

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th September, 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*),
His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*),
Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr.
H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. D. A. FOSTER, F. E. MILLER,
T. O. BRYAN, M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, J. E. T.
BRANCKER, L. E. R. GILL, W. W. REECE, K.C., and
J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E.

Prayers are read.

Messrs. E. K. WALCOTT, GARNER, and MAPP enter the House and take their seats.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to present a Message from His Excellency the Governor as follows:—

MESSAGE No. 25/1950.

His Excellency The Governor

To

The Honourable The House Of Assembly

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that notification has been received from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies that His Majesty's Government has been pleased to approve of a further grant of \$408,000 from the Colonial Development and Welfare Vote to supplement the grant of \$1,212,000 already approved for the construction of the new runway at Seawell Airport.

2. The revised estimated cost of the runway is \$1,620,000.

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
7th September, 1950.

PAPERS LAID

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

Statement showing Gross Customs and Excise Receipts for three months ended 30th June, 1950.

Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st July, 1950.

PETITIONS

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present Petitions as follows:—

Petition from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to increase the travelling allowance to the Inspector of Highways of the said parish.

Petition from the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to pay gratuities to James Hart and Albert Beckles in respect of their services to the said parish.

Petition from the Vestry of the Parish of Christ Church praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to raise a loan of £1,950 to purchase an additional Refuse Collector.

The petition in each case is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

Each petition is taken as read.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to present a petition from the Vestry of the Parish of St. Joseph praying the House to pass a Bill to authorize them to raise a loan of £2,000 to enclose the burial ground of the Parish Church, erect a latrine in the churchyard and to complete the enclosure of the church wall of St. Anne's Chapel. The petition is respectfully worded and I ask that it be taken as read.

The petition is taken as read.

Messrs. MOTTLEY and GODDARD enter the House and take their seats.

NOTICES

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to authorize the Governor to enter into an agreement with a person to serve in the Barbados General Hospital in the office of Anaesthetist.

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$153,829 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary

Estimates 1950—51, No. 19, which form the Schedule to this Resolution:

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,805 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 20, which form the Schedule to this Resolution:

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$3,600 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 21, which form the Schedule to this Resolution:

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to place the sum of \$20,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 22, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. COX: Resolution to fix, with effect from the 1st October, 1950, the air mail postage on letters, post cards, and air letter forms addressed to any destination set out in column one of the Schedule hereto, at the rate set out immediately opposite such destination in column two of the said schedule.

Mr. COX: Resolution to fix, with effect from the 1st October, 1950, the air mail postage rate on printed matter (including books, commercial papers and newspapers) addressed to Great Britain.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to ask leave to deal to-day with the two money Resolutions for \$3,600 and \$20,000 respectively, of which I gave notice earlier.

Dr. CUMMINS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the other money Resolutions of which I gave notice to-day.

Other Notices are as follows:—

Mr. REECE: Bill to authorize the Vestry of the parish of Christ Church to raise a loan of £1,950.

Mr. REECE: Bill to authorize the Commissioners of Highways of the parish of Christ Church to increase the travelling allowance to the Inspector of Highways of the said parish.

Mr. REECE: Bill to authorize the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of Christ Church to pay gratuities to James Hart and Albert Beckles out of parochial funds.

Mr. SMITH: Bill to authorize the Vestry of the Parish of St. Joseph to raise a loan of £2,000.

QUESTIONS

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

What is the total sum expended to date in connection with the erection of the combined Parry and Coleridge Schools in the parish of St. Peter?

(2) Of the above sum, how much has been expended on Labour, and how much on material?

(3) Who is responsible for: (a) the designing and (b) the erection of the said building up to the present date?

(4) Is it a fact that the said building is undergoing marked deterioration in its present incomplete state?

(5) Whether it is proposed to attempt to complete satisfactorily the present building, or to demolish same and erect a new edifice of different and more suitable and attractive design?

(6) Is Government aware that widespread dissatisfaction exists at the design, appearance, and the architectural style of the said building?

(7) Will Government, in view of the fact that amalgamation of these two Secondary Schools has been so long pending, and also that work on the present building was started long ago, take prompt action now, with a view to providing (with as little further delay as possible) a worthy, modern, and fully equipped building for Secondary Education in the Leeward Parishes?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. REECE, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, a Bill to authorize the Vestry of the Parish of Christ Church to raise a loan of £1,950 is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. REECE, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, a Bill to authorize the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of Christ Church to increase the travelling allowance to the Inspector of Highways of the said parish is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. REECE, seconded by Mr. GODDARD, a Bill to authorize the Commissioners of Highways of the Parish of Christ Church to pay gratuities to James Hart and Albert Beckles out of parochial funds is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. SMITH, seconded by Mr. FOSTER, a Bill to authorize the Vestry of the Parish of St. Joseph to raise a loan of £2,000 is read a first time.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MR. C. L. ELDER

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—Before the business of the day is begun, it is with some regret that I have to bring to the notice of this House the death of Mr. C. L. Elder who was formerly a member of the House. Mr. Elder was a man of varied interests—a Civil Servant who served the colony for many years, a man who took an active part in the musical life of the Country and did all he could to promote the musical welfare of the people in this island. After his retirement from the Civil Service he further continued to serve the colony by taking an active part in politics. He was at one time a member of the Christ Church Vestry and, as I have said before, a member of this House. Those of us who met him in the House will always remember his clarity and conscientiousness in debate and I hope that those qualities will ever remain with us as a gift from him to members of this House. I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that as a mark of respect to the deceased gentleman honourable members stand in silence for a moment.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the House while Dr. CUMMINS was speaking and took his seat.

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to second the motion of the senior member for St. Thomas. I fortunately was very closely associated with Mr. Elder during the time—I think it was 14 years—that he was a member of this House but I used to come in touch with him very frequently before he became a member of the House. Mr. Elder was a man of outstanding ability, a man who always put his Country before himself, and I think that the example he has set will be recorded in the history of the island. I was associated with him on the Railway Board and the Central Road Board and he used to take the greatest interest in everything that he undertook to do. This Country has lost a very able man in Mr. C. L. Elder. I second the motion, Sir, with these closing words "May he rest in peace."

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—Those of us who knew Mr. Elder will know that he was a great human-

itarian. He served his day and generation well,—according, of course, to his lights,—and the colony is the poorer by his passing. There are few men who have been given the opportunity to serve the colony in so many varied ways and as efficiently as he did. His passing, Sir, serves to sever a link with the past and his record ought to be an inspiration to those who succeed him. I have great pleasure in endorsing the sentiments so ably expressed by the previous speakers.

The question that honourable members stand in silence for a moment as a mark of respect for the deceased gentleman is put and resolved in the affirmative.

Honourable members act in accordance with the terms of the motion.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 AND 89.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Rules 88 and 89 are suspended in order that the Resolutions for \$3,600 and \$20,000 respectively, of which notice is given earlier in the day, may be now dealt with.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

THE BRITISH WEST INDIES METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman,—The first Resolution is for the sum of \$3,600 to supplement the Estimates under Head 28, Subsidies and Grants, in respect of a new item 39 (a), British West Indies Meteorological Service. This service was formerly carried on by the British Government; they no longer wish to carry it on and desire that it should be passed on to the West Indies. I think that honourable members will agree that it is a very useful Service. We need it in the case of hurricanes; we need it daily for the aeroplane service and Barbados could not afford to do without it. I think the House was notified earlier in the year that a Resolution of this sort would be coming down. An answer would be required by the end of September because that is the date on which the British Government will cease to carry on this Service. Jamaica's contribution is \$7,700, Trinidad's \$12,200, the Bahamas's \$6,200, the Windward Islands' \$4,600 and Barbados \$3,600 which is now before us. The West Indian Governments will take over the Service from the 1st October, 1950. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WILKINSON: No doubt, Sir, the honourable member who has introduced this Resolution has a very good reason why it should be passed to-day and no doubt also, he knows all about it but as far as others around this table are concerned it is asking us a lot to digest this to-day. We have committed ourselves apparently to a considerable expenditure twenty years ahead and I am going to ask the honourable member if he would kindly postpone this Resolution until after the tea interval, at any rate, when perhaps he will be able to give us the information which we require.

Dr. CUMMINS: As I said, the reason why this has been brought forward to-day is because at the end of September, the British Government will cease to carry on this Service and the West In-

dian Governments are expected to carry it on from the 1st October; so it is a matter of time. It is a Service which gives us information about the direction of wind and storms and as I have said it is specially useful when it comes to our landing-place at Seawell. If honourable members wish to postpone the further consideration of the Resolution until after tea I have no objection, the only thing is that the Other Place will be awaiting to consider this and the next Resolution for \$20,000 this afternoon.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: When did the British Government notify this Government that we will have to take over this Service? I think the senior member for St. Thomas will appreciate that he is in close touch with the Minute Papers and the information that is received from time to time while other honourable members are not. We are supposed to take over a Service which will cost \$167,184 for a year—paragraph 3 of the addendum to the Resolution says:—“The total expenditure for 1949–50 on Meteorological Services was \$167,184, and on this basis Barbados's share of the expenses of the proposed service will be \$3,216 per annum . . .” — and I am thoroughly at sea as to the nature of the Service. I once before made this remark and I would like to repeat it. Where you have urgent Resolutions to be passed, it would be of great assistance if you sent them around to honourable members with a note to the effect that the Leader of the House is going to ask for permission to deal with this or that Resolution at the next meeting of the House. If that was done in this case some of us would have been able to ring up somebody who knows something about meteorological services and find out if this proposal is all right. It may be a good proposal but it looks to me a lot of money. You will find that they are quick in starting a scheme in these parts and when they have it fixed, they push it on us. As far as I am concerned I am not in a position to say “Yea” or “Nay” to this Resolution to-day.

Dr. CUMMINS: If honourable members want the Resolution postponed I will postpone it.

The further consideration of the Resolution is postponed.

GRANT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ANTIGUA

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution is for the sum of \$20,000 as a contribution from Barbados towards the relief of suffering caused by the recent hurricane in Antigua.

I think that this Resolution commends itself. We are all more or less acquainted with the extent of the damage done to Antigua by two hurricanes in the space of a few days and I think, Sir that we should show our sympathy as quickly as possible in a most tangible manner. Private persons are doing their bit by the raising of subscriptions and the sending of parcels but that has nothing to do with the Government and the Government should hasten to give assistance as soon as possible. A storm, as we know, is a thing that carries everything. Fortunately in this case there was no loss of life; there were a demolition of houses and loss of stores and money is urgently needed to replace those things. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD: Sir,—Our most profound sympathy goes out to the people of Antigua in their distress. From the reports the hayoc created by the hurricanes has been terrific and the suffering has been enormous. We in this colony have fortunately

been spared the ravages of any such disturbance but our good fortune cannot, of course, blind us, in so far as extending any assistance which we can to relieve those who have been, less lucky than we are is concerned. Antigua, as a matter of fact the entire Leeward Islands, is a poor colony and we are told, Sir, that the Government of that colony can ill afford to render the assistance which the calamity will have entailed to the people of that Country. And, therefore, Sir, we are all of us more or less concerned with rendering all possible assistance we can to the stricken people of that colony. It was, therefore, to be expected that this Government would to-day invite the Legislature to make some tangible contribution towards the relief of suffering in Antigua. But, Sir, I must say that never did I imagine that we would be asked to contribute the sum of \$20,000. Let us make no mistake about it. I am sure that there is not a single person in this island who does not deeply sympathize with the people of Antigua in the blow which they have sustained and I am sure that there is not a taxpayer in the colony who would begrudge a tangible vote towards the relief of those people. But, Sir, I cannot for the life of me see many people in this island agreeing to grant the sum of \$20,000. British Guiana, a very much larger colony with infinitely greater resources and greater revenue, is giving only £1,000; Jamaica with four times our population and more than four times our revenue — I am told by someone on my left that it is 20 times more. I do not know if that figure is accurate but I think the revenue of Jamaica is more than four times that of Barbados — has given only about £1,000 more than we are asked to give and how in the name of all that is reasonable and just could Barbados be asked to contribute to the tune of \$20,000? Quite frankly, Sir, bearing in mind the assistance which all the other West Indian Colonies and the United Kingdom itself will give to Antigua I doubt whether we should be asked to contribute more than \$12,000—£2,500. It takes no stretch of the memory to recall that right here in Barbados people who suffered a short while ago as the result of rain and flood waters have as yet received not one penny compensation from the Government and charity should begin at home. I hope that no remark of mine will be construed to mean or to suggest that I am not very deeply in sympathy with the perilous plight of the people of Antigua. I have been saying daily "Thank God, such a disaster did not happen here," but at the same time, bearing in mind all our commitments, the things we have left undone because we are told that we do not have resources to deal with them, even when allowance is made for the calamity, Sir, one is yet forced to the conclusion that \$20,000 is a bit high for this island's contribution. I doubt whether the people in this Country will be satisfied if we were to contribute an amount of that sort. It is an extraordinary event and I am willing to admit that circumstances of this sort require an all-out effort, that everybody should give until it hurts, so to speak; but I think that \$20,000 will hurt too much. I hope that nothing I say or do will be interpreted as I am not anxious to think in terms of West Indian unity, or that parts of the West Indies which have suffered should not be assisted by those parts which have not suffered because I am satisfied in my own mind that the West Indies should do everything we possibly can to help one another in any way and at any time. But I repeat that, especially bearing in mind the fact that the damage has been estimated at \$1,000,000 and making a rough estimate of the help which

we know, has so far been given and promised, it does appear to me that if we contribute \$12,000 we shall have done as best we could under the conditions and we would have made some material contribution towards relieving the distress of the people in Antigua. \$12,000 would not represent the sum total of the assistance, either in money, or kind, which has been given by this colony. There are private funds to which persons are subscribing daily and contribution is also being made by way of clothing and foodstuffs. It should not be surprising if the total value of the assistance — other than this — from this island aggregates the sum of \$10,000 and I want to submit that \$10,000 from that source and \$12,000 from the Government should be more than enough to convince everybody concerned of our sympathy in the matter and our practical willingness to render all the aid we can. I, therefore, beg to move that the word "twenty" be deleted and the word "twelve" substituted therefor.

Mr. DOWDING enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, — As regards this Resolution I do not want any of my remarks to give the impression that I am not sympathetic towards the removal of suffering but in giving my support for the removal of such suffering I must think and act discreetly, — discreetly in the sense that no one could suggest that I did not know what I was doing and that no one could say that I am a sadist or one who likes to see suffering existing. But in reading the amount stated in this Resolution, it is my humble feeling that it is extremely too high for the Barbados Government to contribute to the hurricane relief in Antigua. That feeling has been further forced upon me because of statements which have recently been made in this Chamber by the Leader of the Government when he said that the colony could not afford any further capital expenditure and that therefore the release of funds must be guarded. I would like to know, Sir, how this Government has arrived at the decision to grant \$20,000 under this Head of the Estimates of Expenditure — Miscellaneous Services. I feel, Sir, that when there is sorrow and suffering the greatest effort should be made to relieve that sorrow and suffering; but I do feel that in dealing with a matter of this sort there are several things which must be taken into consideration (1) the means of the colony to afford such a grant and (2) the number of contributions which are really given to the people of Antigua at this time, not only privately by the Barbadian public but by the peoples of other West Indian Colonies, not to mention the United Kingdom Government. In my opinion such a responsibility as this should not fall only on the shoulders of neighbours in the West Indies but it should be the task of the British Government, if necessary, to rebuild Antigua. I also feel, Sir, that the disaster which we had in 1949 has not been sufficiently remedied for us to look over the heads of those householders who suffered then and who are suffering now as a result. We have been saying to them all the time "We cannot afford any further assistance for you" but by this act to-day we are saying that it was not the inability of the Government to meet the needs of those persons who suffered in Barbados and we are looking over their heads to grant \$20,000 to the people of Antigua. I am sure that they have my sympathy. I can hardly think of anyone who would not be sympathetic towards such a people but, as I have said, discretion is necessary. Let us take an example. Two weeks ago, a large stone fell on to a man's house and partly

destroyed it; his family narrowly escaped injury and possibly death. The matter was brought to the attention of this House and as far as my knowledge goes no member of the Government—from His Excellency down—has seen fit even to visit the unfortunate family, even to give them that measure of consolation that they have been visited by a government official.

The CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member not to mention His Excellency the Governor in debate.

Mr. ALLDER: I have tried to find out, Mr. Chairman, and I have been told that no official, acting on behalf of the Government, has visited the scene of that disaster. And what is more is that the family is uncertain as regards their position; they are left to the mercies of those persons in the area who feel that assistance should be given. The father and husband of the family is not at present employed. The house still remains in its present position with the possibility that another stone or stones might come down and completely demolish the building. I have had to go with the man to the manager of the plantation who suggested to him to get a brief written by the Board of Codrington College and go around and beg for sixpences and pennies. I have had to tell the manager—

THE CHAIRMAN: I must draw to the honourable member's attention that this is a Resolution for \$20,000 for the people of Antigua and I think that he is going too far. I have given the honourable member a certain amount of latitude but he is going too far.

Mr. ALLDER: I am trying to deal with suffering in its wider aspect. I feel that Charity begins at home and he who removes the suffering near to his hand removes part of the suffering all over the globe. I was saying, Sir, that up to now nothing has been done to assist the suffering caused locally by the disaster of 1949 and it appears not only unsensical to me but unsympathetic to the people of Barbados for a House like this, the Elected Chamber of the people, to vote \$20,000 to be sent overseas and at the same time disregard the sufferers here. However you may look at it, Sir, it is not the right thing to do. I have read in the newspapers that British Guiana has granted \$4,800—British Guiana with all her timber, lands, cattle ranches, her mining industries, bauxite industry and all the other kinds of natural resources and she can see her way to give only \$4,800; but by the stretch of the imagination somewhere or other, we have got before us a Resolution for \$20,000. It should not be. The Government has said that the finances of the colony are not such that it could spend money *ad lib.* and I am going by that statement. There are necessary matters which were introduced in this Chamber during the past couple of weeks and they have been partly turned down because of that statement which I have just quoted. Has the Treasury become fuller since then? That is what I would like to know. Have we had some financial windfall or are we only trying to popularize ourselves by competing with the other Colonies as regards how much we contribute above what they have contributed? What it is I would like to know. As far as the newspaper reports go, I have noticed that the response to the people of Antigua has been somewhat generous and in the amount which we can contribute we should consider the cost of reconstruction to the people of Antigua, our own financial stability and also all the money which might be given by the other Colonies and the British Government to help them. You are liable to find that some people who have suffered locally and

who have been waiting for over a year to receive the assistance which has been promised to them are becoming disappointed and dissatisfied. I do not know, Sir, how to face the issue but I would inform this honourable House that there is still a house 14ft.x8ft. accommodating four people in the parish of St. John as a result of the hurricane of 1949. Those occupants are still waiting on the promises of this Government; they are still there huddling on the floor nightly on one another, a collection of people from several houses which have been demolished.

THE CHAIRMAN: Again I ask the honourable member to stick to the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Yes, Sir. I feel the Government should remove all these difficulties first. How would this Government be looked upon if, say, the other Colonies read that Barbados has contributed \$20,000 voted by the House of Assembly,—nothing to do with the contributions by private organizations,—and knew that at the same time the suffering of a year ago in this island has not been relieved,—suffering which was caused by the same thing which happened a week ago in Antigua and which is causing us to decide to help them? I am sorry, Sir, that the junior member for St. Philip has seen fit to reduce the amount to only \$12,000. I still feel that that is too much. It is my humble feeling—I do not consider that it would be individualistic—that £1,000 given by this Government of the taxpayers' money would be sufficient, bearing in mind that such taxpayers are also contributing to private funds. I feel, Sir, that we should not try to do things which would only make us look big but to do the things that would make us truly big. It is going to read nicely when it appears in print in the other West Indian colonies. It is not truly great in so doing. I cannot tell why you have made it so difficult for the people who have suffered locally to be assisted, and in a week's time you can decide to relieve yourselves of this tangible amount to go overseas. It certainly does hurt me because I know it is wrong. If the people of Antigua get to know that we gave what we are able to give they would appreciate it as much as if we had given them one million pounds. I do not feel that they are less charitably inclined than we ourselves are or should be or for that matter as anybody else. We have had our troubles and we still have them, not only troubles caused by hurricanes but also our limited facilities to accommodate our population. The cost of living in those colonies is much lower than we can ever hope to have it here. The people of those colonies suffer, it is true, but their suffering may be of a temporary nature. As soon as they receive the assistance which is being organized they will definitely fall back on an easier standard of living than the people in Barbados can ever hope to obtain unless some great change takes place. I do not know the feelings of the majority of honourable members around this table but I am going to appeal to each honourable member who has a sense of his responsibility to guide the destiny of this island to see that it is definitely necessary to reduce this amount by more than half; you would not be looked upon by intelligent people as individualistic or as people who like to see other people suffer. I believe that the majority of the people of the West Indies know the position in which Barbados stands; they know it; they know that Barbadians are a hardy people and that they are somewhat homogeneous and sympathetic towards one another. That is why we are able, being so many in numbers, to live on so small a land with so few opportunities. We carry

an affluent appearance which has no foundation. The people of the West Indies know that and the people of the West Indies, no doubt, would expect you to contribute more than what you have suggested in this Resolution. I hardly feel, Sir, that the further amendment which I am going to make will have any support around this table but I am going to formally move now, Sir, that the words "twenty thousand" be deleted and the words "four thousand eight hundred" substituted therefor. I do that with a sense of responsibility, not only to myself but to the people of this colony and even to the people of Antigua who are to benefit if the amount remains at \$20,000. Mr. Chairman, I feel that amendment should have some consideration because the amount of \$4,800 is what we can really afford and it is no smaller amount than that which has been contributed by colonies which are more wealthy and better placed than ourselves.

Mr. COX: Sir,—It is regrettable that this debate has taken such a turn. I would like to say here and now that if I thought that it would have taken this turn I would have suggested to the Deputy Leader of the House to have a discussion with the members of this House beforehand and test their feelings as to the amount which they would support. I am sure, Sir, that honourable members will agree with me that no dignified people would appreciate a gift which comes to them after so much criticism; it certainly does not speak well for us. What has happened? We all have seen the pictures in the newspapers giving an idea of the disaster which befell Antigua, Anguilla, and Barbuda, and we can truly say that although there has been no loss of life, from what we have read those people have suffered greatly indeed and are suffering as a result of the hurricane. The Government has, therefore decided to show its sympathy in a tangible manner by offering immediate and substantial relief, hence this Resolution before the House for \$20,000. I would just like to remind honourable members that sometime ago, when there was a fire in St. Lucia, this House voted the sum of £5,000—\$24,000—to assist in the relief of the suffering and distress in that island and not only did the House vote that amount but it also sent a Resolution of Sympathy. We are not sending a Resolution of Sympathy to the people of Antigua but we are sending them a sum of money to assist in relieving their suffering and distress. I will go further and say this: We are hoping, Mr. Chairman, for West Indianism; we preach Federation of the West Indies; we are attempting to build up a nationhood; surely when occurrences of this sort take place it is our duty to show our sympathy not only by passing Resolutions of Sympathy but by also sending substantial assistance—financial and otherwise—to our less fortunate family, so to speak. And that is why I have spoken at this stage, lest some other honourable member might speak in a similar strain to that of the junior member for St. Philip and the senior member for St. John. I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that if there is any further debate on this subject, honourable members will realize that despite the fact that the people of Antigua are in, say, a poverty-stricken condition at this particular moment, they still have some pride and a sense of dignity and decency and they certainly would not like to know that after this criticism they have to accept a gift such as this.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman,—It is disheartening to sit here and hear this lengthy debate on the proposal to make this contribution to the people of Antigua to assist in relieving their suffering and

distress caused by the recent hurricanes. To reduce this vote would be to capitalize the misery and suffering of those people. I see nothing wrong whatever in giving \$20,000 to the people of Antigua: it is part of the price we have to pay for civilization. I wonder if the senior member for St. John and the junior member for St. Philip ever heard of Karl Marx's classic statement that those who have the ability to give should give to those who are in need. It is not a question of how much we can spare but how much we can give and if we can afford to give the people of Antigua \$20,000 we should give it to them. How do we know that \$20,000 may hardly be enough to provide some food and clothing for those who are in need? I repeat, Sir, that the reduction of this vote would be really capitalizing the suffering of the people of Antigua. Think of the children in that island whose garments are threadbare and they themselves are naked and hungry. I appeal to honourable members to curtail this debate and pass this Resolution.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—At first blush one perhaps would think that the sum of \$20,000 would be too much but on reflection, when you think of the poverty, the human suffering and all the other things that come in the trail of a hurricane, you could not give the people of Antigua less than \$20,000. \$20,000 is not too much. After all, we are dealing with human misery and who can tell when our turn will come? I am not going to vote for any reduction at all. Personally, I am engaged now in the parish of St. Philip in collecting money for poor, homeless people who have suffered and are still suffering from the flood we had here last year. I have seen suffering and privation due to that flood and I know that we had only a small fraction of a storm during that year. The people of Antigua were struck by the full blast of a hurricane on two occasions and I can imagine what their suffering is to-day. They have untold suffering and I am going to vote for this \$20,000 with pride and dignity because I know that it is going to relieve human suffering, irrespective of race, colour or creed. When it comes to suffering humanity you do not ask what is the colour of the people. When a storm hits you, it has no regard for your colour. A rich man may be reduced to nothing when Nature acts and so we have to think of what relief we can give to suffering humanity in their hour of distress. But I am going to pass this warning on to the Government: It is all well and good to extend sympathy to others far away from you; that is a good sign but at the same time you must remember your brethren at home also. Charity begins at home and first things first. I want to remind the Government that its commitments in respect of the last storm have not been carried out. I want to warn the Government that while it is asking us to vote this \$20,000 for the distressed inhabitants in Antigua, it must also come back to this House and get something done for our sufferers here who up to now have not been re-housed; some are still forced to live at their relatives and friends and that is not a state of affairs for a Labour Government to perpetuate. I tell this Government these things in a friendly manner and if it does not listen to me its members will be convinced from results. I am their friend and I tell them these things in a friendly manner because I have my ears to the ground. If you want to maintain your position you have to attend to the needs of the people in Barbados first. I know two or three cases in St. Philip where the people's homes have been entirely destroyed and every now and again they come to me and ask me "What about our homes?" They tell me "You have repaired some of the damaged homes for people who did not have such great damage and

our houses have been completely destroyed and you have done nothing about them." I have talked with some members of the Government and they are still evolving schemes. You have to get beyond the evolving stage and do something practical. Perforce you have to attend to the situation in Barbados too. I am not going to say any more because I believe there are other honourable members who wish to speak. But I want to say from the depth of my heart that I am willing to vote this \$20,000 for the suffering people in Antigua. After all, it is only when we get that unity of purpose, that spirit that when one is hurt all are hurt, that we shall ever get anywhere. Antigua happens to be one of the West Indian Islands. She has had her catastrophic day; we too some day might have ours. She may not be in the fortunate position in which we find ourselves to-day, although our position is nothing to boast about. But because of our ability we are going to share with the people of Antigua and in doing so I am glad to have the honour to take part in helping to relieve the unfortunate people who are suffering in that island.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—I yield to no man, either in this Chamber or outside it, in my sympathy for the poor people in Barbados or elsewhere. I think that I know sufficient about suffering that if I were not sympathetic I would have to deem myself callous and perhaps inhuman. But, Sir, the suffering of the people of Barbados is our particular concern and as Members of this House we should need no particular pretext for bringing it to the attention of the Government or for speechifying about it. This is a democracy and I am glad to know that no false sense of propriety would prevent members of this House from expressing their opinions, no matter how much others may disagree with them. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no way of assessing the relief that is needed in Antigua. This is not a matter of buying a particular site in Bridgetown and you can say that this is too much money. The next thing is this: The way to judge this is whether the Government is giving the sum of money that it feels it can afford to meet the obligation that would be placed upon us as fellow West Indians and as a people that were threatened with the very hurricane that hit Antigua. But uppermost in our minds should be this: this is not a sum of money for which the people of Antigua asked us; they did not send a request for the adequate amount we could give. This is a matter of spontaneous relief to people and we hope that it is based on commonsense and prudence on the part of the Government as far as the finances of this colony are concerned. We have not been supplied with a financial statement of the colony; the Government is in charge of that and we have to say that the members of the Executive Committee who are responsible for the finances of this colony must know that they can afford this sum. If there is one thing that I would like to suggest to the Government, it is this: If the Government had followed the method of dealing with the disaster in St. Lucia, it might have stood it in good stead because undoubtedly while he that gives quickly may give double, money at the present moment, Sir, is of no use to the people of Antigua. They cannot eat the money that we cable to them. They want something to eat, something to wear and something with which to build shelters; those things can go to them whether there is money forthcoming at the present moment or not and I am glad to know that those things are being sent to them. But if a Resolution of Sympathy with the people of Antigua had been tabled to-day in the House and the Government had, in moving it, let us know what it had in mind, as it did in the

case of the catastrophe in St. Lucia, I feel sure that this debate would have been avoided. I have seen no official expression of our sympathy with the people of Antigua. It would have served the double purpose of expressing our sympathy with them and of giving thanks that we have escaped a similar disaster. This is a point I am going to make to Barbadians — and I think that all members of this House are Barbadians: It is not a good thing for Barbadians to look around to see that Jamaica gives so much of British Guiana gives so much when a disaster befalls a West Indian colony. Go to the island of Antigua and see how many Jamaicans are there and count the number of Barbadians there are and you will probably say that our contribution is more to Barbadians than to Jamaicans or British Guianese. I am unable to supply the figures but I know that Barbadians occupy prominent positions in those colonies. We have many Barbadians in the Police Force of the Leeward Islands and that is a thing which Barbadians should remember because they can be found not only all over the West Indies but all over the World. I have very much pleasure in supporting this Resolution but I am sorry that we are not expressing the sympathy of the people's representatives and the people of this colony in a Resolution of Sympathy by itself to-day and let the money Resolution follow next week because I am convinced that while, as I said, giving quickly is probably giving double, money at this stage is not as tangible a gift as immediate relief with food, clothing, and something with which to build shelters. I hope that perhaps before this meeting ends we may pass a Resolution of Sympathy or we may regard this as the Resolution of Sympathy.

Mr. ALLDER: I am going to ask permission to withdraw my amendment which has not been seconded and to second the amendment of the junior member for St. Philip. Whatever other honourable members may say about my having approached this Resolution in a very unsympathetic attitude and with a lack of discretion, I am actuated by the remarks relative to the finances of this colony made by a member of the Executive Committee who, in my opinion, knows and also by the fact that a year ago we had a similar disaster and in the parish which I represent—I do not care what other honourable members feel—the suffering of the people has gone unheeded. I have made approaches to those who could have relieved such suffering and a year has gone and no assistance has been given to some of them. I cannot see the suffering in Antigua. I can only imagine what it is from the reports I read in the newspapers but I know and see the suffering which exists here and has been existing over a year ago and we have not been responsive enough to have that suffering removed. I do not want to get fame and be looked upon as a gentleman who is of a charitable disposition in the world. I want to approach my politics from a matter-of-fact attitude. I say that \$20,000 is too much. The senior member for St. Joseph who knows has said that the Government cannot commit itself to any further capital expenditure and as long as a year ago the Government refused to give assistance to some of the sufferers, especially those who live in the parish which I represent. There is still a house 14ft by 8ft—I must repeat it—

THE CHAIRMAN: I draw the honourable member's attention to the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I am sticking to the Resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you have said already all that you are saying now.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I am never tired of saying it.

The CHAIRMAN: But I am tired of hearing you say it.

Mr. ALLDER: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, with your permission that you absent yourself if you are tired.

The CHAIRMAN: I object to that remark and I ask you to withdraw it.

Mr. ALLDER: I have no desire to refuse to withdraw any remark which I may make but I prefaced my remark by asking your permission and you did not object.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not going to allow you to continue to speak until you withdraw that remark.

Mr. ALLDER: If you desire me to withdraw the remark I do so. I cannot sit here and pass a Resolution to relieve suffering in another colony of the same kind that exists here over a year ago. I want to be frank. The senior member for St. George talked about sentiment and Karl Marx. The honourable member seems not to be able to understand Karl Marx and his doctrine. If he want to misapply it he can do so but Karl Marx—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to hear anything about Karl Marx.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that you report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that. The question that the Chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The CHAIRMAN reports and the House resumes.

On the motion of DR. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the House is adjourned until 5.30 o'clock.

REPLIES LAID

On re-assembling,

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay the Reply to Question No. 15, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to lay the Replies to Question No. 19, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for Christ Church.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to lay the Reply to Question No. 13, standing in the name of the honourable junior member for St. Thomas; and the Replies to Questions No. 20, standing in the name of the honourable senior member for the City.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: On the adjournment the House was in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

CONTRIBUTION TO RELIEF OF SUFFERING FROM THE HURRICANE IN ANTIGUA

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the House was in Committee of Supply before the adjournment we were considering a Resolution to place the sum of \$20,000 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates, 1950-51, No. 22, which form the Schedule to this Resolution. The honourable senior member for St. John was speaking.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I do not want to continue the debate any longer. I want it to be clearly understood that it is not my feeling that this sum of \$20,000 is too much for the relief of the people of Antigua; but according to what I take the finances

of this colony to be and also because of the failure of the Government to afford relief to all the sufferers as a result of the flood which took place in this colony last year, I feel that we should not at this time grant this money to Antigua.

Mr. WILKINSON: This Resolution is not a Party measure. What I do think is that members of the Executive Committee in their anxiety, perhaps natural, to show the people of Antigua that Barbados sympathises with them in the calamity which has befallen them, acted too hurriedly. I think that if the honourable senior member for St. Thomas had today introduced a Resolution of sympathy with a small token perhaps, and had unofficially consulted the members of all the Parties in the House, we would have saved a good deal of unnecessary discussion today. When the honourable member told me that the amount which it was proposed to ask the House to vote was \$20,000 I expressed surprise and I thought that the amount was rather on the generous side. While I do not intend to vote against the Resolution as we all sympathise most sincerely with those who have suffered in Antigua, we must remember that we ourselves are not out of the wood as yet. I do hope that in voting this amount of money we are not allowing our hearts to carry away our heads. I do think that if a different method had been adopted in dealing with this matter—no doubt it was the anxiety of members of the Executive Committee to get something done quickly, which made them adopt this method of placing the Resolution before us without any previous notice—it would have meant the delay of a week or a fortnight and we would have saved a lot of unnecessary discussion today. We, on this side of the Table intend to vote for the Resolution as it would appear to be ungracious to Antigua if we supported a reduction of the amount. With those remarks I beg to inform honourable members that we agree to this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In connection with a Resolution of this sort it is customary, as the honourable junior member for St. James has said, to throw out a hint to honourable members beforehand and see exactly what the position will be in order to avoid any undue criticism on the floor of the House. It cannot be argued that the amount of this Resolution is too much money for affording relief to Antigua, because \$120,000 would not be too much money for the purpose; but my argument is that \$20,000 seems to be generous, coming from Barbados. I am supporting the Resolution, but it is timely for honourable members to take the opportunity of letting the Government know that charity begins at home. I suppose that everyone of us appreciates the speed with which the Government has brought down this Resolution to assist fellow West Indians in this catastrophe which has befallen them from an act of nature; but you cannot help feeling that right here at home there are persons who have suffered from a flood a year ago and they have not yet been relieved. This is an opportune time to let the Government know that it is hardly fair to expedite this matter in respect of affording relief to Antigua and not expedite a scheme for the relief of people here at home. Only a few days ago it was brought to my notice that the Churchwarden of St. Michael actually sent a letter to the Governor-in-Executive Committee asking for some assistance in the repairs of houses in St. Michael made necessary as a result of the heavy rains—there were numbers of people coming to him—and the Governor-in-Executive Committee replied to the effect that they are considering the matter. If you have a responsible Board representing to the Government that people

are suffering as a result of bad weather, the Government say that they are considering the matter and then they immediately come to the relief of people in Antigua, it must show that it is time that they come out of their lethargy with regard to the needs of the people in the matter of housing. I see that some honourable members are laughing, but they might laugh at the fact that some of them who are members of the Executive Committee do not even know of the existence of that letter. The honourable junior member for St. Andrew, speaking with me just a few moments ago, has said that he was prepared to support this Resolution but there were still people in St. Andrew who have not yet got anywhere to live. Any criticism which we offer here today is not criticism in respect of granting money to Antigua, but we must remind honourable members of the Government — we warn them that we will use this action towards Antigua as something against them. We can say that we are in sympathy with Antigua but merely to say that we are in sympathy with them is not enough; we want to let them see that we really appreciate the plight in which they are. I throw out the hint that there should not be any mistake that we of the Opposition are unmindful of our duty to the people of this colony who have suffered as a result of the flood and who have not yet been relieved; the Opposition cannot make the Government expedite the matter and I would like to say that we have not heard anything about the Fund which had been opened by the "Advocate" subscribed to by the general public and handed over to the Colonial Secretary. A year has passed and nothing has been heard about that. However the criticism of the honourable senior member for St. John might be taken, I say that it is not untimely for us to use that criticism; but I appeal to the honourable member to show his manhood in voting for this Resolution because two wrongs do not make a right. We are grateful that this calamity passed us by and today we are giving relief to Antigua; British Guiana has made a contribution of \$5,000 and it does appear that what we are giving is a large amount. I appreciate the action of Mr. Bustamante of Jamaica; Jamaica's national income is four times as much as ours and not only did they give £5,000 but Mr. Bustamante actually had a Resolution passed to the United Nations Organization. I regret that this Government did not pass a Resolution as well. I suppose the entire West Indies will contribute about \$100,000 through their Governments and I heard over the radio that the Mother Country is waiting to see what is needed. It must never be forgotten, as the honourable junior member for the City has said, that he who gives quickly gives twice. I say if it should happen that another calamity should take place in any other part of the West Indies and we had to come to the aid of our people—if you had to come back here tomorrow with a money Resolution for the purpose — I am practically sure that there are those of us who will support it; but we must say that you are not playing the game in not relieving the distress of some people who suffered as a result of the last flood in this colony. One of your strongest supporters, the honourable senior member for St. Philip, has actually told you so. I hope that the members of the Government will not just sit and be strong headed; it is no use fooling us that anybody else is responsible for keeping back this matter. I have heard the honourable senior member for St. Philip and the honourable junior member for St. Lucy representing the case for their respective parishes. It is true that some of the sufferers have been attended to but if it can be argued that all the money which was voted has been expended,

the Government has given absolutely no account of the money which has been handed over to the "Advocate". The honourable senior member for St. Philip says that there are still people in that parish who have not been relieved; we are voting this money here today and it cannot take one year to relieve the sufferers in Antigua. If we had met last Tuesday this Resolution would have been passed. It is good to be charitable and it is also good to be fair; do not let us fool ourselves, the people of this colony will not begrudge the people of Antigua this aid which we are giving them, but they will hold the Government responsible for not giving the assistance which they need. In my capacity as a member of the Vestry of St. Michael I have seen the list of the selected few who have been helped and I do not think that the right thing has been done. I am voting for this Resolution and although it might appear to some honourable members that the criticisms which have been made here today are ungracious, I say that they are not untimely; because while we vote for this Resolution we must let it be known that we are mindful of the fact that charity must begin at home. We cannot say that you are just if you do not look after the needs of the people of this island who have suffered in a similar manner though not to the extent, to the people of Antigua.

Mr. DOWDING: I must compliment the Government on having brought down this Resolution. I, personally, have no criticism to offer to this Resolution: in my opinion, they have done as much as they can do and I think that the effort is an admirable one. The amount is in no way too generous and we should realise that we ourselves might be placed in a similar position on some future day. But, Mr. Chairman, I am craving your indulgence to add my voice to the voices of those honourable members who have rightly, justly and correctly criticized the Government for being so slow in getting off the mark—they have been inefficient in my opinion—when it comes to dealing with similar mishaps, if they were not to the same extent as in the case of Antigua, which befell the people of this island last year. I remind them that in 1948 this House passed an Address when high winds damaged houses in quite a number of parishes in this island and up to now that matter has not been settled. To put the blame on the lack of staff in the Secretariat, and on this, that and the other, in a matter of this importance is being very, very weak. I have before me a list of people whose houses were damaged in the parish of St. George with the specifications, the amount of lumber which is needed for the repairs of each house, and so on, and it would be a simple matter for the Government, if the Secretariat is overloaded with work, to employ a Barbadian who can handle this simple job of deciding how much money should be given to the suffering people and let us get something done. I do not intend to continue in that strain any longer; the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has told me—and if I speak incorrectly he will correct me—that this matter is being attended to and that within two weeks something will be done. (Dr. CUMMINS: Within a month). I am here publicly stating that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has said that within a month the matter will be attended to; if within that time nothing has been done I shall definitely continue this discussion from where I left off this afternoon and I shall be much stronger than I have been this afternoon.

Mr. BRANCKER: I am not supporting the motion for the reduction of this amount because in these days when we are so federation-minded and West Indies conscious, to reduce this amount would be a very unfortunate gesture. I must confess that I do not regard this amount as being excessive by any means, having regard to the magnitude of the dis-

aster and the fact that we are a neighbour to Antigua and that we are up to the moment in a comparatively solvent state in so far as the Colonial Treasury is concerned. Another reason why I am supporting this Resolution is that the Government can regard it as a precedent to assist local cases which are equally deserving as this one is, not only from the standpoint of the speed at which they are rendering assistance but also from the standpoint of the magnanimous scale on which the assistance is being rendered. I presume that this Resolution will be passed and there will be a precedent for the Government to follow, bearing in mind that charity begins at home and that when disasters take place in various parts of the island the Government will move as speedily and as thoroughly as they have moved in respect of Antigua. It is known that there are well-grounded complaints as to how speedily the Government can go to the rescue of some parishes and how tardy they are in going to the aid of others. I hope that the passing of this Resolution will be regarded as a precedent that the Government will move as effectively as they propose to do in this case.

Dr. CUMMINS: Before you put the question, Mr. Chairman, there are one or two points to which I would like to reply. The Government did not come to any hasty conclusion in arriving at this amount as some honourable members think; we argued that the Government made a grant of £5,000 to St. Lucia when there was only the devastation of Castries and now in the case of Antigua where the devastation is more widespread, extending throughout the island except the Capital and where more people are to be housed, fed and clothed, we should grant this \$20,000. This sum was even considered to be a small sum but, unfortunately, we could not do anything more. I feel that we are justified in taking this course. With regard to the honourable senior member for St. John, his opposition is centred around two things; first of all, he said he was told by the Leader of the House that the Government could not afford any expenditure. What the Leader of the House said was that we cannot afford any capital expenditure. This money is not capital expenditure and the Government does not propose to go in for any capital expenditure until a revision of the situation has been made. We know the mess we have been left in (Mr. MOTTLEY: Put in) and until that mess has been cleared up we do not intend to embark on any capital expenditure. The other thing is that the honourable member moved the adjournment of the House and spoke about the damage which was done to a house by a large boulder. I want to point out that the Government is committed to a policy of helping people in the event of a hurricane or a storm taking place and causing devastation; we cannot help every individual case which comes up because if we did that where would we end? If there is a heavy rainfall and something has happened you cannot expect the Government to come to the assistance of people in all such cases; we have a policy and we intend to keep to that policy. In case there is a storm or hurricane or flood causing devastation we are committed to helping people and we are going to keep to that policy.

One or two honourable members referred to British Guiana's contribution; British Guiana is a big place, it is true, and it is not in the hurricane zone. I do not suppose that British Guiana will ever have a hurricane, and therefore British Guiana cannot sympathize with the people of Antigua in the same way as Barbados sympathises with them. I can remember one or two hurricanes that we had and I remember the devastation which was caused by those hurricanes. When British Guiana makes a grant of \$4,800 we will realise that that is a token of her sympathy.

Much has been made of the situation locally; nobody deplores more than we do the long delay in relieving the people who suffered as a result of the last flood. The honourable junior member for St. George says that nobody could believe that this delay is due to the position in the Secretariat; but every now and then the Secretariat has been in a topsy-turvy condition with Colonial Secretaries coming and going, and we have not been able to arrive at any conclusion in this matter; we have not been able to finalise anything. I told the honourable member that within a month we will be able to finalise the matter because Mr. Jemmott, a Barbadian, has taken over duties in the Secretariat. Up to today one of our members told me that this matter was being worked upon. We cannot be expected to go into the Secretariat and do the work; when the matter is finalised and the position is placed before us, we will pass the money as speedily as possible. I want it to be realised that those members who have criticised us adversely over the lack of a settlement of the situation in connection with the last flood do not sympathise with the sufferers more than we do, but we cannot help ourselves.

The honourable junior member for the City made a point which I thought would answer, and it is in connection with a Resolution of sympathy being sent to Antigua. It is true that we said we would express our sympathy in the most tangible way, but the Officer responsible for administering the Government did by cable express the sympathy of the people of Barbados with the people of Antigua in the calamity which befell them. Relative to the point made by the honourable senior member for the City about the Churchwarden of St. Michael writing to the Government asking for help in the repairs of houses after some recent rains and the Government replying that they were considering the matter, I want to say that I was not here at the time, but my information is that the Churchwarden asked for help from the Labour Welfare Fund, which is a different matter. We have a policy, I repeat, and we are prepared to stick to it.

Mr. LEWIS: I have to thank the honourable member for noting my point, but I think that if a cable has been sent to Antigua expressing the sympathy of the people of this colony, such a cable should have been put in the Press.

The question that this Resolution be reduced by \$8,000 was put and resolved in the negative, the Chairman declaring: "I think the Noes have it."

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF A BRITISH WEST INDIAN METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE

Dr. CUMMINS: In connection with the previous Resolution which we were considering—a Resolution to place the sum of \$3,600 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950-51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1950-51, No. 21, which form the Schedule to this Resolution—I think, Mr. Chairman, that honourable members are willing to continue the consideration of that Resolution.

Mr. WILKINSON: The honourable senior member for St. Thomas has given me some information since we postponed the consideration of this Resolution today and I intend to vote for the Resolution now. But I must warn the honourable member that we must have more notice of important matters like this one. From what the honourable member has told me I think it was possible to give us a little longer notice so that we could appreciate for what we are voting. The purpose of this Resolution is apparently to get weather reports from the weather bureau at Bermuda and elsewhere and I appreciate that it is important to continue that

service. I would like to point out that this is one of the services started by the Colonial Development and Welfare Organization and they have now said: "We have shown you what we have done and you must bear the burden of carrying it on." We did not realise what the expense was going to be; I think the honourable member should be forewarned that the Government cannot continually send down Resolutions at such short notice and expect them to be passed.

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

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

MENTAL HEALTH BILL, 1950.

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to deal with Order No. 3 as the next Order of the Day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas: Second reading of a Bill to amend the law relating to persons of unsound mind and for purposes connected therewith.

Dr. CUMMINS: This Bill seeks to amend the Lunacy Act. We do not propose to create more lunatics; what we hope to be able to do is to find lunatics who are outside the Institution and put them inside. The object of this Bill is to bring the law into line with that which obtains in other countries. It is proposed to change the definition of some terms which were quite all right some time ago but which have now become somewhat offensive and sometimes misleading. For instance, the word "lunatic" will be changed and we will use instead the term "person of unsound mind" or "mental patient"; and the word "asylum" will be replaced by the term "mental hospital". The new term "person of unsound mind" will cover idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons and moral defectives; that is the main purpose of this Bill. As I have said, it is proposed to amend the Lunacy Act and bring it into line with developments which have taken place in other countries. Clauses 3 to 5 of the Bill deal with the management of the mental hospital following the lines of the existing law; Clauses 12 and 13 follow the law which exists in the United Kingdom and other places. Trinidad has adopted similar legislation and we propose to bring our legislation into line. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: Naturally I would not know much about this Bill, but I have attempted to discuss the subject with someone who has had experience outside Barbados. I have had it mentioned to me—and I mention it now for the benefit of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas who will be able to help me—that in Barbados if we have to declare a person to be one of unsound mind, it is done on the lines of regarding such a person as a criminal. What I mean is—I do not think it happens in many other countries of the world—that a Police Magistrate is to be a member of the Board which has to declare a person to be one of unsound mind. I do not know if the presence of the Magistrate

guarantees a fair trial or what. We have some very peculiar methods of doing things in Barbados; some people admire them, but I do not think that they are emulated so much. I have mentioned something which has been drawn to my attention and I mention it here so that the honourable member in charge of this Bill may be able to enlighten me as to what he knows of the methods adopted outside Barbados in dealing with people of unsound mind. With the method adopted here some people feel that you surround a person who might be declared to be of unsound mind as you would surround a criminal. It is true that you have one or two medical men as members of the Board and it is on their advice that you have to be guided as to whether a person is of unsound mind or not. I mention the point for what it is worth and I hope that the matter has received the attention of the Authorities now that they are trying to be more humane, now that they are trying to regard this question of lunacy as an unfortunate affliction altogether out of the realm of anything criminal.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In this Bill it is proposed to make changes in the sense that you are changing terms, as will be seen from paragraph 2 of the "Objects and Reasons." That paragraph says: "Certain terms such as 'lunatic' and 'asylum' have been replaced by the terms 'person of unsound mind', 'mental patient' and 'mental hospital.' In addition, the meaning of the term 'person of unsound mind' has been extended, by the interpretation Clause, to cover idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons and moral defectives." For many years I thought it was necessary for us to have some place for housing people other than those whom medical practitioners would term mental cases. Every day you see in Bridgetown and in other districts people who are mentally defective, feeble minded and so on; you find some of them nearer to you than you expect at times. You can have a Board of Lunacy held privately and that would bring a person out of the criminal sphere; you can have a Board of Lunacy held outside the precincts of the Law Court and I suppose a Magistrate should be there for the purpose of seeing that there is a fair trial. It is not unknown that people conspire to have others sent to the Mental Hospital with the aid of persons other than Police Magistrates. I should never like to see persons who have had judicial training cut out of these proceedings; you want to give people a fair trial and that is why, I suppose, you have a Magistrate, a Justice of the Peace and medical men when a Board of Lunacy is being held. Now you are amending the law and whereas the place where insane people or people who are mentally unbalanced are sent was called Jenkinsville or the Lunatic Asylum, you now propose to call it the Mental Hospital; but you are also extending the meaning of the term "person of unsound mind" to cover idiots and so on. I should like to say that some people are born mentally defective and others are born idiots but they are harmless. None of us would like to know that any of our offspring or relatives whom Nature had not endowed with the ability to understand things has been placed in the Mental Hospital among insane people; it is necessary to have a place to send people who have become idiots or otherwise after taking too much alcohol. I would like to know that arrangements will be made whereby feeble-minded people will be treated separate and distinct from insane people, otherwise we will be sitting here and passing a Bill which, I am sure, will not meet with the approval of the general public. Surely some of us might have under

our care persons who might be mentally defective and we would not like to know that they are placed in the Mental Hospital among insane people. I think that we should be given some undertaking before we can pass this Bill. A person might be mentally defective as many of us are today, but he might not be a lunatic; and if we pass this Bill as it stands, such a person can be placed in the Mental Hospital. While I agree that there is the necessity for a mental hospital or a rest house, the position is similar to that in which there is a boy who has been caught stealing or throwing stones across the street and he is sent to Dodds to be reformed; he comes from Dodds with a stigma and he is marked in Barbados for life. If you visit the St. Michael's Infirmary you will find quite a number of imbeciles and feeble-minded people and they are not the type of people who should be put in the Mental Hospital. There is the necessity for an institution for housing imbeciles and feeble-minded people and I do not think that such an institution should be erected within the precincts of any mental hospital. I remember well that we used to have a well-known character around Bridgetown known as "Isthmus"; how often did you hear people say that she should be placed in some institution if only for the reason of maintaining the dignity of womanhood? It was always borne in mind that you could not compel her to remain in the Almhouse at all, but there should be some other institution where she could be placed and cared for. I want to point out that anybody can make an application to have a Board of Lunacy held, but I do not think it would be fair to have that action taken in respect of a person who is just an idiot—it would not be fair to send him to the Mental Hospital and put him with another person who is an open lunatic. That would be the end of that person. People who are sane have got to do things in the interest of the feeble-minded some of whom display more intelligence than a lot of other people. I should like to hear the honourable senior member for St. Thomas speak on the points which I have raised. I should like to see something done for imbeciles and such people as are set out here; we should not want to see people thrown into the Mental Hospital because it may be cheap to do so.

Mr. MAPP: While it is possible to emphasize too much the things mentioned by the last speaker, on the other hand we must pay more attention to the dangers to which attention has been called. While the methods proposed to be employed in respect of this matter might be very well suited to other countries, that might not be the case in a small place like Barbados. In the United Kingdom people can be sent to an institution and that is known by a few people but in Barbados that might not be the case. Another point is that in the outside world science has so advanced that it is recognised in very many cases that a person might not be insane in the accepted sense of the word, and he would not need to be put in a mental hospital. It may simply be a case calling for psycho-analysis. If it had not been for the treatment of a skilled doctor, persons who were not insane would probably have been put in the Mental Hospital. I think we need in this island more modern methods of dealing with these people who are set out in this Bill. I remember that after the last War a man was placed in the Mental Hospital, unjustifiably he told me, where he mixed with the insane persons down there and that made him worse than he was. There are people who are not really insane and they are questioned by two or three doctors who come to the conclusion that they are insane and they are sent to the Mental Hospital. There are cases which call for

more expert attention than others. Here we are widening the meaning of the term "person of unsound mind" to cover idiots, imbeciles morally defective persons and so on; in the opinion of two doctors, a Magistrate and a Justice of the Peace, a person might be morally defective, but they may not be absolutely sure about that. Under our present law anybody can report that a person is mentally defective; that person is placed among others in the Court and after examination he might be sent to the Mental Hospital. A person might be suffering from bad nerves and that might affect his mind. I am hoping that we will have a more expert method of dealing with these particular cases. I really do not like the procedure to which these people are subjected and I suppose that we will soon have before us a Resolution to extend facilities at the Mental Hospital. I am throwing out the warning that a very big extension is being made in this Bill and it does not appeal to my mind at all. I have been in the Courts and I have spoken to Magistrates who have said they were never convinced that some people were really insane, and those people have been taken to the Mental Hospital.

Mr. DOWDING: I hope that the honourable member who introduced this Bill will fully explain the need for such a Measure. I hope that this Bill is not the legacy of some imported official; I hope that it is not before us because some official feels that because conditions in England necessitate a Measure such as this, it must be put into force in Barbados. I should like to hear from the honourable Introducer the reasons and the necessity for a Bill of this kind. I view the Bill in a serious light; if under this Bill any of our brothers and sisters who happen to be feeble-minded but absolutely inoffensive and harmless can be placed in an Institution like the Mental Hospital, it is, in my opinion, a serious step for this House to take to pass a Bill without a long and full debate. If you visit the Mental Hospital at the present moment you will find there several people who would be similar to feeble-minded people. I myself have visited that Institution and I have been amazed to talk and listen to inmates whom I thought were insane and dangerous. The atmosphere surrounding these inmates at the Mental Hospital is definitely detrimental to their improvement; the mere fact that these inmates have been placed in this Institution is sufficient, in my opinion, to make them really insane. There is obviously the necessity for an institution in which certain feeble-minded people who become nuisances to the public can be housed. I hope that this Bill will be referred to a Select Committee for serious consideration as to whether people who are feeble-minded should be placed in the Mental Hospital. In this island today we often have to send people to the Mental Hospital and after some months they are able to leave the Institution supposedly cured. I know that there is in St. George now a boy who has just left the Mental Hospital; he is a young strapping, hard-working boy who is quite capable of becoming a useful citizen in this colony, but on account of the fact that this stigma of having been sent to the Mental Hospital is attached to him he is unable to do anything more than to assist in work around the St. George's Almshouse. I view that condition as a very pitiable one; that merely feeble-minded persons should be sent to the Mental Hospital where their lives will be completely closed as far as their ever being citizens of Barbados again is concerned, is something which this House should be most careful in considering. Legislation in England does not always suit con-

ditions in Barbados and I sincerely hope that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas will tell us whether Barbadians have explored the necessity for a Bill of this sort or whether some official has just come here and said: "You are out of date; your law wants amending to include feeble-minded people in your Mental Hospital". We have had a bitter experience which I hope will be clearly publicised in the near future, of what happens when we Barbadians are too gullible in our dealings with these imported officials.

Mr. REECE: It has been said that more lunatics are outside the Mental Hospital than those who are inside the Institution; but whether that be so or not it shows you how difficult a subject this is and how difficult it may be at times to say whether a person is a fit subject for confinement at the Mental Hospital or not. In the Bill before the House the definition Clause has been changed and the word "lunatic" has been replaced by the term "person of unsound mind". In Clause 2 of the Bill you find a large number of variations in the type of persons who may be defined as persons of unsound mind, and in Clause 2 of the 1907 Act there is also a very wide definition of the word "lunatic". For the benefit of honourable members who may not be as conversant with this matter as Police Magistrates and lawyers would be I will read the definition. It says:—

"'Lunatic' includes epileptic, idiot, or any other person suffering more or less from temporary or permanent disease or derangement of the brain producing disordered action of the mind in such a way as to put the subject in a condition varying from his normal self, and out of relation with his environment as to render him dangerous or inconvenient to himself or others".

Mr. Speaker, you can see what a very wide definition that is. We are now only re-enacting in a more modern phraseology what appears in the Act of 1907, but there are other provisions of this Bill which must be looked at carefully; one of those provisions has been pointed out by the honourable Introducer and I will refer in particular to Clause 7 of the Bill which deals with the adjudication of a person of unsound mind. That Clause says:—

"When upon such inquiry as is provided for by section six of this Act it appears to a Magistrate and a Justice of the Peace that a person is a person of unsound mind and a proper subject for confinement and such medical certificate of his unsoundness of mind as is required by the said section has been given, the Magistrate and Justice of the Peace may adjudge such person to be a proper subject for confinement and may proceed to make an order according to this Act for the care and custody of such person and by warrant under their hands commit such person to the Mental Hospital."

The Order of the Police Magistrate is an Order committing the person to the Mental Hospital. If you look at Clause 8 you will see that that Clause deals with the custody of a mental patient. That Clause says:—

"In all cases when a person has been found a fit subject for confinement in the Mental Hospital, he shall be handed over to the custody of the police authorities, together with such certificate as is necessary under this Act, and they shall be responsible for his safe conduct to the Mental Hospital where he shall be handed over to the authorities of that Hospital who shall thereafter take charge of him and be responsible for his safe keeping."

That does not alter the position as it is today; as soon as a patient finds himself before the Board and the Board says that he is a fit subject to be

sent to the Mental Hospital, the Police take charge of him and he is sent there. There are persons who remain in the custody of their friends and those persons cannot be called private patients because in the true sense of the word, they have not been certified to be insane although their condition may be well known to the medical attendant and the members of the family. The point I am making now is in respect of Clauses 7 and 8 where an Order is made for confining a person, who is adjudged to be a person of unsound mind, in the Mental Hospital. If you turn to Clause 27 you will see that that Clause deals with private mental hospitals. It says:—

"If any mental patient shall be confined in any private or parochial house, building or hospital, it shall be lawful for any person ordered by the Governor-in-Executive Committee to do so, to visit at all times any such house, building or hospital and to ascertain by examination of witnesses on oath (which oath such person is hereby authorised to administer) if such mental patient is properly treated and to give such orders and directions with respect to the treatment of such mental patient as to him shall seem meet....."

That Clause has been taken directly from the old Act. I would like to find out how, under this proposed Bill, does a person become a patient at a private home or at a private hospital. Under Clauses 7 and 8 a Police Magistrate is only empowered to order a patient to the Mental Hospital, and the point I have raised is a point on which I think the honourable senior member for St. Thomas should be able to enlighten us. There can be no doubt that there is the necessity in this colony for a hospital or a place where private patients may be treated and I would like to see in this Bill the definition of a private hospital and the authority of a Police Magistrate in respect of ordering a patient to be kept at such a hospital. Today there is no such provision and the position is somewhat ludicrous; because you have the Governor-in-Executive Committee giving power to a person to visit and inspect a private hospital and see that it is properly run, and further to do certain things in case the patient is not being properly treated. But where is the power to entitle a Police Magistrate or Board to order a patient to be kept at a private home or private hospital? There is no provision in this Bill to meet the situation which will arise in Clause 27. I know that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has given much thought to this Bill, but it is not a matter of medical knowledge at all; this is a question of procedure, and it is something against which we have to protect people. We have to see that some proper provision is made for the benefit of people who may be unfortunate enough to be certified as being of unsound mind. I hope that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas will be able to give us assistance in this matter. I have spoken with the honourable member and I do not want to retard the passing of this Bill; for my part, I think we could pass some Clauses of the Bill and give the honourable member the opportunity later in the evening to make any amendment which may be necessary in order to make the Bill a really workable Act when it receives the assent of the Governor.

Dr. CUMMINS: I appreciate the points which have been raised by a few honourable members. In answer to the honourable senior member for the City and to settle his fears as to whether imbeciles and feeble-minded people will be mixed with the violent lunatics, I should like to say that as soon as a person is sent to the Mental Hospital the Medical Superintendent assesses the type of patient to which he belongs and the person is placed for treatment in

his group. The same thing will obtain under this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: On a point of order. I know that that obtains today, but what I want to find out is whether in this new departure the honourable member can give us any guarantee that there will be any sort of private nursing home where persons can be cared for even within the precincts of the Mental Hospital.

Dr. CUMMINS: I can assure the honourable member that I will take great care to bring his point to the attention of the Medical Superintendent who is a specialist in his field. As regards the honourable junior member for St. Thomas—my colleague—he has his D.P.M. and consequently I am unable to cope with him; his knowledge surpasses mine. I can only tell the honourable member that the Medical Superintendent at the Mental Hospital is a fully-qualified man in his field, and I am quite sure that the patients down there will get the same modern treatment as is obtained in any modern mental hospital. We have a capable man down there and I think another man is on his way here. Only recently this House agreed to a special condition which will enable this new man to come down here and he may be here very soon. The honourable junior member for Christ Church has raised a point. He is worried about Clause 27 of this Bill which does not give a Magistrate any power to commit anybody to a private hospital as is the case in Clauses 7 and 8 where a Magistrate can make an order committing a person to the Mental Hospital. I am not a legal man but Clause 30 of the old Bill is the same as Clause 27 of this new Bill except that the word "asylum" is changed to "hospital", and the powers which are given to the Magistrate under the old Bill are given to him in Clauses 7 and 8 of this new Bill. A Magistrate with a Justice of the Peace and two medical practitioners can certify a person to be a lunatic and after the person has been so certified he is committed by the Magistrate to the Mental Hospital. Clause 8 of this Bill is the same as it is in the old Bill; it seems to me that Clause 30 of the old Bill has been put as Clause 27 of this new Bill with a change in the nomenclature. If the honourable member is satisfied with the remainder of the Bill we can pass the remainder of the Bill and postpone this Clause for further clarification.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill and that it be an instruction to the Committee that the Clauses be taken as read on the numbers being called.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I have been working rather hard over here in comparing the old Act with this new Bill and I hope that there will be no objection to the suggestion of referring this Bill to a Select Committee. I think that the honourable senior member for St. Thomas will agree with me that it is a rather bold statement to make in saying that this Bill will bring the law into line with modern developments. I am going to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee and I think the feeling of any honourable member of this Assembly on such an important subject as this one, is really better satisfied by having the views of doctors and trained persons in that respect sitting around a table than in open debate in the Assembly. Looking at this Bill, the only real developments which seem to be new are the voluntary treatment

in Clause 12 and the temporary treatment in Clause 13. Most of the other Clauses are really old and this is not a satisfactory modern development of an Act at all. In the majority of cases the old Clauses have been simply copied out; in some cases the Clauses have been copied out with very little addition, and in other cases paragraphs have been left out and put in somewhere else and it is said that the Bill is a new one. Another point is in connection with the definition in Clause 2; it is impossible for the layman to satisfy himself that the definition is too wide or that it is not wide enough. Therefore these are matters which would seem to be settled much more easily by appointing a Select Committee to consider this Bill than by debate in this House. You are changing this Bill for all time and if you make a mistake you make it for all time, and you are making it in respect of persons who cannot help themselves. Those of us who know something about lunacy do not want to take this Bill just as it is; we agree to the Bill being given its second reading and there is room for vast improvement. I think that if the honourable member sat in Select Committee he would be able to satisfy us in a much shorter time than we would otherwise be satisfied.

It is felt that the method of dealing with a private hospital is not justified, and that there should be some modern method of sending people to the Mental Hospital. In big countries you have institutions which have to be registered for dealing with people who are mentally deficient either temporarily or for all time. I have read the two new Clauses dealing with voluntary treatment and temporary treatment; we know particularly those of us who are in practice as lawyers or doctors, that if anybody with any mental form of illness goes to the Mental Hospital for treatment he is doomed in Barbados. If he goes to give evidence the first question which is asked him is whether he went to the Mental Hospital or not. I make a very strong appeal to the honourable senior member for St. Thomas on this point; I hope he will be able to help us to see whether we can make some real improvement. The treatment which will be given to people will never be of any use if they have to go to the Mental Hospital for it. It may be that we cannot do any better in the way of improvement at present, but personally I feel that the improvement suggested here is very little. The Bill is actually a rehash of the old Act with a few suggestions and it does not seem to me to be good enough to be labelled as legislation to bring the Act into line with recent developments. I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee and I suggest to the honourable member to make it the first Order of the Day at the next meeting of the House. The honourable member himself can organize the Committee and provide experts to tell honourable members what they think about the Bill. The courtesy of the honourable member is so great that I have never failed to pay him a compliment in this respect. We want to feel that we have done our duty and the best that we can do for people who cannot do anything for themselves.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second the motion that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

The question that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee was put and resolved in the affirmative, the following division being taken:—

Ayes: MESSRS. FOSTER, BRANCKER, ALLDER, MAPP, LEWIS, DOWDING, GARNER, MOTTLEY, GODDARD, E. K. WALCOTT, GILL, WILKINSON and REECE—13.

Noes: Messrs. SMITH, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT and Dr. CUMMINS—5.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I appoint the following honourable members to serve as members of this Select Committee: the honourable senior member for St. Thomas (Dr. Cummins) the honourable junior member for St. Thomas (Mr. Mapp), the honourable junior member for the City (Mr. Lewis), the honourable junior member for Christ Church (Mr. Reece), the honourable senior member for St. James (Mr. E. K. Walcott) and the honourable junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker).

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS No. 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Peter:—To move the passing of the following Resolution:—Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1950 No. 2," made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the 21st day of August, 1950, under section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (1937-16), as amended by sections 41 and 42 of the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 (1945-12), and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the 22nd day of August, 1950.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—I hear some honourable member say that these Regulations should be withdrawn, but when anything stands in my name I cannot be threatened into withdrawing it. The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act gives the Director of Highways and Transport the right to make Regulations and the Regulations which are before us deal with the control of motor vehicles other than motor omnibuses for the purpose of transporting people. Some honourable members are under the impression that these Regulations will preclude motor lorries from transporting people on Sundays and Bank Holidays; but if they will take time to read the Regulations they will find that that is not so. These Regulations give the right to lorry owners to transport people on lorries, but they seek to regulate the number of people which should be carried on lorries. You control the number of people which must be carried in a motor bus, but at present there is no control as to how many people should be carried on a motor lorry at any time or to any place. I could not be a party agreeing to a system which permits a lorry owner or driver to put as many people as he likes on the lorry and transport them to any place; it will be remembered that about five years ago 33 people lost their lives in a lorry accident and about two years ago a man lost his life in another lorry accident and there was no protection given in either of these cases. We want to give protection to people. This new Regulation 34A says this:—

"34A. The driver and owner of a public service vehicle other than a motor omnibus or the driver and owner of a motor lorry or other goods vehicle shall not allow to be carried on such vehicle a greater number of persons than the number authorised by the Inspector's certificate issued in respect of such vehicle.

Provided that in the case of a motor lorry or other goods vehicle, the Director of Highways and Transport may, subject to such terms and conditions as he thinks fit, grant permission to carry a greater number of persons than is authorised by such in-

spector's certificate, such persons to be carried sitting either

- (a) on the platform of the lorry; or
- (b) on such seating accommodation as may be approved by him in accordance with regulation 45A of these regulations."

If you are carrying on business with the use of a motor lorry you get the Inspector's certificate for carrying two, three, four or six persons on that lorry; but if you want to use the lorry for some special service, if you want to carry a larger number of people than the number authorised by the Inspector's certificate, permission will be given to do so if you conform with certain Regulations. If you are going to have more people than can be accommodated on the platform of the lorry you have to make certain seating arrangements. I cannot see anything unreasonable or unjust about that; you cannot carry more people than the certificate allows you to carry. I do not agree that you should be indiscriminate as to the number of persons which should be carried on a lorry. If these Regulations would prevent people from using their vehicles then I would say that a hardship would be created on people; but you give people the right to transport others on their vehicles with certain restrictions. You cannot ask bus concessionaires to put additional buses on the road for excursions. I doubt whether any honourable member would say that there should not be any restriction as to the number of people who should be carried on a lorry or that no measures should be taken for their safety. It is the duty of those who make traffic Regulations to provide adequate protection for people's lives; if this protection is not provided some honourable members will be the first to call upon the Government to give compensation in case of any accident. Regulation 45A says:—

"45A. (1) Where a motor lorry or other goods vehicle is converted, whether for use as a public service vehicle or not, by the provision of seating accommodation on such vehicle, the seats shall be fixed across the platform of the vehicle in a secure manner approved by an inspector.

(2) All such seats shall be firmly fixed in position and shall be of a depth of not less than fourteen inches. The unimpeded distance between the seats shall not be less than thirteen inches and no seat shall be placed more than fifteen inches above the floor of the platform of the vehicle."

With regard to the seating accommodation on a lorry, a permit will be given as to how many persons can be carried on the platform. There is a practice of transporting workers on lorries and where you want a certificate for that purpose you can ask for it; you will not be allowed to carry more workers than you should carry on a lorry. I think it is the duty of the Government to make adequate provision for the safety of people. I do not think that honourable members should import into these Regulations what they have in their minds; it is thought that these Regulations will prohibit people from using their vehicles, but that is not so. Permission is given for transporting persons on lorries, but there is a Regulation as to the number of persons which should be carried. I do not think anybody would doubt that these Regulations are not only in the interest of the travelling public but also in the interest of the owners of vehicles. Honourable members are aware that there is no Third Party Insurance being carried in this island and it would be a very serious thing to allow large numbers of people to travel on any type of vehicle without reasonable provision being made for their safety. I, personally, cannot see that there

is anything wrong in these Regulations, and I prefer to err on the side of protecting people's lives than on the side of indiscretion. I have a clear conscience in this matter; it is not a question of restricting the flow of transportation in this island, it is a question of regulating the number of people who should travel on these vehicles. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. WILKINSON: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Resolution. Much risk is being run particularly on Bank Holidays in the transportation of people to picnic parties, and the Advisory Committee to the Director of Highways and Transport and the Commissioner of Police have been in consultation on this matter. It is quite obvious that it would not pay bus concessionaires to provide buses to meet the demands of people on Bank Holidays and what has gradually come about is that several lorries are being crammed with people travelling all over the country, which I think is a terrible risk. The Commissioner of Police and the Advisory Committee to the Director of Highways and Transport are concerned with the safety of the public. As the honourable mover has said, we have no intention of preventing the public from travelling on Bank Holidays and on special occasions; it has been made as easy as possible for lorries to carry passengers at a very small expense to the owners. The main purpose of these Regulations is to ensure that these lorries will only be permitted to carry a certain number of passengers, which, in the view of the Transport Board, can be safely carried. Only recently we had a race meeting in this colony and honourable members must have seen the lorries going to that meeting with people packed so tightly on them that they could not sit down; I saw one lorry swing around a corner and everybody on it went to one side. There was the need of only a few inches more and there would have been a terrible disaster. That is what the Director of Highways and Transport and the Commissioner of Police are trying to prevent. The honourable senior member for St. Peter has explained the purpose of this Resolution very satisfactorily and I suggest to honourable members that they should consider first the safety of the public. I hope that there will not be any negative vote in connection with this Resolution.

Mr. GARNER: I have great sympathy for the honourable member who has brought these Regulations before the House and also for the honourable member who has seconded the motion for the passing of this Resolution. I realise that both these honourable members are in invidious positions in that one of them is in the Government and has a portfolio, and the other is in the unique position of being a member of the Advisory Committee to the Director of Highways and Transport. Be that as it may, I am a backbencher and I can say and do what I like. Although both these honourable members have made beautiful speeches I am not moved as to what they have said. I am going to move that these Regulations be not approved. (Cheers). We have got to consider the people of Barbados; we have got to remember the transport conditions in this colony before we can make regulations affecting the working people of this colony and people who are unable to buy motor cars or any form of transport to carry them about this island. (Cheers). First things must come first and it is all very well to copy regulations from some other place which has a proper means of transport. We know that the school children in this colony cannot get proper seats in the buses and tradesmen are offered transport by lorries in order that they

can get to their work. I think that we have to consider the safety of the travelling public, but we also have to take into consideration the fact that more accidents are caused by private cars than by lorries transporting people here and there for recreation and relaxation on Bank Holidays. I am not allowing anybody to fool me with any false idea; this seems to be trusting somebody too far; this is the thin edge of the wedge. I fail to see that when lorry owners want permits or certificates that they will be granted them at all. When lorry owners go to the Department of Highways and Transport for permits they are going to be told that this work is work which should be done by buses. Knowing the personnel over there as I do, they only give permits to certain bus owners; if that is so in the case of bus owners how much more so will it be the case when you come to the lorry owners? I think I hear them say; "We have to find out how many buses can do the work before we can give you a permit." Such a question is bound to arise. We should first think of the travelling public; what will be the result to the travelling public if you really curtail the activities of these lorry owners? I have great apprehensions in this matter; I know that, human nature being what it is, the people in St. Andrew, for instance, will want to have a change whenever a Bank Holiday comes along; they cannot afford to spree on any day like some of us and they will want to come to the King George V. Playfield Park and have a spree up there. (Laughter). Am I going to stay here and prevent the good people from St. Andrew from coming to the good people in St. Philip? (Laughter). I am not going to do that. On the other hand people have to transport workers from place to place and they may have to do it impromptu; the rain is falling, a speedy job can be done and the manager of an estate may decide that since the weather permits he will take labourers to work at some place. Must that manager go to the Transport Board to get a permit so that the labourers can go to that place to work? I have read of the biggest railway accidents in England, but they did not prevent transport by railway. If you make regulations in respect of lorries will you prevent accidents from taking place? I counsel honourable members to give these Regulations the fate they deserve and that is to disapprove them, because they are not going to do this colony any good. I am not going to believe that permits will be given to lorry owners. I must be bound by my conscience and my conscience tells me that it will not be right to put any embargo on these lorry owners. Many of these lorry owners have to pay trade tax and some of them do not get any work until there is a Bank Holiday; are we going to take away that little privilege from them? Can we circumvent the activities of these people and put them out of business? I beg to move that these Regulations be disapproved and I feel that in agreeing to this motion we will be doing this island a service. Those who believe that these lorry owners will be given permits to operate their lorries are trusting to luck and living in a fool's paradise. We are bound to think of the travelling public; I do not care what Regulations you bring forward, they will not prevent accidents from taking place. You have a law which provides a penalty for those who over-speed and every day you have people in the Courts charged with that offence. I repeat, if you give power to the Director of Highways and Transport to circumvent these

people that is not going to prevent accidents from taking place.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the disapproval of these Regulations. In doing so I am as conscious of my responsibility to the community as the honourable member who moved the passing of this Resolution and the honourable member who seconded the motion are conscious of their responsibility to the community. These Regulations were first hinted to me by a bus concessionaire, a good friend of mine. I listened for nearly an hour to him and I considered how easy it was for people when their stomachs are full, to disregard other people. I understand that representations were made first of all by bus concessionaires; the feeling was that several lorry owners were crossing swords, so to speak, with bus concessionaires and using their lorries to transport people. Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree that as this service grows bigger and bigger something must be done to see that people who travel by these lorries are protected; but it does not necessarily mean that because some people get into accidents everybody is going to be reckless in driving a lorry. As the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said, you have big railway accidents taking place but people do not stop travelling by train; it does not mean that because you have big steamship accidents that people will stop travelling by steamships. On the other side of the picture, are the transport facilities enough to accommodate the travelling public? Do not let us only deal with the question of lorries taking people from one place to the other; there is also the question of transporting labourers from one plantation to another at the most appropriate time for the purpose of doing work, as the honourable senior member for St. Philip has said, and is it suggested that a person would have to come to Bridgetown and get permission from the Transport Board so as to be able to transport those labourers from one place to another? There are several lorry owners other than plantation lorry owners, and these people invest all their life's savings in these lorries. I know a man who, since he returned here from the War, has invested his small savings in lorries; after the crop season people have to put aside lorries on which they have spent \$1,500 or \$1,800 and they had to pay taxes on these lorries. I am ashamed of any bus concessionaire who tries to strangle these poor people; it is a disgrace for any of them to try to do that. I intend to vote against these Regulations if I stand alone.

Lorries are being used to transport people of various denominations on Sundays and Bank Holidays. It is not a question of these lorries travelling on a particular route and being used in plying for hire, because I would not encourage that at all. People from the Pilgrim Holiness or some other denomination may want to go to St. Peter or St. Lucy; after a certain time you do not get any bus transportation and arrangements can be made to transport these poor people by motor lorry for a pittance. The lorry owner and everybody else is happy and do you tell me that I must pass Regulations which preclude that? I will not support any such Resolution. It must be remembered that there are many people in the City who cannot afford to charter three, four or five buses; they cannot afford to pay the price which is charged for transportation by these buses. There are those who have forgotten whence they came and that they had to walk at times because there was no transport; I ask them to remember that. People in the City may want to go to the country for the purpose of enjoying a little fresh air; they cannot pay what is charged for transportation by buses and they may raise a shilling

apiece and the lorry owner may raise about \$7.20 which has to run his house for a week. I will not vote for giving anybody power to stop that. If you have an Act which says that you must grant licences to bus owners for transporting people. I am yet to see how you can grant these licences to lorry owners. The bus concessionaires should be ashamed of making representations so as to cut out these lorry owners who transport people who cannot afford to pay the high prices charged for bus transportation on excursions. I say that any honourable member of this House who lends a hand to squeezing out these lorry owners should himself be squeezed out. If we agree to these Regulations we are not only doing something which will prevent these lorry owners from earning a living but we are making things difficult for a number of people who cannot pay for bus transport. I feel that we should not agree to any such Regulations and I counsel honourable members to allow the Director of Highways and Transport to find different means of protecting the public. If it is feared that reckless driving takes place and that that will cost lives then I ask; what is more reckless than the use of "drive yourself" cars—five-seater cars carrying fifteen people in them? And in many instances the people who drive these cars are not even Barbadians! You are not prohibiting that state affairs as being dangerous to life and limb, but you want to interfere with a few lorry owners who help people. I would like to hear the honourable member in charge of this Resolution opposing these Regulations; I would like to hear him opposing them if he were outside the Government. I strongly support the motion for the disapproval of these Regulations and I hope that the Government members will see the wisdom of walking out of the House if they cannot see that these Regulations should not be approved. People cannot get adequate transport facilities in this island and how must they get from one part of the country to another part of the country? Must they fly or walk? I regret that the honourable Leader of my Party has supported the passing of this Resolution approving these Regulations and I ask honourable members to disapprove them.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am willing to admit that protection for the travelling public must be one of the main considerations of the transport officials; if they do not take proper steps to safeguard the travelling public, then of course the responsibility for failing to do so will fall on their shoulders and all blame will be attached to them if and when accidents occur. Therefore one can appreciate to some extent why the transport officials have sought to concern themselves with this particular problem; but as to whether or not the methods proposed in these Regulations are the best by which to achieve the end sought, is, in my opinion, an entirely different matter. Within recent years the practice has grown up in this colony for motor lorries to be equipped with seats and used for the transport of large numbers of people on Sundays, during the week and on special holiday occasions. It has been felt by a large number of people that these converted vehicles constitute a danger both to the people inside them as well as to other people. I can well understand the apprehension on the part of the Director of Highways and Transport in this matter, for if he did not pay what he considered to be due regard to the situation, he would be rightly blamed on all sides in case any major disaster occurred in consequence.

At this point, Mr. SPEAKER vacated the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—These Regulations are the result of the attention paid

by the Director of Highways and Transport to this particular situation, and I suggest that we should consider them in the light of the fact that the entire transport system of the colony is totally inadequate efficiently to handle the situation from day to day. I want to emphasize that these converted lorries are not used so much for spreeing on holidays as many honourable members seem to think; many of these lorries are in daily use for transporting workers to and from their work—workers who cannot get transport by the buses for the simple reason that there are not enough buses on any route to cope with the transport situation from day to day. There is the spectacle daily of large numbers of these lorries transporting people to their work and school children to school, and the matter has to be considered from that point of view before we can begin to put obstacles in the way of transport by lorries. We must provide an adequate number of buses before we place obstacles in the way of the system of transport by motor lorries and so make it difficult for a very large section of the public who must find themselves on their work daily from very remote parts of the country to the City and back home after work. At the present moment lorries provide the only means of transport for this large number of people.

These Regulations propose that the number of persons who are allowed to be carried on motor lorries should be regulated by the certificate of an Inspector, and they also propose that permits might be given by the Director of Highways and Transport for allowing a greater number of persons to be carried than that authorised by the Inspector's certificate. Those of us who know anything about the manner in which certificates or permits are granted by the transport officials even to bus concessionaires would be the last to suggest that similar power should be put in the hands of these officials in respect of this particular matter. Allegations have been made—and they have been well substantiated from time to time—that in the granting of permits to bus concessionaires for doing special work there has been a considerable amount of discrimination. If that is so, it can be easily understood what the position will be if similar power is given to the transport officials to regulate the granting of permits to lorry owners for the special purpose mentioned in these Regulations. As regards the proposal to fix seats on these lorries, that is not as easily put into effect as these innocent words in these Regulations would make it appear. One has to bear in mind that these lorries are not used merely for transporting people, and to have these seats fixed firmly in position and so on, will of necessity mean that the lorries are either going to be used exclusively for transporting people or as vehicles for transporting goods, and the normal use to which these lorries are put will be considerably hampered. Therefore the real purpose of these Regulations is not so much to make it easy for lorry owners to transport people on special occasions, but really materially to interfere with the transport of people by lorries and to force the public to use what buses are available and those who cannot find accommodation in them must be compelled to get about as best they can. I want to suggest that before such Regulations are supported we should first be convinced in our minds that the number of buses be increased to the point at which nearly all the people who want to get around from day to day and on special occasions can be accommodated. While something should be done by all means to protect those who travel by these converted lorries and other people, yet what is proposed here is not the way in which it should be done. It may

well be that authority can be given to the Transport officials to inspect lorries which are transporting people and see that such people are properly protected; and if the seats provided for the occupants are not properly fixed then the lorry owners and drivers should be prosecuted. Some such provision might meet the needs of the case: but I definitely submit that we would be well advised not to support these Regulations at this stage.

Mr. BRANCKER: I do not propose to go into the legal aspect as to whether these regulations are *ultra vires*, I should like to deal with the everyday aspect of the matter. It seems to me, from the remarks of the introducer and seconder of the regulations, that the Government has been stampeded into action by an accident or two. If there have been an accident or two, the lorries are not to be blamed. As an honourable member remarked, the most potent source of accidents is the self-driven car because a certain type of person who has just acquired a driver's licence rents a car, gets two or three people with him, a certain quantity of alcohol, goes on a joy-ride and more often than not becomes involved in an accident; he is not an experienced driver; he is not the driver that a bus driver or a lorry driver is and he is simply out to have a good time and a good spree with the vehicle which he has rented, say, for \$10.00. That is the greatest source of danger. The Government, I repeat, seems to be stampeded into this action by the lorries, which is far from the case. We have to consider the people and their means of transport from one part of the island to another. This same Department which tries to foist these regulations on the public has never seen to it that an adequate bus service is provided to accommodate the people and that there should be sufficient routes covered by such a proper bus service. Officials of that Department with possibly one exception, have motor cars; they do not consider people who do not have motor cars and have to travel by other vehicles.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable member to sit for a moment and let me appeal to some of the other honourable members to allow the Reporters and myself at least to hear what he is saying. The honourable member may continue.

Mr. BRANCKER: The point I was making is that it is difficult, if not impossible, for people to secure transportation and the vast majority of them cannot afford to rent self-driven cars. The lorries perform a very useful service in this respect. In case people of the various religious denominations want to visit one another's churches or a number of people in a particular district want to attend a funeral nothing is more difficult for bus owners than to obtain permits for the purpose. If the popular concessionaires—because there are one or two of them who are very popular—cannot get permits, how much more difficult it is for a small lorry owner to get a permit? We have to consider the people who do not have their own motor cars. There is no virtue in these regulations; they are made by persons who are out of touch with people who have no independent means of transport and who have thought of these in the absence of something better. I intend to support the motion for the rejection of these regulations.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,—It is all right to talk about public safety, that is a nice catch phrase. It is known all over the world that Barbados has the largest population to the square mile in the world. A country's progress is measured by its transportation among other things and the movement of the people should always be of prime importance in a country. These regulations should never have been brought before this House (Cheers). I dislike the way in which they have been brought before this

Assembly and how we are supposed to be fighting to throw them out. This is wrong; this savours of Hitlerism. Until we are satisfied that we have an adequate bus service in this island to take care of the movement of the people, we should have no kind of regulation to restrict travel by means of vehicles like motor lorries. I am one of the backbenchers who are expected to support the Government but this type of regulations is going to hurt the fellow who needs this form of transport most. I happen to drive a pick-up which may be classed as a lorry and on mornings it is my delight to pick up a number of people who wait at certain points of my route for me and bring them to town to get to their work. There are many people in this island who cannot afford to buy even a bicycle and I repeat that until we have an adequate bus service we should not have any regulations to restrict the travel of the people from place to place. I suggest to honourable members to reject these regulations.

Mr. SPEAKER resumes the Chair.

Mr. MAPP: I am going to support the motion for the rejection of these regulations but I am going to support it on slightly different grounds from those of the member who moved it and others who supported it. I do not want it to be thought that simply because transportation facilities are difficult I am going to be led away by those who would allow any driver to carry any number of persons on his vehicle without any regard for the safety of the public and no measures taken to safeguard the lives of people. I do not agree with that, on principle. It will go abroad that the members of the House feel that because transportation facilities are not what they should be, lorry owners should be allowed to carry any number of passengers in their lorries. As I said, I cannot agree with that and I agree with the motive behind these regulations, that is, to regulate the number of passengers to be carried by a lorry and make the lorry owner provide adequate seating accommodation for passengers. But, Sir, I am going to bring now to the attention of the Government this: It is obvious that this House has no confidence in the Director of Highways and Transport and it is obvious that under the Act the Director of Highways and Transport has too much power. Recently he proposed to increase the bus fares to the country districts and we did not agree to his proposal. Under the Act he can make regulations, submit them to the Governor and then to this House. We feel that any terms and conditions laid down by him should be subject to the approval of the Executive Committee and that the Governor-in-Executive Committee should try to change the Act and take some of the power out of his hands. Until they do that they are going to find themselves in difficulty whenever they bring matters of transport before this House. The Government should provide for safety on these vehicles but I do not like the method of giving the Director of Highways and Transport all this power; that is my objection. While I am voting against these regulations it is my duty to say that I am sympathetic towards the motive behind them.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I have listened to the speeches of honourable members, some of which were illogical. Honourable members say that this is a means of protecting life and limb, that they agree to it but we should wait until the day comes when there is adequate transportation for the people. That I say, is illogical. The senior member for St. Philip has said exactly what is operating in the minds of honourable members, that is the lack of confidence in the Director of Highways and Transport but you

cannot persuade people to have confidence in others. Despite the feelings of honourable members about the Director and these matters I still maintain that regulations of this sort are in the interest of the people of the colony. As regards self-driven cars, I have never seen one; all cars are driven by persons and I still believe that you need, in a community like this, provisions for the protection of the people. The principal regulations were in existence since 1937 when the junior member for St. Lucy was a member of that Board and those are the same powers which the Board has now.

Mr. BRANCKER: I was not on that Board in 1937 or 1938. The only lawyer on that Board at that time was the present Attorney General of British Guiana.

The question that these Regulations be disapproved of is put and resolved in the affirmative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes. Messrs. SMITH, FOSTER, MILLER, ALLDER, MAPP, GARNER, CRAWFORD, BRANCKER, E. K. WALCOTT, REFCE, GILL, and MOTTLEY.—12.

Noes: Messrs. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, and Dr. CUMMINS.—3.

ADDRESS *RE* FILLING OF POST OF ASSISTANT MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MENTAL HOSPITAL

Dr. CUMMINS, with leave, moves the following Address in reply to His Excellency's Message No. 24/1950 relating to the filling of the post of Assistant Medical Superintendent of the Mental Hospital:—

The House of Assembly To His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 24/1950 dated 18th August, 1950 relating to the filling of the post of Assistant Medical Superintendent, Mental Hospital.

The House of Assembly agree to the appointment of an Assistant Medical Superintendent for the term and on the conditions mentioned and set out in Your Excellency's Message.

Mr. COX: I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Address.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the senior member for St. Thomas to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Dr. CUMMINS: As Your Honour pleases.

ADDRESS *Re* THE ACQUISITION OF ROSEGATE TENANTRY

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,—I ask that Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order. The matter has been fully discussed already and I only want to have a decision on it.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order is to resume debate on 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,—I beg to move that the following Address do now pass:—

*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 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 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. MILLER: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable senior member for St. John to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. ALLDER: As Your Honour pleases.

THE CHRIST CHURCH PARISH LOAN
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker,—I ask that Order No. 49 under Private Members' Business be taken as the next Order.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable junior member for Christ Church,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Christ Church Parish Loan Act, 1948.

Mr. REECE: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill seeks to authorize the Vestry of Christ Church to lay a rate in the year, 1963, sufficient to pay in that year the sum of £300 being the balance which will then be unpaid of the sum of £4,500 borrowed under the provisions of the Act, with the interest becoming due in that year on such balance. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. E. K. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. REECE, seconded by Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, Mr. SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

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

On the motion of Mr. REECE, seconded by Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. REECE, seconded in each case by Mr. E. K. WALCOTT, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. Cox, the House is adjourned to meet on Tuesday, the 19th of September, 1950, at 3 o'clock p.m.