution of the landed area in this Colony has not been kept in line with the growth and expansion of the population.

2. The House of Assembly observes that unless a policy for re-distribution of the landed area in this Colony becomes practical, any attempt to implement the programme of the rehousing of the people (to which the Government has already committed itself), would be met with difficulty.

3. The House of Assembly is aware that the Tenantry in the parish of St. John, known as Rosegate, (and comprised of thirty acres, more or less), is on the market for sale.

4. The House of Assembly is aware that many of the present tenants have lived most of their lives on this land, and would find it difficult to obtain land elsewhere; further that they have not the means to purchase the spots on which their houses now stand without Government assistance.

5. The House of Assembly would give favourable consideration to a Resolution sent down by Your Excellency for the purpose of acquiring this Tenantry to be used under the scheme for rehousing the people, as is being done at the Bay Estate.

6. The House of Assembly therefore, respectfully request Your Excellency to take immediate steps, which would give effect to this request.

This Address needs no pressing if honourable members know the land situation in this colony and remember the difficult circumstances which confronted those people of Carrington's Village when that tenantry was sold out and the people had to remove their houses off the land for which some honourable members of this House said at the time that an exorbitant price had been charged. Mr. Speaker, I am approaching the passing of this Address with a certain amount of unhappiness brought about by the unwillingness of the four members of this House who sit as members of the Executive Committee to consider the Address and who finally will have to give their assent to its passing when it reaches the Executive Committee. I am going to try to get honourable members to see the wisdom of this matter and the sympathy which it deserves and there is also the question of the people who expect to suffer if the Government does not step in and give them the assistance which they need. For the past three weeks I have had several tenants of this same tenantry coming to me with the fear that some of them will have to leave this land; one man said that he lived there for 48 years, another said that he lived there for 30 years and so on down the line. These people have been accustomed to living on plantation land without any trouble of having to remove their houses, but for some reason or other, recently the owners of this tenantry have decided to sell it and that is why all these tenants are running around trying to ask for mercy. I told them that the only thing that lies in my power to do is to appeal to the sympathy of their Government to see what it can do to save the situation in their interest. I feel that this would be an easy decision for the Government to make

inasmuch as tenantries which cost several hundred times more than these 30 odd acres are going to cost, have been bought and up to now they have not been put into use. The Government has published its decision to carry a similar scheme which exists at the Bay Land and the Pine to every parish and that is what has caused me to feel that this would be a good opportunity for the Government to go to a rural district and implement what has already been implemented in St. Michael. Knowing the difficulty which exists to get large portions of land in an agricultural district, I feel that this land would be a God-send to the Government; hence I decided by the wish of the people to bring forward this Address. I feel that it is the duty of the Government to see that the people in the country areas—those unfortunate people who have watered the canefields with their sweat and blood, who have been exploited for over 300 years and who are now in the gullies—are brought to the front and given the amenities which they need. To-day the first honourable member to protest against this Address is the same honourable member———

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of order. I did not protest against the Address; I protested against the honourable member having this Address made the first Order of the Day. If the honourable member knew about this matter for the last three weeks he should have brought it here so that I would know about it too.

Mr. ALLDER: To further clarify the matter, the honourable member is opposing an Address of this nature.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I want the honourable member to be correct; I am not against the passing of the Address.

Mr. ALLDER: A man who lives on this same tenantry came to me about one o'clock to-day and told me that he met the honourable senior member for St. Michael and the honourable member told him that the Government is not going to consider the matter. I am asking if the honourable member was expressing the policy of the Executive Committee or if the statement came from him alone. I told the man that I was surprised to hear that the honourable senior member for St. Michael had said that, and that I doubted whether the Government knew anything about the Address and therefore a responsible member of the Executive Committee should not express himself as he did before anything came before them. All these things do not help the progress of the masses of this colony: I feel that the time has come when sympathy must not only be preached but it should be practised towards the underprivileged people who long wanted legislators who really know their suffering and who in truth and in fact will show their sympathy in whatever policy they adopt as a Government. If the Government does consider the horrible plight in which these tenants find themselves, the only alternative for these people would be to resolve themselves to accept whatever burden might be placed upon them by virtue of the activities of a land hungry population as we have in this colony. High prices and several other things come about as a result of land being highly in demand and there are always people who are willing to pay even more for the land than what is its true value. These tenants cannot compete in the market against those who are stronger financially and who want to buy the land; they only have to hope that somebody who has power at his disposal will come in and save the situation, and the only saviour whom they can have is the Government which they have reinstated. If that Government leaves them out they must resolve themselves to be cast to the commercial wolves as we know we have. I would not be surprised if some individual paid the sum required for the whole tenantry and then told the people: "Give me so much and so much for this land or get off; your Government has refused to buy it and therefore———

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the honourable member should accuse the Government of something which is not before them. I am just warning the honourable member.

Mr. ALLDER: I thank Your Honour but it has been intimated to me that this Address will not bring the result which is desirable. I have made a few points and I notice that the Government which I feel knows the real circumstances of the masses is not even being sympathetic, but it has on many occasions expressed its sympathy for the masses. I hope that the time although short, will be sufficient to give the Government the opportunity to arouse its sympathy and see what can be done in the interest of these tenants. I can see the difficulty with which a Government can be confronted if there is before it a project which calls for a large amount of money to finance it; but the purchase of 30 odd acres of land in a rural parish cannot call for any large sum of money or for a larger sum of money than I have seen passed by this House within a day in respect of another project. I have taken the trouble to approach the manager who is in charge of this land and he told me that there are 58 tenants on the land and when I say that 58 tenants are there, it does not mean that only 58 people are involved. Knowing the congestion which takes place in the country owing to the limited areas of land for expansion, you can multiply that number by 5 or 6 and have the exact number of people who are living on that tenantry. As we know, most of the land in these areas is controlled by the plantation owners who only give way to the demands for house spots to the immediate labourers. This particular land has already been developed; roads have been laid down and the manager in charge told me that the the people get a good yield per year from their crops. I would like to ask this question: Would it be fair or right or requisite for us as a Government to allow these people to be rooted up from the land which they have husbanded for so many years and leave all that they have enjoyed to be enjoyed by somebody else? I say "No"; that should not be so. If you say that this is a matter which calls for a sacrifice, then it is a necessary sacrifice to save the people. As a matter of fact, when I suggested that there was partiality in the extension of social services to the various parishes I was accused of doing a lot of wrongs; but does not what has taken place this afternoon strengthen the feeling of any impartial onlooker that somebody does not want to go out of a particular parish to affect improvements that are necessary? It is not fitting for a Government to be partial because the built-up areas in any place are consequent upon the sacrifice made by the inhabitants of the rural or agricultural districts; and when it comes to the expenditure of Government revenue, that should be done for the benefit of all. We should not pick out a parish or two and do things and feel that in respect of other parishes the people have always been accustomed to hardships and privations and therefore we need not address ourselves to them. I would certainly like, Mr. Speaker, to hear the arguments which are going to be adduced 18 months from now; I hope that the people will take things into their own hands and do what any aspiring people should do. We have the example of the Belgian people who have decided that the only salvation for the masses is action by the masses, instead of a few people who feel that they have all the political power that there is on earth and therefore they must do whatever they like regardless of th

feelings of others. What co-operation are you talking about when you do not want to be reciprocal in your dealings? Do you think that everybody must support Mr. "A" but Mr. "A" must not support you? Do you think that everybody will sit quietly all the time? Somebody must bell the cat; we cannot go on like this all the time. I have seen members who have given this Government trouble and they are in support———

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member still speaking on this Address?

Mr. ALLDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To those who feel that I want to give this Government trouble I say that it is far from me to do that. I am trying to cause some members of the Government to come down from the clouds, see things as they are and do things which people feel they should do. I would feel proud to say that you are justified in claiming my support because this and that have been done in my interest. When I see that things are not done, it raises my ire; it is not true that I do not want to see the Government progress.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is dealing with the Government more than with the subject-matter of this Address: I warned the honourable member sometime ago.

Mr. ALLDER: I was only trying to clinch the argument for the passing of this Address. I am closing now in anticipation of the kindness which the people expect of the Government in implementing this Address. I beg to move that this Address do now pass.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg to second the motion. I read the text of the Address for the first time about half an hour ago. This Address is comprised of six paragraphs: the first two paragraphs express the opinion of the honourable mover with regard to the maldistribution of land in the colony and propose that something should be done to remedy the situation. The other four paragraphs merely ask the Government to consider the possibility of purchasing Rosegate Tenantry in the parish of St. John, which tenantry is now on the market for sale, and claims that the House would give favourable consideration to any action which is taken by the Government to acquire this tenantry. Paying due attention to what this Address sets out, it is absolutely impossible to appreciate the opposition which the Address encountered earlier this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot sit here and allow that remark: I cannot see that the Address has encountered any opposition.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Perhaps I had better put it this way: the opposition centred around the suggestion that the Address should be considered to-day. It may be true that the honourable mover should have circularised members of the House with copies of the Address earlier to-day, but that breaks no revolutionary ground; in principle, it is nothing more than what we have done before. When we purchased the Bay Estate for an amount probably ten times more than what this land will cost, the honourable mover had the Address on that occasion passed without opposition giving the Government a blank cheque to purchase that Estate. The Government was given *carte blanche* in the matter of the purchase of the Bay Estate when we already had the Pine Estate, Waterford and Deacon's Road properties, and could there be any opposition to telling the Government that this House would consider the proposal to acquire this tenantry in St. John in order to save probably over 200 people from being chased off the land on which they now live? This Address does not ask the Government to commit itself to anything more than they have done before; it only says that the House would give favourable consideration to the matter. A glance at this Address for two seconds would be enough to satisfy even the most captious spirit that so long as the House has the time to devote to the proposal, so long as we are not committing ourselves any further than we are asked to do, certainly no harm can be done by supporting this Address. After all, we know how matters such as this go in this country; this is a very land hungry country and it is impossible to acquire an acre of agricultural land in this parish under $1,800 or $2,000. If the Government in implementing its housing policy want land even if we create our central Housing Authority and buy two or three sites in every parish for carrying out housing schemes, it is difficult, except by expropriation, to acquire an area of land of comparable size in this parish because the land is not in the market. This is an excellent opportunity for the Government to obtain an appreciable site well situated in the parish, near a main highway and already developed to some extent—a site which can be further developed for the purpose of housing. I want to submit that I have seen matters far more revolutionary in nature than this one, supported by this House at even shorter notice; and I want further to submit that the honourable member in asking the House to support this Address this afternoon is merely discharging to the best of his ability and as effectively as he can, the obligation which he owes to his constituents. As a matter of fact, were he to sit there and know that this estate is in the market and know the position in which the tenants would find themselves if the estate were acquired by private enterprise and did nothing at all about it, he would be most severely censured by the same people who were opposing the consideration of the Address this afternoon on the ground that they want more time to consider it. I suggest that if they did severely censure the honourable member for not doing anything in the matter, they would have been doing it with justification for the simple reason that you do not get 33 acres of land of this sort for sale every day and therefore when you do get it you have to strike while the iron is hot. In view of the bitter experiences which we have had in the Carrington's Village and the Bay Estate affairs we have to exercise every possible care and utilise every possible opportunity to see that these bitter experiences are not repeated.

One phase of this matter to which I would like to make reference in passing although not perhaps directly connected with the subject of this Address, is this: Under the Labour Welfare Housing Scheme we are now lending money to workers in the sugar industry to repair or extend or construct their homes; most of these people at present live on land owned by the plantation on which they work, and it is exceedingly difficult for people to contemplate making considerable extensions to their properties when the tenure of the land on which their houses are situated is so relatively insecure. The ultimate success of your housing scheme with respect to Labour Welfare is to be achieved by making it possible, at the earliest possible date, for workers in the sugar industry in every parish to own the piece of land on which they are going to construct their new homes. Therefore one would think that people who profess to have the interest of these people at heart would welcome with both hands and promise to give the utmost consideration to any proposal which sought to make it easier for people to acquire their own house spots, or which sought to make it easier for the Government to help people to acquire property with something approximating a secure holding of the land on which their houses stand. I have seen on more than one occasion in the past that comparable areas were in the market in parishes throughout the island and the representatives of the particular parishes suggested to the Government that these areas should be acquired for a similar purpose to that suggested in this Address. Some suggestions have been successful and others have not been successful; but I know per-

haps better than many other honourable members that the land hunger in this parish is very acute, and the possibility of obtaining land either for housing or for agricultural purposes is very remote. Therefore I sincerely hope that when we support the proposal contained in this Address the Government will not only favourably consider it, but will actually take practical steps to act in the spirit and letter of the Address. With regard to the price of the land and the other details, those are things with which the Authorities should concern themselves immediately; but I suggest that this is a matter which will brook of no delay. It is a matter in which the Authorities should act with all possible expedition in order to allay the apprehension which now exists on the part of the tenants who now occupy the spots. Any action on the part of the Government along the lines I suggest will be sincerely appreciated not merely by the honourable senior member for St. John and myself, but also by the people who are most directly concerned in this very vital matter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When I rose to take objection to this Address being taken as Order No. 1 on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business I gave as my reason for doing so that I knew nothing about the Address. I never had a hint that an Address of this nature was coming before the House. This is a very important Address. If you refer to the Government introducing anything one day and the House considering it the same day, I want to say that the Government has introduced matters and when honourable members said that they wanted more time to consider them, the request was granted. When the Government introduces anything of which there is no knowledge beforehand it comes before the House as a case of an emergency. The purchase of the site of the Central Foundry is an instance of an emergency; the Government was pressed to do something. When we hear the honourable mover talking about the Government not being sympathetic, I would like to say that the four members of the Government were so unsympathetic that they could stand by the side of the honourable member on each occasion when he ran against the rocks so that he could be here to-day. The honourable member could not put sentences together so as to make himself understood. The people who helped him are those who are unsympathetic to-day; that is the gratitude you get from people whom you have tried to assist. The honourable member has a short memory; he has a new friend. The four members of the Government stood by the honourable member but now he is here, we are the first persons whom he can attack. The honourable member can continue———

Mr. ALLDER: On a point of order. Is the honourable member speaking on this Address?

Mr. SPEAKER: As I spoke to the honourable senior member for St. John I shall speak to the honourable senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: No honourable member can prevent me from expressing my views. I got up to say what I have said and I thank Your Honour for your indulgence.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I think I can throw some light on this matter and I will do so for the benefit of hon. members. I am not voting for the Address, not because I do not appreciate the urgency of the matter and the position of the people who now occupy this tenantry, but because I am partly financially interested in the matter at the moment. I speak therefore in my professional capacity. It is true that this tenantry of 32 acres is for sale in my office and therefore hon. members will see where I have financial interest which I am proud to have. This tenantry is presently owned by Mr. H. O. Emtage and my instructions are to take steps in the usual way, make application to to the Public Health Department and offer the land for sale. Mr. Emtage's instructions are that under no circumstances must any of the tenants be removed; he has made it clear that if some of the tenants want to buy any of the land and they have not got any money, the matter must be referred to him personally for him to make a decision. This tenantry is not a tenantry in the sense of the Bay or Carrington's Village; the land is rented from half acre to two acre lots, it is under cultivation now and there are on it 30 tenants—speaking under correction. It runs from Guinea Plantation and on to the property of a former member of this House near Massiah Street. This is an agricultural tenantry and most of the tenants are labouring people and they are at present employed between Guinea and Mount Pleasant Plantations. I rose so as to let the House know the true position and when I leave the Chamber it will be known why I am unable to vote for the Address. In accordance with tradition and procedure I am not voting for the Address because I am financially interested in this matter. I rose also to make Mr. Emtage's position clear from the point of view that he is going to do all in his power in the interest of the tenants. I usually like to do business as a businessman should do it; I do not like any reservations made when property is for sale in my office. The reservations made by Mr. Emtage are that the Board of Health be informed of this matter and if the tenants can buy this land when the price of it is fixed, he will sell it to them; under no circumstances must anyone be removed if he cannot buy the land which he occupies. From what I have said it will be seen that Mr. Emtage's idea is to allow those people who are on the land to remain there. Also on the land are some people who are not labourers; I have not got the same conditions for them, but in respect of the labourers Mr. Emtage has made it clear that they will be allowed to remain on the land and no advantage is to be taken of them. I do not vote for this Address not because I am not in sympathy with it, because it looks as if the Government buys this property there will be one sale. (Mr ADAMS: There will be more money). In this case there will be less money. I think that hon. members have seen the position quite clearly: anybody who is interested in this property can see me to-morrow after the speeches here to-day.

Mr. REECE: This debate has focussed the attention of everybody on the need of a land policy which will ensure the proper division and use of land in this country. We are an agricultural community and it is essential that a large portion of the land should remain under cultivation for the purpose of giving employment to the people of the community. It is also essential that a part of the land should be used to house workers in the agricultural industry and indeed other persons who live in this colony. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph only recently dealt with this question under another matter which was then under debate; the honourable member was really speaking more of the holdings of agricultural workers and the need for them to have holdings with which they could feel safe and without the fear that they will have to remove. We must carry on with agriculture and we must house the population. This question of a land policy must be dealt with sooner or later, and it is not a question which can be solved by the mere acquisition of land and erecting model tenantries; it is a much bigger and wider question than that. This is a question which must be solved if we are to continue to flourish. We have a tremendous population, we must find work for the people and we must house them; we will have to decide how much of our land can be used purely for agricultural pur-

poses and how much can be used for housing the population. This is an important problem and it must be tackled. In the past the Government has acquired land in St. Michael with the idea of easing the tenantry problems which have arisen in the parish; but it is not only in the parish of St. Michael that these problems have arisen; throughout the island large tenantries have sprung up and I feel that the sooner we have a settled policy whereby not only the acquisition of land will be considered but also the wider and bigger question of the proportion in which the land should be used for the purpose of agriculture and for housing—the sooner we tackle that problem the better it will be for us. The population of this colony is increasing by leaps and bounds and if we continue to increase at the rate at which we are going and people are not regimented when it comes to this land question, we are going to find ourselves in a most difficult situation. It is for that reason that I was glad to hear the honourable senior member for St. Joseph deal with the question of the housing of workers employed on sugar estates; but that is not an end of the question. The Government has been thinking of a policy and it must be borne in mind that in that policy it will have to be decided exactly how much of the land we can use to create the wealth of the colony and how much can be used for housing. I am in favour of this Address; I think we should acquire this land. I feel that it is not only in respect of the parish of St. Michael that housing schemes are needed: these schemes should be put forward throughout the length and breadth of the island. Although there is much in the suggestion of the honourable mover that the acquisition of this land by the Government should be favourably considered, yet there is the wider problem which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has already begun to give attention, and each and every member of this House who has the interest of the community at heart must face it. I repeat that this problem cannot be settled merely by the acquisition from time to time of individual spots in the colony which are set up for sale in the open market; that will only ease the situation. The problem is wider and much more fundamental than that and I feel that it would have to be given proper attention by the Government.

Mr. LEWIS: I got here in time to hear the opening of the debate on this Address, and Sir, it strikes me that this is a matter which is not out of keeping with the policy of the present Government: therefore I do not see any reason why this matter should be taken so much as a surprise. I am very glad to hear my colleague speak early in the debate because I remember the House passing an Address asking that a small plantation be purchased and it turned out that the plantation was not on the market for sale. I am glad to hear that this land is really for sale and that there are certain conditions attached to the purchase of it. An Address of this sort is for the purpose of asking the Government to consider purchasing this land, and the House would vote the money if it is felt that the land should be purchased. If it is discovered that there are any objectionable conditions, then the Government would not purchase this land. There is one observation which I would like to make as a member representing a part of St. Michael; I feel that the people of this colony may say that all the land which the Government is buying for housing and other schemes seems to be bought in the parish of St. Michael, and after all, it is the taxes of the people of the island as a whole with which the Government purchases the land; I feel that if a gesture is made towards the people in the country, it may have the good effect of giving people the impression that the Government is not confining the purchase of land to the parish of St. Michael. I do not know if the idea in this Address is to ask the Head of the Administration to regard this matter as a scheme for re-housing people as is being done in the case of the Bay Estate; in so far as the Bay Estate is concerned, I do not think that that land is rented in lots of half an acre or an acre. A housing scheme in a suburban area is different from housing agricultural people and the housing of agricultural people is something which would be considered as being essential. I suggest that the honourable mover of this Address should accept an amendment setting out that this land should be used as an agricultural housing scheme, because I think it is somewhat misleading to tell the Head of the Administration that this tenantry should be bought for a scheme such as the one at the Bay Estate. I suggest that the words after the word "Tenantry" in paragraph 5 be deleted and the words "to be used as an Agricultural Housing Scheme" be substituted therefor. I do not think that the Government should go into the country and merely provide people with houses because the people will also want a piece of land. I think we should know what is the attitude of the Government in this matter. I express the opinion that since the majority of land is purchased in the parish of St. Michael, it is a good thing not to let the people in other parishes feel that they are not being considered at all. I feel that a Socialist Government which is committed to a land policy should find money to carry it out; the Government should feel that they can make a success of this policy and give to people that security which private enterprise does not altogether give. We have just bought land at Waterford out of current revenue, we had a Resolution to-day in respect of current revenue and it seems that we cannot say that we have not got any money. I repeat that this matter is nothing which a Socialist Government should be surprised about because it is the policy to which they must be committed if they are really Socialists.

Mr. COX: Perhaps if I had not been drawn into this debate in the manner in which I was drawn into it, I would not have said anything on this particular question. I think it is but fair that I should take this opportunity to reply to any accusation that is made as a result of the proposed purchase of this tenantry. I should like to say that from 1944 and even before then, I was acquainted with some of the Rules of the House and I have tried as far as possible to keep in line with those Rules. As far as I remember, the honourable senior member for St. John asked leave that this Address be taken as the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business; and when leave to proceed with a matter has been asked for and objection is raised, I am accustomed to seeing a division taken and then a motion is made to the effect that the matter be dealt with. If that motion is agreed to, or if the suspension of a Rule is agreed to by twelve honourable members, then the matter is proceeded with. I was merely objecting to this Address being made the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business, it was not a question of there being opposition to the Address. Before I go further I should like to say quite frankly that I am in sympathy with the spirit of this Address. I remember bringing the Address, to which the honourable junior member for St. Philip referred, before the House in 1947 and asking that it be dealt with on the same day that notice was given of it. In giving notice of that Address, I also gave notice of my intention to ask for leave to deal with it, and when the time came for dealing with the Address I went

through the procedure as I saw it established in this House. What I have seen take place to-day is quite different from what took place at that time.

During the course of his remarks the honourable senior member for St. John said that a man told him that I said that the Government was not prepared to purchase this tenantry. I should like to say here and now that I was prepared to give the honourable member as much as I could give him this afternoon for saying that, but inasmuch as I have since then been informed by an individual that he was present when this man did make use of those remarks, I would like to say that the honourable member has got off. What has happened is this: I met this gentleman from St. John somewhere in Roebuck Street this afternoon and he told me about this land being for sale. My suggestion to him was that an Address should be passed by the House asking the Government to purchase this land, and he intimated to me that some individual had already arranged to have that done. This gentleman raised another question about the Government purchasing this land and selling it to the people, and there is where I said that I could not express any opinion on the matter, but I did not think that would happen inasmuch as in respect of all the land which the Government has bought up to now, and on which people have been placed, there was no indication as far as I knew, that the Government would sell the land to the people. To return to the honourable junior member for St. Philip for some reason or other he has changed his manner to a large extent; I do not know if the political flogging which he has got has caused him to see that he cannot fool people any longer———

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind the honourable member that the honourable junior member for St. Philip is not in his place.

Mr. COX: I apologize Sir. When I brought before this House that Address relative to the purchase of the Bay Estate, I particularly sought the assistance of that honourable member and he told me in no uncertain terms that the Government was not going to purchase that Estate; that the Government had much land on its hand and it was willing to sell some of it, let alone purchasing more. I remember well that in the absence of the honourable Leader of the House, the honourable junior member for St. Philip put his signature to the price of the Bay Estate as being an equitable price. The price of the land was £65,000 and the honourable member came into the House and tried to make people believe that the price of the land was exorbitant and things of that sort although it was pointed out to him that the land was purchased at 6¼ cents per square foot, whereas the land at Carrington's Village was sold between 60 cents and $1 per square foot. I am very glad to see that he has seen the wisdom of changing his manner of discussing political questions, he having had to get a good flogging in order that he could be brought to his senses. I have shown absolutely no opposition to this particular Address: I did not tell that man what the honourable senior member for St. John has said, but it is one thing——— —

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed the honourable member to make a personal explanation and that is sufficient.

Mr. COX: I regret that the honourable senior member for St. John was not man enough to say at the same time what was also told him that is, that I said if he presented this Address I would help him to get it through. I am sorry that when the honourable member was making his allegation he did not also say that; I am sure that the same impression would not have been conveyed as I know has been conveyed. I have always said that in order to make sure that people have some sort of security of tenure it would be a wise thing for the Government to purchase these areas of land when they are available.

Mr. FOSTER: I am supporting this Address; I feel that the Government is very fortunate in having the opportunity to purchase this land. I think it would be a wise thing for the Government to take every opportunity of putting forward a housing scheme particularly in the country areas. I myself was thinking of bringing in an Address asking the Government to help the people in St. Andrew in this respect; therefore I support this Address wholeheartedly.

Mr. ADAMS: I am appealing to the honourable senior member for St. John not to proceed with this Address but to postpone the consideration of it for a reason which arises apart from the nature of this debate. There is a second reason which arises from the speech of the honourable senior member for the City, and the honourable senior member for St. John must see from that speech that the whole foundation of his argument has fallen to the ground. For a third reason I am appealing to the honourable member if he means what he says that he is sympathetic with this Government—for a third reason I am appealing to him to see that if an important matter has been suddenly thrust upon the Government, the members who support the Government, ought to have an opportunity of conferring among themselves in order to agree on a policy. The honourable member brought the proposed Address to me; I did not take the time to read every line of it, but I noted the gist of it and I promptly told him that it was a matter which the Government could not support at present because we have already said that we are not indulging in any extra capital expenditure until we have made a fiscal survey in order to know how much we can put aside for a harbour scheme and how much we can put aside from Labour Welfare Funds for the purchase of land. When the honourable member makes his threat and throws out his challenge, I say that if he wants a showdown he can have it; and if the people of this island have to judge between him and the Labour Party they are not so foolish as to give him the decision. What is the good of the honourable member saying that he is sympathetic with the Government and is yet throwing accusations against the Government when he knows what the position is? The honourable member was asked to postpone the consideration of the Address and he was given the reason for that. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew has given the honourable senior member for St. John one of the best possible reasons why the Government could not possibly look favourably on this matter today; the honourable junior member for St. Andrew is coming with an Address next week, the honourable junior member for St. Thomas is also coming with one and everybody who has a tenantry to sell will come for the milch cow to buy it. They want to rush this Government off its feet. Of course, this Government intends to buy land in every parish and settle people on it; but when somebody rushes the Government with a matter of this sort, the Government cannot decide how much it can buy. The honourable senior member for St. John thinks that things must be done by his thundering: "Do this, that or the other." He is playing the Opposition's game and he is not intelligent enough to see that. Let the honourable member approach the honourable members for St. James on behalf of these poor hard-working people who are going to be pushed off the land except the Government helps them. The honourable members for St. James are rolling in money and I do not think they will feel

hurt if I say that. But I will not pursue that argument in view of the fact that the honourable senior member for the City has said that Mr. Emtage is not going to put these people off the land; he says that if these people have not got any money to purchase their spots he will prevent any injustice from being done to them. When the Government said only a couple of weeks ago that an Address had not gone far enough and that the Government intends to bring down legislation as quickly as possible to secure people in their tenancies, that you cannot give a person seven days' notice, how can the honourable senior member for St. John think that he can frighten anybody by what he says? There will be no weekly tenancies of land in this colony and you cannot just put people off the land. I do not know whom the honourable member thinks he is firightening by asking: What is the good of a Government which talks and does not show its sympathy? If other honourable members want to support him they can please themselves and continue to embarrass the Government and give openings for people to ask: "What is the good of the Labour Party?" The honourable member will get up in Massiah Street and preach that the four members of the Government say that what they want done will be done, and if they want to do anything they will do it. But let honourable members please themselves: I have given my best services to the island in trying to represent it and if the honourable senior member for St. John wants a showdown I leave it the people of this colony to say what is to be the outcome of the showdown. Because of paltry, out-of-date vote catching, honourable members who say that they are supporting this Government, get up here and they are in opposition to the Government; the honourable senior member for St. John is a greater opponent of the Government than all the members of the Opposition put together with the possible exception of the honourable senior member of the City. There are times when members should show that they have a sense of responsibility to the colony which they should put above mere Party politics, let alone personal ambition. I ask the honourable senior member for St. James if he were still leading the Government and he told a member of his Party that the Government were considering a land policy and they were absolutely determined to safeguard tenants in their holdings, but they had not yet considered the details of a definite policy as regards the purchase of land, would that member of his Party be rushing forward with something which came on the market immediately? That member of his Party would not do that because the Government would be establishing a precedent before they had considered the details of the policy. Suppose, for instance, the Government were to say that people would be in danger if we did not buy this tenantry: the position would be that every man who had a tenantry to sell would say that here is a policy which the Government has established and he would put the matter in the hands of the honourable senior member for St. John who will threaten the House and they will buy the tenantry. You only have to let somebody know what the tenantry will cost and you are bound to pay more for it than you should pay, to quote the honourable junior member for St. Philip. One is somewhat tired of reminding the honourable junior member for St. Philip that on this particular question his utterances are not worth the time which he spends in making them. The honourable member will refer to things which are alleged to have taken place, and he will not mention names or times or places so that we have no means of checking up whether what he says is true or not. He will sometimes refer to matters which he feels are Executive secrets and you cannot answer him. Let me remind him of the classic occasion when the former senior member for St. George, Mr. Hugh Springer, got permission to reveal an Executive secret to show that the honourable member was deliberately saying something which he knew was not true. Let me remind him about this very Bay Estate question that after putting his signature as to the price of the land, he came in here and attacked the Government for paying too much for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I rise on a point of personal explanation; it is time that this matter be cleared up finally. I was asked to be the Chairman of the Bay Estate Committee in the absence of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. Before the honourable member left the colony he told me personally that the Bay Estate could be purchased for £56,000; and the moment the House passed a blank cheque giving the Government *carte blanche* to buy the Estate for any amount, the Committee was told by the vendors that they are not accepting less than £65,000 for the property. When I reminded the honourable member that he had told me that this Estate could be acquired for £56,000, he said that he had no recollection of that at all. I said that in here, I said it in Queen's Park and I said it everywhere.

Mr. ADAMS: The Solicitors told me confidentially the price of the Bay Estate; it was not made public what price the vendors were asking for the property. That is how I passed on the information. In my absence the price went up and when I came back I saw this Minute signed by the honourable member. The honourable member had no right to declare in public what was said by Solicitors confidentially.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed honourable members a certain amount of indulgence but if this state of affairs is going to continue I will have to adjourn the House. If this is the feeling which is going to pervade this House I will adjourn the House instantly. I want honourable members to know that I have it in my power to adjourn the House and I will do that if this state of affairs continues.

Mr. ADAMS: If a solicitor tells you anything in confidence, what sort of human being are you to repeat it in public? Why should anybody repeat in public what is told to him in confidence? The Solicitors for the vendor gave the information. The accusation against the honourable member is this: why put your hand to something which you say is reasonable and then afterwards say that it is too much? There was nothing to prevent the hon. member from writing a Minority Report. (MR. CRAWFORD: And then you would say that I did not want them to buy the Bay Estate). As far as this particular issue is concerned, the Government is more than sympathetic. I have said that there should be yearly tenancies in respect of land and people should be given six months' notice: we have gone further and said that we intend to come before the House with legislation to that effect as soon as possible and then the honourable senior member for St. John tries to convince people that the Government is unsympathetic towards this Address! But however sympathetic the Government may be, the honourable member cannot make it consider purchasing this land before it knows how much money it can afford to spend in respect of land and how much it can afford to spend on housing. This Government has in view the recommendations of the Committee as regards Housing and Town and Country Planning since 1943; when the honourable senior member for St. John says that the Government only speaks but does not act all the records for the past three years prove that that is not true. I appeal to honourable members to see that members of the Government

cannot remain in the House and take part in voting "Aye" or "No" relative to Addresses which are passed and which they will have to consider in Executive Committee; but at the same time the members of the Government do not want to make it impossible for the House to continue its sitting. I again ask the honourable mover to postpone further debate on this Address: he can continue the debate on another occasion. I beg to move that the further consideration of this Address be postponed.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that the further consideration of this Address be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes:— DR. CUMMINS, MESSRS. MAPP, MILLER, LEWIS, COX, ADAMS, WILKINSON, E. K. WALCOTT, MOTTLEY, and GILL—10.

Noes: MESSRS. ALLDER, CRAWFORD and BRANCKER. —3.

THE ADJOURNMENT

The Order Paper having been fixed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 8th day of August, 1950, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

* * * *

ERRATUM

In the Debates of 25th July, 1950, page 186, column 1, line 60, please read "for St. Joseph" in place of "for St. Thomas.".