

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15th May, 1951

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

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. H. CUMMINS, M.D. C.M., Messrs. J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., G. H. ADAMS, B.A., M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, H. A. DOWDING, R. G. MAPP, F. C. GODDARD, O. T. ALLDER, F. E. MILLER, L. E. R. GILL, and J. A. HAYNES.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting of the 17th April, 1951, having been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Messrs. BRYAN and MOTTLEY entered the House and took their seats.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Honourable the Legislative Council returning the Bill to amend the Law relating to persons of unsound mind and for purposes connected therewith with amendments.

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:—

Report of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. Philip for the half year ended the 31st March, 1951.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure on Tenantry Roads in the parish of St. Philip for the half year ended 31st March, 1951.

Report of the Highway Commissioners of the parish of St. Joseph for the half year ended the 31st March, 1951.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure on Tenantry Roads in the parish of St. Joseph for the half year ended the 31st March, 1951.

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. 15/1951.

*The House of Assembly
to*

His Excellency the Governor

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to Message No. 30 of 1950 concerning the establishment of a Farm Institute for the Eastern Caribbean in Trinidad, and to inform the Honourable House of Assembly that it has been learned with regret that the Government of British Guiana feels unable to participate in the Scheme.

2. If the Scheme is to be implemented it will be necessary for the remaining Governments to meet the contributions payable by British Guiana. On the existing proportions, Barbados would be called upon to increase the contribution to capital cost from \$14,668 to \$20,520 and recurrent expenditure for a total of four student places from \$4,188 to \$6,039 per annum.

3. It is possible however that if the Farm Institute is established in the near future the Government of British Guiana may reconsider its decision not to participate, in which event it would be required to contribute its share of the Capital cost.

4. The Honourable House of Assembly is invited to approve participation in the Scheme by the Barbados Government under the revised conditions subject to the additional contribution in respect of Capital cost being refunded should the Government of British Guiana later decide to participate.

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
27th April, 1951.

PAPERS LAID

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

Quarterly return of Transactions in Rum to 31st March, 1951.

Report of the Department of Highways and Transport for the Year 1949—50.

Post Office Advances for payment of Money Orders to 31st March, 1951.

Colonial Report—Barbados 1949.

Report of the Select Committee on Vocational and Technical Training with special reference to the Part Time Training of Apprentices.

NOTICES.

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$24,544 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part I—Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 4 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$42,377 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part II—Capital as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 5, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: A Bill intituled an Act to authorise the payment of an additional gratuity and Pension to Frederick Archibald Conrad Clairmonte.

Mr. ADAMS: A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Teachers Pension Act 1925.

Mr. ADAMS: A Bill intituled an Act to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year One thousand nine hundred and fiftyone, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

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

Messrs. WARD, BRANCKER and GARNER entered the House and took their seats.

Other Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. MILLER: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
to
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to take steps to send down legislation having for its object the purchase of the plantation known as "Drax Hall" situated in the parish of St. George, owned by absentee proprietors.

2. The House further desire that the above-mentioned plantation be broken up into one-acre plots with Roads, Water-supply, and Communal Baths and Toilets thereby providing about seven hundred (700) needy families with the opportunity to establish Homesteads giving priority to those people who are now renters on the same plantation.

3. The House further desire, that this land be released on a long-term easy-payment plan.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
to
His Excellency The Governor.*

WHEREAS it has been represented to this House that Mr. Milton King, a Barbadian employed as a Seaman on the S.S. Strategist of the Harrison Line, plying between the United Kingdom and the Union of South Africa, was—between the third and fourth days of March 1951—foully beaten to death by a member or members of the Police Force of the Union of South Africa:

BE IT RESOLVED that His Excellency the Governor be requested to inform His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies by cable, of the strong sentiment of the Elected Representatives of the people of this ancient colony, arising from the untimely and lamentable demise of so esteemed a West Indian, and that this House requests that the Secretary of State shall exert his utmost endeavours to ensure that a thorough and intensive investigation be made into every circumstance surrounding the death of Milton King; with a view of bringing to justice the culprit or culprits responsible for his premature end; and further of ensuring the payment of adequate compensation to the children of the deceased from the Treasury of the Union of South Africa. (Cheers).

Mr. MILLER: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor.*

The House of Assembly respectfully request Your Excellency to take steps to send down legislation having for its object the purchase of a portion of Walker's Land, where it joins the highway at Taitt Hill, in the parish of St. George.

2. The House further desire that the above-mentioned land be developed into a Tenantry, similar to that of the Bay Estate.

3. The House deplore the plight of the tenants of this estate who live in the ravines and gullies, denied even the merest facilities offered by Public Utilities, and without a track that could be called a road.

QUESTIONS.

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

1. Is it a fact that a number of Police Constables were recently fined for sheltering out of a heavy rain and are now compelled to remain on duty during such heavy rains without proper protection or suitable shelter?

2. Will Government take immediate steps to protect such Police Constables from punishments of this nature?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

On motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the following Bills were read a first time:—

A Bill intituled an Act to authorise the payment of an additional gratuity and pension to Frederick Archibald Conrad Clairmonte.

A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Teachers Pension Act, 1925.

A Bill intituled an Act to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year One thousand nine hundred and fiftyone, and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MR. E. K. WALCOTT

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker,—Before you proceed to call the Orders of the Day, I am asking for two months' leave of absence as from to-day for the hon. senior member for St. James who is under medical treatment.

There being no objection, the leave of absence asked for was granted.

ORDERS POSTPONED

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I ask leave to postpone the consideration of the first four Orders of the Day.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS FROM STORM AND FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. ADAMS: This Resolution, as honourable members will see, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$9,716 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52 Part I—Current, as shown in Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 2, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

This Resolution, it is true, comes to the House after a long period of delay. The Government is always prepared to acknowledge its faults in case any can ever be discovered; but where the fault lies in this case is in an endeavour to examine carefully the claims which have been sent in. In a case of this sort in which however humane everyone of us must feel, especially where there has been a substantial loss of life and where there have been such a great deal of attacks on people and propaganda being used, it became extremely necessary for the Government to examine carefully many of these claims. It has to be remembered that this grant is an act of grace. I know that the honourable members for St. Andrew will agree with me that in that parish the Government made a thorough examination to adjust many of the claims. I myself have accompanied the late honourable junior member for St. Andrew, Mr. Darry Foster, and have seen more of the actual damage in that parish than in any other parish except the parish of St. John. I have accompanied Mr. Greenidge and Mr. B. L. Barrow along with the Colonial Secretary and the Financial Secretary in St. John. I hope that honourable members will feel that now is the time to stop making recriminations and vote this money. I do not suggest that honourable members should not ask questions or even criticise, but recriminations can be a boomerang. In spite of the great number of attacks which have been made on the St. Michael's Vestry, I intend to say nothing except that the sum of \$69,000 which had been asked for by the Vestry was cut down by the Vestry themselves to \$7,000. I am not worrying about the personnel of those who investigated the claims at one time and those who investigated them at another time; I have no intention of criticising anybody. I may know why the amount was so high at first and why it is so low to-day. I quoted the figures to show that the Government when faced with claims from the various parishes and began to investigate them, discovered that it was not wrong in investigating them, because the same Body which claimed \$69,000 now claims \$6,707.52. The Vestry of St. Michael claimed on behalf of 550 parishioners many of whom we discovered were not in the flood area. At an investigation held by the Executive Com-

mittee in October, 1949, it was decided that the Vestry had used a wrong principle, and, as a result, the vestry appointed another Committee who then recommended grants to 224 people amounting to \$6,707.52. We have agreed to those figures; that is the first big item. Then we had estimates from nine other parishes for the repair of houses; there were ten special houses in St. Michael in respect of which a sum of money was voted and there were one or two extra claims. There were special claims to which we thought special attention should be given. Investigation has been made time and again and no amount of consideration could possibly allow every body 100% in respect of his claim, but the Government has endeavoured to be quite fair in making these grants. The Government still hopes that members of the public might help those whom it was impossible to help fully. For instance, if a house and shop are washed away and you got back some fragments, we assess the damage at \$400; it is impossible to put the owner of that property back in the position in which he was before. The Government can only give a substantial amount where the damage amounted to \$1,000 and over and a lesser amount where the damage amounted to less than that sum. In any event, we have carefully examined the claims which have been sent in, but the claims of 550 people were on a basis which could not be entertained. People sent in claims, for instance, in respect of two fox terriers, piano, gold watches, and so on, belonging which were washed away. That is unfortunate, but you could not possibly give back people the value of those things; however, we had to stick to the figures where it was a question of the loss of houses. In the case of a house having been washed away, we had to give back a new house and \$120 in furniture as a sort of stopgap. I have all the lists here in respect of claims and if honourable members ask for any information, I shall be glad to give it. Things have not been done in any haphazard way; we prefer to spend a month in checking up than come down in a hurry with any amount.

I must pay a tribute to the parish of St. Philip; the authorities from that parish sent in what appears to be the most reasonable claim of all the parishes. They do not seem to have overstated the position. (Mr. MOTTLEY: What else could they do if they did not have any damage particularly?) If there was not a lot of propaganda going around people could not have sent in some of these claims. Honourable members will see from the addendum to the Resolution how this amount of money has been made up. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—It is now many months since this matter was pending. There is an old adage that he who gives quickly gives twice. I am going to be as reasonable as I possibly can in any criticism which I may make, but I am bound to criticize the Government for a lot of things in connection with this matter. I will start off with exactly what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said; I would not be doing my duty as a vestryman if I sat here and allowed the honourable member's remarks to go unchallenged—remarks to the effect that the Vestry of St. Michael amended their claims from \$69,000 to \$6,000, and left the matter just there. That is not quite fair.

Mr. ADAMS: I must interrupt the hon. member. I was at pains to say that it was pointed out to the Vestry that the basis on which they made their estimates was too wide. I read out that phrase.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the honourable member read out that phrase and I did not hear it, I apologize; but merely to say that the Vestry actually amended their claims from \$69,000 to a little under \$7,000 is not quite correct. When I saw the figures

which were sent in from the Vestry to the Government I felt that they were high; I was not satisfied that all was well with those figures. I remember speaking to a member of the Government at the time and that assisted in causing the Vestry to amend the figures. It was represented to the Vestry that there was no point in asking the Government for an assistance in replacing furniture or any such loss which occurred in the flood area. I told the Government that a statement like that coming from the Social Welfare Officer would do harm; no Government could see such conditions and say that they could not give any assistance in replacing furniture, clothing and the like. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that the figures received by the Government from the Vestry of St. Michael were in respect of 550 persons, and I hope it will be recorded that the Government told the Vestry that the scope was too wide. In other words, the Government said that only people who were in the immediate flood area, people who suffered to such an extent that they could not assist in replacing their belongings could be helped, and, as a result of that, the Vestry reduced the number of people to 224. Praise seems to have been showered on the parish of St. Philip; but honourable members must realise that the damage and the suffering as a result of the flood happened to be within the City area and in the parish of St. Michael along Constitution Road, Queen's Park and River Road. Seven-eighths of the people who suffered and lost their lives came from those areas. When praise is showered on other parishes and not on St. Michael, I smile; I know that a number of persons in River Road and Nelson Street had their belongings absolutely washed away; not long ago a man who has seven children came and told me that he had to borrow clothing on the day after the flood. I hope that people who have suffered will be given the necessary relief. It is true that the Government was quite in order to make a thorough investigation as regards the claims which were made; but I say that the investigation in respect of people who have suffered at the hands of Providence has taken too long. Nobody wants to deal with fictitious figures; if a storm takes place in this colony and you have to wait for two years to get assistance in respect of any damage you have suffered, then I say; God help you. Even the subscription which was given privately had to be sent to the Colonial Secretary's Office to be dealt with, and at one time it was said that there was nobody in that Office to deal with the matter.

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that claims were sent in with regard to people many of whom were not in the flood area; however, he knows that the flood area was the area from Glendairy Prison down to the Wharf. After the St. Michael's Vestry sent the claims to the Government setting out that there were 550 people who had suffered loss, the Government picked out people who were not in the flood area and assisted them and that was stark dishonesty. They picked out people who lived at the top of Codrington Hill, and when a flood could get near there, God help us. People in St. Stephen's district and Codrington Hill were picked out for obvious reasons and given assistance.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Everybody knows that I live at Codrington Hill and this is the first time I have heard that anybody from Codrington Hill got any assistance. In any case, the matter would be dealt with by the Secretariat and not by any member of the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If I felt that the honourable member had something to do with this matter, I would say so. I can say that the honourable member had nothing to do with the matter. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, when the honourable member says

that the names of 550 people were sent in by the St. Michael's Vestry as those who had suffered, and that many of these people were not in the flood area at all, I say that these 550 people were in the flood area from Glendairy Prison down to the Wharf; but 10 persons were picked out from Codrington and St. Stephen's Hill—places where people were far removed from the flood area—and given assistance. A letter was sent to the Government drawing to their attention that there were persons, in the opinion of the investigating Committee, were definitely in the flood area and from whom the flood had taken away everything and carried it into the sea. Why should people be selected and assisted from an area where, you will agree, if they had been affected by the flood as we know the flood, everybody would have gone? No honest man in this House could agree that any action like that is above-board. I am going one further; as a member of the Housing Board, I say that houses were removed from the flood area to the Bay Estate and occasionally a house was picked out from outside the flood area and removed to the Bay Estate. If you are dealing with a principle, you are dealing with a principle; if anybody on this side of the House had anything to do with this matter you would have heard from that side of the House about partiality being shown. Whenever people came to me about this matter I told them that they must take their direction from the Government.

The honourable member referred to propaganda in connection with this matter. I kept silent because I felt that if a man is living in a house and purely because some water entered the house, he put in a fictitious claim, that could not be right. But I knew that there were some genuine cases where people suffered in the flood area. On the morning after the flood I visited the various areas and saw that many people had lost all their earthly belongings. It is true that some of these people were given refuge at the Pine Estate, but there are still people who have not yet caught themselves. There were a number of middle class people into whose houses the water had entered, and it was fair to give these people assistance just as the other people were given assistance. Today, after nearly two years, the Government is asking us to vote this money. The addendum to this Resolution says:

Under the provisions of Resolutions 44 and 54 of 1949, a total of \$29,049 was voted for the purpose of relieving distress caused by storm and flood damage during 1948 and 1949. Of this amount \$22,934 has been disbursed, leaving an unexpended balance of \$6,115 which has lapsed. In addition there is an amount of \$5,150.20 in hand from voluntary subscriptions.

Further claims totalling \$14,865.60 and based on returns from Vestries have now been approved and the amount of \$9,716 is now required together with the amount of voluntary subscriptions to pay these claims."

When it is asked why something was not done with the subscriptions, the reply was that there was nobody in the Colonial Secretary's Office to deal with them. I am voting for this Resolution today and I feel that this money will be of some assistance to people. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said that the names of many people who were not in the flood area were sent in by the Vestry and yet there were people outside the flood area who were selected and given assistance. I have heard supporters of this Government accuse members of the Government of this; that if you vote for people other than those of the Labour Party, there is some question about not giving you any assistance. In connection with giving relief to these flood victims, if you examine closely what has happened, you will see that

there is a feeling that because a lot of these people would not continue to follow the Labour Party blindly, they are refused assistance. We have to vote this money, but we do not vote it without some protest because we feel that this assistance has been too long in coming forth.

There is one further point which I want to make. The actual figures on which the Government has now worked, have been in the hands of the Government months ago and help is only now forthcoming for people who have suffered. We pin faith in the Almighty that we will be protected from such disasters in future. Some people pray for such things to take place because they have nothing to do but drive around and try to organize all sorts of things; but God will help us in times of distress as he does at all times. It is not a good thing for the Government to take so long to give assistance to people who have suffered, especially when money has been subscribed towards that assistance.

Mr. CRAWFORD came into the Committee and took his seat while Mr. MOTTLEY was speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: I have no intention of bandying words with the honourable senior member for the City. From the addendum to this Resolution it will be seen that sums of money were voted in respect of flood damage before this Resolution came before the House; we have voted money in this regard twice before. The honourable member spoke as if the members of the Government selected the houses; but every single list of damaged houses came from the Churchwardens of the various parishes and the checking up was done by the Colonial Engineer. In St. Michael, the Housing Board along with Mr. Kidney and Mr. Merritt did something, but every list of these houses came from the Churchwardens of the various parishes. Provision was made for shelter in the first place; the Government did nothing except to check up on the Churchwardens. The Government got the lists from the Churchwardens and sent around Mr. Went to check up on the estimates for repairs. That is why the Government sent back to the St. Michael's Vestry and told them that they had worked on a wrong basis. The honourable senior member for the City is so accustomed to making vilely offensive remarks against people—remarks which have no foundation in fact—that I ignore them, and he takes my silence for acceptance. Sometimes I have to remind him that I am not dumb. In some cases we said "all right" to estimates sent in by the Churchwardens, in other cases we cut off something and in some other cases the Colonial Engineer added something. I repeat that the Government only checked up on the estimates; when we saw the list of 550 persons from St. Michael we said that the Vestry had gone on a wrong basis, that the basis on which they had worked was not what we meant, and they revised their estimates. As regards the reference to the Labour Party, we have no Churchwarden in the Labour Party. I only rose to say that no selection of houses was made by the Government, that the Government only checked up on the estimates and, in the case of St. Michael, we said "You have done it on a wrong basis."

Mr. MOTTLEY: Despite the fact that the honourable member says that I make vilely offensive remarks, I say that they are not made of him. If I make statements on the floor of this House, I do not go out of the way too often; and whenever the honourable member attacks it is a matter of indifference to me. If I feel that I am right, I will say so whether it offends any Party or not. I do not know if the honourable member will say that it is correct or a downright lie to say that 10 persons were selected and assisted. I remember that Miss Arne, in a sweeping statement to the Vestry said: "You need not ask

for any assistance in respect of furniture; the Government will not be giving any." I knew that the people in the Government would not have done that; I knew that Miss Arne was talking ignorance. I went to a member of the Government and asked him why they were allowing people to dictate their policy. Here in the flood area you have people who have suffered; nothing was said about any principle, you submit over 500 names, and 10 people are selected and given assistance! If they had selected 10 persons who lost everything they had, I would have said that those persons did not appear on the list which the Vestry of St. Michael had sent in. These people did not live in the flood area and we were dealing with people whose beds and so on were washed into the Carenage. I am big enough to apologize for anything I say if it is wrong; if my remarks appear to be offensive to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph because I make a statement of fact about the Government, whose fault is that? When a letter comes to the Vestry stating: "I am directed to state so and so" who must I blame? Officials of this colony should not be allowed to write letters dictating Government policy. If I am wrong, the files are in the Colonial Secretary's Office; if the honourable member would be so kind as to read the letter and show where I am wrong, I will make all the apology he wants. Does the honourable member want me to say; "God bless the Government" and things of that sort? When people are right, I will say that they are right. I say: let us face facts. I know that people have really suffered and when you keep them back for two years before you assist them, I say that that is too long, when, on the other hand, a few people are selected and dealt with. The honourable member does not know a lot of things, but he will soon know them.

Mr. ALLDER: This is apparently the last phase in the chequered history of this flood damage. I would like the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to help me to understand what the real position as regards St. John is. The last report which I have had from the local authorities was that they had committed themselves to certain expenditure, they were not in a position to pay the lumber yards, and therefore the bills are there against them for all these months. I would like to know if the money which is to be granted to the parish of St. John under this Resolution will be used in paying off the debt to which the local authorities have committed themselves, and what part of it, if any, will go to relieve the suffering of those persons who were told that they must wait until more money is given. There was a kind of shortsighted policy adopted in appointing members to the various Committees; I have found that where a house was partially damaged it was readily repaired; but there were also a few houses which were totally destroyed. I can testify to that because I have visited some of these houses; one of them was lying on the ground and when I paid another visit I saw no part of it on the spot and it had not been erected on any other spot. That means that people are suffering and their suffering can only be measured in terms of the several months during which they have not had any assistance so as to be able to inhabit their houses and enjoy privacy. I would like to know if any special provision has been made for persons like Ella Small whose neighbours could not continue to offer her shelter. No calamity such as that which befell us in 1949 has taken place and the Government could not be expected to compensate householders where they incur the loss of articles as a result of heavy weather; but it is the Government's obligation to give assistance when a calamity takes place and there is suffering among the poor people. The houses of the poor people might be destroyed, their household effects might be lost and since they have no

means, they suffer as a result of not being able to give themselves back the shelters which they formerly had. I feel that such people should be helped as soon as possible. Where people have lost articles such as pianos, refrigerators, jewellery and the like—articles which can be considered as luxuries—I do not think that they should be given back those things; but where houses were washed away and the occupants are poor, I feel that they should be given back their household articles. Some people were relieved by the Insurance Companies, but real suffering is still being experienced and people have not been given the assistance which a far-sighted policy would have brought about. The Resolution is now before us, but you cannot get away from the fact that it has been delayed for too long. The greater the suffering is, the more immediate the relief should be. I do not know how the money is allocated to the respective parishes, but I do know that of the parishes St. John has been the hardest hit after St. Michael, and the Government should be as generous as possible in giving assistance to those people. When you hear about people asking for compensation for the loss of fox terriers, pianos and things like that, I consider that a waste of time. The loss of those things is unfortunate, but we should restore goods to people who have not got the means of replacing any part of those goods. I hope that it will be explained to me what the position is as regards the allocation of these funds in so far as the parish of St. John is concerned.

Mr. DOWDING: I have listened to those honourable members who have spoken on this Resolution so far and I intend to add my quota to this debate. In the first place, this year is the year 1951, and an Address which I had passed in this House in 1948 in connection with damage to houses, has not yet been implemented in full up to today. All I can say is this: I wonder if this were not election year if we would have had this Resolution before us today. Just think of it. On the morning after the flood in 1949, I went around the parish of St. George along with the Churchwarden and the Rector; we took two days in estimating what damage had been done and we made recommendations to the Government, but the Government with its large Secretariat took from 1949 until 1951 to get through with these estimates. I think that the people who had their houses damaged two years ago are lucky that this year is election year. I am under the impression that apart from the length of time which it took the Government to cogitate as to whether they would grant this money or not, the fact that this year is election year is the motive behind this Resolution having been sent down. Nobody can fool me that the people in the Secretariat could not have dealt with a few figures in a shorter time than what has elapsed. I am not suggesting that the many people who undertook the arduous duty of estimating the flood damage could have completed it within a short space of time; but in the case of St. George we had a planter, a shopkeeper and a reverend gentleman to help us in our deliberations. We reported in full in respect of the various houses; we made our comments, we gave our reasons and we did our best, but they have not yet discovered what the figures are in respect of St. George. It might be that the facts have not been gone into by any member of the Government and I wonder who guided them in their deliberations. When we received the first available amount of money to assist the poor people, those whose houses were completely destroyed were not taken into consideration, and if you look up the list you will see what some kind gentleman has done; he picked out houses which needed little or nothing being done to them, but those which were destroyed or greatly damaged are still there. In my opinion, that was a very unbusinesslike and unfortunate way for the

Government to have acted in this matter. In my opinion, I repeat, if the Government did not have to face an election this year, nothing would have been done.

Mr. WARD: As far as I can see, a storm had to take place before people whose houses were damaged by a previous storm could be given assistance. I hope that we will not experience another storm. What I am amazed about is this: I do not know who is to be blamed, but after the Committee made an investigation and reported on the damage which they saw soon after the storm, another Committee was sent out to investigate and that Committee must have a different picture to what was seen in the first instance. I am sure that there are one or two houses, which, from what I have been told, the Government has not taken any notice of at all, because it was claimed that those houses were not in the best state of repair when the storm occurred and therefore those houses should not be repaired at all. In the parish of St. Lucy I know that a house 10x8 was destroyed and the owner was given \$70. Do you tell me that \$70 could replace that house? One feels that the Government never intended giving any assistance at all to the owner of that house. I have told many people that the Government did not intend giving them any assistance. As the honourable junior member for St. George has said, the people who had their houses the least damaged got a little assistance, but those whose houses were greatly damaged got nothing. Some people who put themselves in debt to repair their houses in the hope that they would be given assistance, were given a pittance. That state of affairs should not exist when there is in power a Government which says that it is fighting for the people. It is appalling that people who have suffered from the storm should be offered \$20. What are they going to do with that? Is that amount to supply them with bread for two or three days? I may not agree with all that the honourable senior member for the City has said, but it seems to me that as soon as you do not belong to a particular Party you do not get what you should get. (Cheers). My opinion is that all the people of this island are represented by this Government, and the Government should be fair and impartial to everybody. I was a member of the Committee who went around to see what estimate could be given of the damage which had taken place, and I say that it is a waste of time for any Committee to go around and make investigations and then they are given up 100%. That is a ridiculous state of affairs. Personally, I would tell the people to keep the money that is given them and do something else with it. I do not believe that the Government really intended to give people any assistance; if they intended to assist them they would not have waited for two years to do that. I told my constituents that they must try and repair their houses.

Mr. ADAMS: It appears that the visit of a distinguished West Indian to this colony has started something new in the Electors' Association, something by which you cast aspersions against the Government and say things which, on sober reflection, you cannot support. Honourable members' memories are very short; we asked the local authorities to make lists in connection with the flood damage and send them in to us. We came down with first things first; some of the damage in the rural areas was not as great as that in St. Michael. Where a house was destroyed we had to see what arrangements could be made to provide shelter for the occupants, and I would repeat that we have voted money twice already in respect of the flood damage. The parish of St. Michael has been keeping us back mainly; if we had come here for assistance in respect of St. Michael first,

we could easily have been met with that type of retort which is unusual of the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, and I would advise him to stick to his natural form. The honourable member makes a statement which, even from a selfish point of view, is silly; he is either speaking the truth or he is not speaking the truth. If what he says is intended to have a political effect it can be a boomerang, because it means that one will not associate with the Electors' Association because he did not get any help. The parish of St. George has \$1,542, St. Andrew \$1,036, St. Lucy \$763 and the lady whom the honourable senior member for St. John has mentioned gets \$295. The parishes of St. John and St. Andrew have had much help perhaps because of the importunity of their representatives. I went through those parishes; I did not go through the parish of St. Joseph because there was my colleague who is more enthusiastic about the necessities of his parish than any of us in this Assembly. We went through the estimates and where there were hard cases we had to pick them out and deal with them separately. I assure honourable members that it is not a question of dealing with this matter because this year is election year. Do hon. members think that we would wait until election year to deal with a matter of this sort? If it was a question of waiting until election year to deal with this matter, one would imagine that in January we would have come here without careful investigation and showed how quickly we had brought down this Resolution.

Mr. WARD: I did not say anything about this matter being dealt with in election year; but there are still alive people who can bear witness to what I have said. Anybody can go down to St. Lucy and see if what I have said is a lie or not.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, — If the interruption from the strangers' gallery reaches a stage where Parliament cannot be conducted in the way in which it should be conducted, then let us have our Parliament anywhere. I am not afraid of the electorate and people are not going to browbeat me when I am doing my business.

Mr. ALLDER: I do not think that the disturbance from the strangers' gallery is sufficiently great, Mr. Chairman, as to have your attention called to it. However, I want to draw the attention of the Government to what is an error. I want to know if the Government intend to replace Ella Small's house entirely or if they mean that she must pay a part of the cost. In my opinion the granting of this \$295 is going to put her in greater trouble than what she is in at present. If there is a case in which restitution should be made in its entirety, it is that of this woman; I am sure that if hon. members saw this woman they would want to give her more than the house which was destroyed. This old woman has spent all her days in the canefields and she is unable to get a morsel of food; she has to depend upon her neighbours and some of her children who occasionally help her. She was unable to repair her house otherwise it might not have been so badly affected by the weather. It is a waste of time to give her this money unless you are asking her to spend it in buying food; she is unable to pay the difference between the cost of the house when it is finished and what the Government is giving her. I was particular in drawing to the Government's attention when we first discussed this matter, that this woman should be given a special concession because she is old and decrepit; she has contributed her quota to the colony in so far as work is concerned. She told me that she has spent all her days in the field and has never been to school; now she has come to the evening of her days, she is being driven from house to house and is at the mercy

of those who are kind enough to help her. This particular case is a bad one and I would be very glad if it were re-considered by the Administration; I am sure that if members of the Government had gone and seen that woman, they would be more generous than they have been. I do not want to carry the argument too far, but I certainly cannot digest what has been suggested to me as the amount which this woman will get. If houses which were in the flood area but which were not damaged could be removed elsewhere, certainly this particular case should be dealt with more generously than it has been dealt with. Where you have a case in which a person is dependent upon the charitable disposition of neighbours and friends, that is really a case of dire necessity, a case in which the Government should show greater sympathy. While there have been a few lives lost in St. Michael, the dead cease to suffer; what we should try to do is to save those who are living and this woman definitely deserves to be saved. Honourable members do not seem to be taking this case as seriously as they should take it, and it may be that the case is not sufficiently known to them; I suggest that this particular case should be left out until the Government has had the opportunity of investigating it more thoroughly. I am sure that the local authorities would not object to rebuilding the house for this woman. I have been told that the Colonial Secretary recommended to the local authorities that they rent somewhere for this woman and her family until the house was built. As a matter of fact, the local authorities said that they could not find a house to rent and this family was forced to remain in a small house which was already congested. If the authorities had rented a house, do you not see how much it would have cost them for two years? Everybody expected that the old lady would have been given back a house at the Government's expense. I have seen much of the storm damage and I do not think that the Government has been presented with any case which is as needy as that of this woman, Ella Small.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: When honourable members talk about the Government in relation to this question of flood damage, they forget that the Vestries of the various parishes undertook the work of preparing estimates which were checked by the Colonial Engineer whom everybody praises. It is not that the Government as individuals went into the question and looked after the amounts of money to be granted; I represent a parish where the Vestry did nothing for a woman and I had to subscribe to that woman's need. I challenge anybody to sit around a Board and say who should get \$10 or \$15 more; the Government had an administrative Officer to see to the matter. I wish that some people would get a chance to administer things and see how it is done. The Colonial Engineer was asked to go into the estimates as to the flood damage; he did so and presented figures to the Government. I say that there was in Boscobel a woman whose name did not appear on the list of sufferers sent in by the Vestry of St. Peter, and I gave that woman some help. It was not sufficient help, but which of us can get all that we need? The gibe that an honourable member would make the Government do something for his parish is cheap and unworthy of any honourable member.

Mr. GARNER: I am of the opinion that this matter has been advertised for too long and, further, I feel that a distinct policy should have been adopted in respect of those houses which were completely destroyed. I know of two cases in which the occupants or owners of houses, along with their families, had to seek refuge at the homes of their friends or relatives. Up to now, this Resolution does not set out

any scheme for rehabilitating these people who lost their houses; I had hoped to see a distinct policy adopted for rehabilitating such people. In one instance, I spoke with a labourer in St. Philip and he told me that the sufferers in a particular village had been allotted \$75. I know that that amount is only a drop in a bucket today when it comes to the question of repairing a home; I thought that the Government would have given people one-half of the cost of repairs and let them supply the other half. If you are just patching, that shows that you are not going the whole way. I want to hear about a policy for rehabilitating people; even now people who have lost their homes come to me and ask: "What are you doing to assist us?" Like the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, I told them that at a certain time that I had given up, and I suggested to them that they should carry around a "brief" and see what can be done, because you cannot force the Government to do anything in the matter. I feel it is time for the Government to bring forward a policy for rehabilitating those people whose houses were absolutely destroyed. Every one knows that the price of lumber has gone sky-high and so have other materials and labour; the man who undertakes to build a house today has to look for money. I am sure that we did not exaggerate in St. Philip and I hope the same can be said of other parishes. I do not know about what happened in the City; the honourable senior member for the City can deal with that. I know people whose houses have been destroyed and they are taking shelter at other people's houses; let the Government help by rehabilitating these people.

Mr. GILL: I am indeed grateful to the Government, although they are somewhat late, for having decided to grant this assistance to persons who suffered as a result of the calamity which befell us in 1949. However, I would like to draw to the attention of the Government that in the parish of St. Andrew there are still some persons who are in dire need of assistance in getting back in the position in which they were before the disaster. In the Chalky Mount district there is Helena Marshall; I do not know if she has gone by another name, but I do not see her name on the list of those who are being assisted. There is also the case of Iris Springer of Belleplaine; I believe that she is on the list, but the amount allocated to her is, in my opinion, absolutely inadequate to carry out the necessary repairs to her house. As far as I know, this woman's house was demolished and she had to seek shelter in the Almshouse. In the case of Helena Marshall, whose house was also demolished, she had to seek shelter at her friends. From the amounts which I have seen allocated to people, I am wondering if the Government have taken into consideration the fact that the price of lumber has gone up to between 30% and 50%. The amount of lumber which could be obtained for \$20 six months ago would cost \$60 today. The amount of \$1,036 has been allocated to the parish of St. Andrew, and you find that \$550 is to be divided among 20 persons. I hope that the Government will take some notice of those persons whose houses have been actually demolished and who are unable, out of their financial resources, to rebuild their houses.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I believe that if the Government were minded from the beginning to tackle this matter seriously, they would have appointed their own special Committee either to work in connection with the parochial Committees or to supervise the estimates which were sent in by the Vestries. The members of the Government are always claiming, with a certain amount of justification, that the Vestries of

this colony are dominated by a certain type of persons who, by no stretch of the imagination, could be regarded as being in sympathy with certain sections of the community. Therefore, if the Government is comprised of people of political convictions different from those of people who dominate the Vestries, it does appear to me that if this matter were being tackled seriously, the first step to be taken by the Government would have been for them to appoint their own special Committee to deal with it. Following the claim that the Vestries have displayed commendable interest in the people who suffered as a result of the catastrophe, we have the spectacle of honourable members on my left stressing the claims of the poor people; but when the matter is carefully considered, one cannot escape the conviction that the matter had not been gone about in the right way. In my opinion, a special Committee appointed by the Government to submit its own figures — a Committee in which the Government would have more confidence where submissions are concerned than in the Vestries — would have helped considerably in improving the situation which is being complained of. In that case, there could not be any excuse for the delay in paying final and proper attention to this matter. There has been a long delay in this matter of relieving the victims of the disaster and claims of partiality in giving assistance can be substantiated. There are the cases of a house in Bank Hall and another in King Edward Road in which the owners were assisted, and neighbours claimed that those houses were in no way damaged by the flood; therefore claims of partiality and unfair discrimination are not entirely without any foundation. There are other instances which might be mentioned before the debate is closed. I should like to say that the greater part of the money which has been spent so far, and which is being spent in relieving the flood damage, is the result of the condition of the Constitution Swamp; it is sheer pigheadedness, sheer obstinacy, sheer playing with politics in not having the condition of the Swamp remedied that has caused this damage. We have been very fortunate that during last year there was no extensive damage by a flood, but we do not know how soon a similar catastrophe will overtake us. We should bear in mind that the machinery for canalizing the Swamp has been lying idle in the yard of the Public Works Department for a long time. If the Swamp is canalized, in the event of another flood we shall not have to concern ourselves with the extensive loss of life and damage to property which occurred on the last occasion. Fortunately for the constituency which I represent, little damage was done; but even in connection with the little damage, I know that people are still suffering as a result of the inattention of the matter of relieving the distress which has been caused. It is absolutely impossible not to share the view which has been so strongly expressed by previous speakers this afternoon, that the matter has not received either the attention or the interest which it should have received at the hands of the authorities.

Mr. ADAMS: At the present moment I have my pen in my hand giving approval to the draft replies to questions which came to me while I was ill, questions in respect of the Constitution Swamp. The Government has already taken steps to minimize any flood damage, and that is stated in the proposed replies which the honourable member will get to his questions within the next week or so.

Mr. MAPP: We have had a flood of debate on this Resolution in connection with the relief of the flood victims, and if there is one thing with which

I agree, it is that as long as you leave these matters in the hands of the Vestries, you will get a lot of political play in respect of them. That has happened with regard to the provision of playing fields, with the relief of flood victims and it will happen with regard to many more matters. It appears to me that much of which we are talking would come under the heading of slum clearance for the country areas, because it is a fact that in my constituency many of the houses did not take the wind or the flood to knock them down. To restore such houses to the position in which they were before the flood would be restoring them to nothing. I know a poor woman who was given relief consequent upon the flood damage; she got lumber which had to be placed above the house while the other sides were exposed. That is a joke; what we want is a proper housing scheme. I think that the Government should take steps to see that a scheme of slum clearance is brought about relative to the entire island. The matter should be gone into properly; we do not want to spend \$75 or \$100 on a house and then when heavy weather takes place, the condition is worse than it was at first. I would advise the Government that if they want to get down to business, they must not put these matters into the hands of the Vestries; the hon. junior member for St. Philip did not say whether the Vestries practice partiality or not, but when the question is boiled down, you will see that partiality is practised by the Vestries. It is practised every day, every year and all the time.

Mr. LEWIS : As this is election year I think I should follow the good example which has been set and make a little contribution to this debate. One of the most unfortunate things that have happened with respect to this relief is that it has been delayed for so long; because with the long delay there has been an increase in the damage since the cost of repairs has increased. But the Government has said that it is sorry for the delay and has confessed its faults; however, the ill effect of the delay still remains and it will cost the Government more money. In a Resolution of this kind, I feel that the schedule or addendum should set out the parishes with which the Resolution is concerned, the number of claims and the amount of money to be given to each parish with a note as to the amount of money which has been given to the parishes under previous Resolutions. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph should be in a position to say that in the parish of St. Michael there are so many applications for relief and so much money is to be allocated from the present Resolution; similarly with St. John and other parishes. That is the way in which I would like to see information brought to this House in a Resolution of this kind. I would like to say for the benefit of some hon. members that while there has been dissatisfaction over the delay in bringing down this Resolution, I understand that there has been intense dissatisfaction over the distribution of some of the money which has been already handed over to the parochial authorities to be distributed to people who have suffered from the flood. If you take the history of this matter you may discover the reason for some of the high estimates and some of the changes of policy which have been made since the disaster occurred. In St. Michael on the morning after the flood, when the Head of the Administration visited the area, there were dead bodies lying along the streets and surely a scene of that sort must call forth the sympathy, support and rehabilitation as indicated by the Vestry of St. Michael; but when the weather had subsided and people found homes, the whole policy was apparently changed. I understand that people who are regarded as being in very poor circumstances, and who are unable to find the ready cash to replace articles which were lost in the flood,

have not been given any consideration at all. When you hear that people should have had their personal effects insured, I say it would be unusual for people to insure their property against damage of this kind.

I do not know if this matter comes under the heading of a storm, but if the Constitution Swamp were recognized by the Government as being a menace and they had plans for remedying it, you could with some justification say that those plans have not been carried out and they have contributed to the damage caused not only to the poor people but to the middle class people as well. In the case of some of these people, it would not take more than a few drops of rain to wash away all that they had, and I am glad that some relief is being given to them. I should like to say that it is not paying this Government any compliment to say that they waited until election year to distribute money which they did not intend to distribute at all; I must say that action of that kind would put the Government in such disfavour with the people that they would be unable to recover from it. I feel that some of the delay in this matter has been caused by people puffing up their claims, and I regret that the Government could not have made a reasonable estimate of some people's losses and compensate them at once and let those who played tricks be the only ones to suffer. The innocent have had to suffer with the guilty, and the delay in giving compensation makes some of the compensation of no use at all; that is to say, if you assess damage at \$25 two years ago, it might take \$75 to repair the same damage today, and that is regrettable. I heard an hon. member suggest that the Government should have set up its own Committee to assess damage to property; but if the property has been washed away, there would not be any damage to be assessed. I feel that the Government could not have done better than send out the person whom they sent out to assess damage; it was a good idea to select a person who has knowledge of these matters and send him out. It is very unfortunate, perhaps, that some of these people did not insure their goods against damage of this kind, because the damage which was done might easily have been the result of nothing having been done about the Constitution Swamp.

Mr. HAYNES : I take it that this Resolution is the close of the compensation for the flood damage; in other words, I take it that there will be no chance of any increase or of any more claims being made by people whose damage has been under-estimated. I would like that point made clear by the hon. Leader of the House. I do not see why poor people whose houses have been damaged could not be given help out of the Labour Welfare Fund which is controlled by the Executive Committee. If as hon. members have said, the money which is now being granted was even adequate two years ago, it is certainly nothing like adequate today. I should like to know whether the Labour Welfare Fund could not be used in helping people who have suffered such severe losses.

Mr. DOWDING : Since 1948 we have been dabbling with this matter, and I would like to know from the hon. Leader of the House if what is before us now is the final analysis, if these figures are in respect of 1948 and 1949. The second paragraph of the addendum to this Resolution does not lead one to the conclusion that this is the end of the matter, and I am wondering if further claims can be entertained. I have before me three names — Keturah that will show whether the matter is final or not.

Mr. ADAMS : I do not know whether they are on the list in respect of 1948 or whether they are on a previous list.

Mr. DOWDING : They are definitely in respect of 1949.

Mr. ADAMS : I must say there comes a time when there must be finality, and as far as help towards repairs to houses, replacement of furniture and other items are concerned, this is the final list. As regards houses which were completely lost, we in St. Michael were particularly lucky that the Housing Board were on the verge of putting 29 people in newly-built houses, and therefore those who lost their houses could go into houses. Unfortunately, there were no housing schemes in respect of the rural districts, and therefore the same thing could not be done in those districts as was done in St. Michael. In answer to the hon. junior member for St. Andrew, I will say that the point which he has made has been considered by the Executive Committee; there might be one or two instances in which no recommendation for assistance for people was made, and doubtless in any scheme which might be an extension of the scheme in respect of the Labour Welfare Fund, those persons will be given some relief. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that the answer to your question about people other than those who are engaged in the sugar industry being assisted from the Labour Welfare Fund, was that consideration will be given to a scheme whereby loans might be made to assist poor persons, other than those engaged in the sugar industry, to repair their houses. As the hon. junior member for St. Thomas has rightly said, a number of these houses would have to be condemned as being unfit for human habitation. It is all very well to ask: "How much is \$275?" But some of these houses were only firewood, and obviously, it will cost more to restore a house than to repair it. In the checking up in one case, it was discovered that neither the Churchwarden nor the Colonial Engineer was in a position to say how much a house was worth; neighbours said that the house was an old one. It was almost impossible to put back that house, and in those cases people were given some assistance. I want to point out that it is the function of the Vestries to see after poverty in whatever form it is. I am telling hon. members what the law is; it is the duty of hon. members to see what can be done in their respective parishes. You do not lay any rate for flood damage, and where the Vestries cannot help beyond a certain extent, the Government has to come to their rescue. When we have discovered oil, in spite of the fact that we have to give royalties to landlords, we may nevertheless have enough money to help people who have suffered; we may be able to pay \$500 in the case of a fisherman who loses his boat. In exceptional cases when a calamity takes place and fishing-boats drift to St. Vincent or any other colony, the Government renders assistance. When the Government can afford to build houses for people, it will do so; and when it cannot afford to do that, it will help them by granting them some money. If that principle were borne in mind, a lot of the remarks which have been made this afternoon would never have been made.

I am sorry that the hon. senior member for the City is not here, but there is a Memorandum to the Vestry of St. Michael signed by Mr. Fred Ashby showing that, from the start, the Government and the local authorities were working in co-operation. It is incorrect to say that the Government did not tell the Vestry on what principle they should act; the Government's responsibility was not to extend beyond the actual repairs to houses leaving relief in respect of personal belongings to voluntary gifts. The Vestry requested that some person deputed by the Board of Guardians should assist the officer of the Public Works Department in looking after the claims for damage to houses. From the beginning the Government said that its responsibility would not

extend beyond the repairs to houses; later a letter was received from the Financial Secretary relative to *ex gratia* grants where personal property was concerned and the Government went back on its word and said that it would give relief where personal property was concerned. When the hon. senior member for the City attacks Miss Arne and says that the Government did this, that and the other, I should like to point out that there is a distinction between damage by the storm and damage to furniture; the Government said that it would only give assistance in cases of damage from the flood, not from water coming through the roof of houses. If you lived at the top of Pine Hill and the roof of your house was blown off, that would come under the heading of repairs to houses; but if you lived in Delamere Land and water came through the door of your house, that would come under the heading of flood damage. Reference to the Memorandum of the Churchwarden's Clerk would show hon. members that the accusation about the Government coming down with this Resolution during election year does not bear the light of examination. I do not think it would be fair to the Secretariat for me not to have made that statement and also to show that the Government made its position clear within three weeks or just over three weeks after the flood damage was done. The Vestry of St. Michael knew on what terms we were giving help in respect of repairs to houses and later in respect of furniture and household apparel which might have been damaged.

Mr. ALLDER : I would like to know on what basis the Colonial Engineer made his recommendations. In the particular case I have mentioned, how is the money to be spent? Are you going to erect a frame and tell the old lady that she must get through with the remainder? Or are you going to say that the money is in the Treasury and when the stage is reached where the money will complete the house the old lady will get it? This particular case is such a hopeless one that nothing short of giving this old lady a finished house would be doing her justice. That is all I am imploring the Government to do. If the Colonial Engineer knew that the Government wanted to restore happiness to this old lady he could not have made the recommendation which he has made—a recommendation for \$250. In this case, either a wrong estimate was made or the Colonial Engineer estimated according to the instructions which the Administration gave. I am saying that the honourable Leader of the House should grant honourable members the courtesy of listening to them as he should listen; we are all here to discuss matters in the interest of the public and the honourable member is obligated to have matters fully threshed out and explain the policy of the Government when honourable members ask it. While the honourable members ask it. While the honourable member might refuse to listen to me, I cannot refuse to listen to the people. I see that the honourable senior member for St. Michael is laughing; but in a very short time he might be doing something other than laughing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : The honourable member must stick to the Resolution.

Mr. ALLDER : I would not like this old lady to suffer worse than she has been suffering. I have not been able to get the Government's intention in this matter; I hope that they will not think in terms of whence the appeal has come, but that they will look at the principle of the matter. I appeal to honourable members to realise that they have come to this House by the votes of unfortunate human beings in the respective constituencies, and I am asking for a review of this case by the Government. I ask them

to forget that this particular case might not be in their constituency. If honourable members are so weak that they think hard to express themselves—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would be glad if the honourable member would withdraw those remarks about honourable members being weak.

Mr. ALLDER: I will refrain from making those comments. I would prefer to postpone the passing of this Resolution inasmuch as honourable members are not certain about the facts. We cannot be asked to pass a Resolution for a sum of money without knowing how the money is to be spent, and then we are asked not to say anything about cases which have been long standing. That is expecting too much of an honourable member who has to do justice to the people whom he represents. It is said that the best kind of Government is that which is mindful of the neediest under its control and you should not try to belittle the attempts of anybody who seeks to remedy the ills from which people are suffering. Because you know that you are powerful and nobody can stop you—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What is the honourable member speaking on when he says that nobody can stop you?

Mr. ALLDER: I am going to sit down, Mr. Chairman; but I cannot get the feeling of the Government in this matter, and yet they expect co-operation from people in this Chamber. When it is said that the Colonial Engineer has estimated the damage, he has estimated it along the lines of what he thinks the Government wants, or on what suggestions the Government might have made; but if he knew that the Government intended to replace this particular house which was totally destroyed and whose owner cannot commit herself to contributing any part of the cost of reconstructing that house, he would not have made that recommendation for \$250. You cannot replace that house for \$250; what is the policy of the Government in this matter? What is their intention in this particular case? I am sitting down now with the hope that I will get an explanation from the Government as regards their policy in this particular case. In the event that I do not get that explanation I shall try to ask this Committee to support a motion for the reduction of the amount of this Resolution by one dollar as a mark of dissatisfaction in respect of the handling by the Government of this compensation for flood damage. I shall await the reply of the Leader of the Government.

Mr. ADAMS: If that motion is carried, I take it that the dollar will be taken from this woman's share.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member is always feeling that he alone can generate heat, and that he alone is enthusiastic about any matters which come before the House in respect of the welfare of the people. I am not replying on behalf of the Government; I have already said that this relief has been kept back from the people for too long and the Government has apologized for that. This particular Resolution was introduced on the 17th of April, the House was adjourned for three weeks during which time I became interested in knowing whether a certain case was on the list, and I took the precaution of going to the Colonial Secretary's Office. I was shown the list and the particular name, how much the person was getting, and I take it that the honourable senior member for St. John could have done the same thing. The honourable member has admitted that he does not know the method by which the \$250 has been awarded, and I expected him to use an argument different from that which he has used. The amount of \$250 must represent the policy of the Government, and if you

change that amount because of a wrong estimate, you will have to go through the estimates again.

I heard the honourable senior member for St. Lucy say that the Government did not intend to do anything and they kept back this Resolution and brought it up during election year.

Mr. WARD: I have never said that.

Mr. LEWIS: I apologize. The honourable member said that the Government did not intend to give any relief at all; it was the honourable junior member for St. George who said that the Resolution was brought up during election year. The Government has already lost a by-election and who can tell whether the delay in bringing down this Resolution was not something to do with that? I say that the honourable junior member for St. George and the honourable senior member for St. John must share in the blame for the delay in bringing down this Resolution. If they felt that an injustice was being done to the business of the House, they should have made the Government bring down the Resolution. The members of the Opposition would be surprised to know, if they had taken a stand like that, how they would have been supported. I do not see the necessity of delaying this matter any longer; there are some people who did not have any house at all and all the furniture was washed out of the house, and they are people to whom the honourable senior member for St. John would not give anything. In this particular case mentioned by the honourable member this woman is an old agricultural labourer, and he should be able to go up to St. John, put plantation owners to shame and make them contribute towards this old woman's relief. Personally, however, I feel that the honourable member should have found out within the last three weeks the method by which this compensation was computed, because I went to the Colonial Secretary's Office and got the information which I wanted. The honourable member had three weeks in which he could have done something for the old lady but he did nothing for her. I can say that there are one or two persons in the Colonial Secretary's Office who had this matter to deal with and they have been most helpful in giving information about it. I take it that this Resolution is the policy of the Government and I know some people who have not got anything at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman—I am afraid that that argument of the last speaker is more than passing strange. I am really surprised that he should suggest that a member of the House should go to the Colonial Secretariat to inquire as to the policy of the Government. The honourable junior member for the City sat in this Assembly for years when we had a Conservative Government dominating this Chamber. If during those days he had wanted to inquire about the policy of the Government and was told to go to the Colonial Secretariat and inquire, he would have brought the roof down. As a member of this Chamber, the honourable senior member for St. John is entitled to call on the Government's spokesman to explain Government's policy on any particular matter. Of course, it is true that the policy of the Government is more or less embodied in the terms of the Resolution. Be that as it may, if any member wants further clarification of the matter, or wants to know whether Government proposes to come back later with a further grant or whether this is the final say on the matter, I cannot see for the life of me why we should go to a Government Official when the Government spokesman is entitled to give that information. If he feels that he has already done so, and is not prepared to give it again, no one can make him do it. I repeat: the honourable member knows that he himself would

have strenuously objected in the past if he had been told that he would have to go to the Colonial Secretariat for information as to the policy of the Government.

Mr. LEWIS: If you want to discover Government's policy on a particular matter, the best people to learn it from, in my opinion, are the people who had to deal with the specific case. When the honourable member gets up and says a claim is put in for \$480.00 and the claimant is allowed \$240.00 that means that the claim has been cut in half. But have claims been cut in half in other instances? Surely, if you are interested, you would want to know the reason for cutting this claim in half, and you would be able to seek the support of the House on secure grounds. I know that the honourable member is deploring the fact that he is not getting any support in the particular case. I repeat you will be able to put your case more efficiently if you are armed with the facts before you come to the House.

Mr. ALLDER: The honourable member who has just spoken is trying to champion the case of the Government in this particular matter. But inconsistency is the greatest damaging factor in a politician's career. I would further advise the honourable member that he is walking a tight rope which might suddenly end the wrong place. I know very well that if an honourable member wants certain information he can go to the particular Government Department and ask for it. I also know that honourable members should not be obligated to go to the head of some department and pray and beg him to explain matters when they can come here and get the information from the Government Spokesman. I was not questioning the Government's policy as such, but after I had made certain suggestions, I expected the Leader of the House to explain whether he would be willing to re-open the particular case, and whether I could expect any further handling of it. That was all that I wanted to know. I have listened to the honourable member at several debating societies, and I know the technique that one can employ in supporting a thing. But I still have my feelings and my opinion. With regard to the suggestion that I should go out and approach the plantation owners, I promise the honourable member that I will never do that. I always feel that you should not ask a man for something unless you share his views political and otherwise. The honourable member can do that for the City if he cares to. What I know is that there are several applicants from the City who are in a better position than many of the unfortunate people who have been left out. He says that several of them did not want to own a house. Sometimes it pays you better not to own one. What I know is that I would not be afraid to tell these people that I would not give them one half cent. Why should the Government give back radios, refrigerators, Morris suites etc. at the expense of this unfortunate old lady who might be living in a 12x8 house and is without means of replacing her losses?

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman—On a point of explanation. I would like the honourable member to say what honourable member said that certain people were to be compensated at the expense of others. If he discovers that no honourable member said that, ask him to do the right thing and withdraw the remark.

Mr. ALLDER: I suggested that these people should not be given back refrigerators etc. Is that saying that some honourable member said that they should be compensated at the expense of others? But it is obviously implied that if you spend a certain amount on people who are better off, people who

have had refrigerators and radios damaged, that it would be at the expense of others who are not so fortunately placed. A few people in River Road made certain claims. Some said that the refrigerator was washed across the house; a wardrobe was damaged and this thing and the other. Now the honourable member feels that because these people are in the City, that the Government should give them back these things; not because he genuinely feels that they deserve it, but because it is a question of voting. But if there were people in St. John who were in a better position than the present applicants I would say do not give them one cent. Right is right regardless of whether it is the City or anywhere else. The honourable member asked why I did not agitate during the interim when the people were still suffering. He knows very well that I am willing to join hands with him any time in the cause of the underprivileged. Of course I knew that people were suffering. I went around and investigated for myself and I saw suffering and misery. It was understood that the Government would help them. I feel, rightly speaking, that the plantation owners should help this unfortunate old woman. Many of them are on the Hurricane Relief Committee and they saw her misery. The old lady tells you that she was working on a plantation from the time she was eight years old. I am asking the Government to defer this case until they can see it for themselves. Look at the woman's age, and see whether she can still work. See if this is not a special case. At this stage I want to move formally that the Resolution be reduced by one dollar as a protest against the policy of the Government on this matter of calculating damage relief.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman I feel very deeply in this matter. I feel we would be adding to the misery of these suffering people by reducing the Resolution. The Hon'ble Senior Member for St. John said he was not in favour of giving back people radios, pianos, refrigerators etc. I am at a loss to know what is his policy. Such things only happen in a Police State. In my view if a man can justify the reason why she should be given back a piano, he should be compensated even if he had \$40,000. Otherwise you will get the middle class being discriminated against in favour of another type of person. I realise that there must be some policy in dealing with the relief of damage. If you have a quarter of a million dollars to distribute you must formulate some system. You find here that the amount allocated to St. George is equivalent of what you are giving one person in St. John. If the policy is to compensate people for total loss, the same thing should apply to St. George. By reducing the vote by a dollar you will be adding to the crime. For the first time I am learning that this old lady is getting half of the allocation for St. John. I feel sympathetically towards the people of St. George. I do not agree that you should replace the entire loss of any one individual because she is old and unable to work. I have been sitting here wishing that the allocations were higher, but we must accept a policy in dealing with this matter. I can mention a lady at Drax Hall. After the flood damage she was without clothes or shoes. I helped her as much as I could. That was alright, because I knew we must have a policy. I cannot ask the Government to make a complete allocation for one person. There is no reason why the Hon'ble Senior Member for St. John should feel that he is more sympathetic than anyone else. This woman has toiled all her life on a plantation, and now that she is old she has to fall back on the Government or the almshouse. I do not know why a person who has spent all her days on an estate should be forced to fall back on the mercy of the

Government or the almshouse, but that is how it is. Let us hope that the position will be improved. People in St. George who suffered are only getting back 10 per cent of their losses. I do not see why she should be given the total compensation.

Mr. ALLDER: I am not surprised at the honourable member trying to wreak vengeance. As far as his saying that he does not know my policy, I wonder if he knows his own, he is so superficial. My policy, Mr. Chairman, is like an open book. Certainly if claims are justified I would be willing to support him or any other honourable member as long as I felt that the claims needed by support. If he can show me a house totally demolished in St. George, and that the owner, an old woman, has ceased to work and cannot do better, I would feel it is my duty to assist him in bringing that special case to the attention of the Government. I also want to remind him, Mr. Chairman, that you usually take from these according to their ability and give to these according to their need. Wherever there is inequality, that is the policy that must be followed by every progressive government. It is better at times for some honourable members to sit and say nothing than to push themselves into things just because they want to satisfy certain demands. I am still saying that the whole handling of flood relief is wrong.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member is against giving aid to those who have lost a refrigerator but he is willing to give 100 per cent. to one who has lost a house. The case, I agree, is a lamentable one. But what the honourable member wants is against the rudiments of democracy, put aside socialism. The honourable member has talked about "superficial" and used other four syllable words. Pity is the lowest feeling that one human being should have for another. If he thinks that I am superficial, and wreaking vengeance, those are only the little things that amuse his mind. Little things amuse little minds.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman—It is so refreshing to hear the honourable senior member for St. John talk about the middle class. It is so often that his colleagues only talk about the rich and the rest.

The question that the Resolution do now pass is put to the House and agreed to without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Resolution passed in Committee of Supply was read a first and second time and agreed to.

REPLIES LAID

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT laid Replies to Questions No. 2 by Mr. WILKINSON, and No. 58 by Mr. MOTTLEY.

Mr. COX laid Replies to Questions No. 76 by Mr. BRANCKER, and No. 54 by Mr. CRAWFORD.

Dr. CUMMINS laid Replies to Questions Nos. 28 and 52 by Mr. CRAWFORD.

Mr. ADAMS laid Replies to questions Nos. 70 by Mr. MAPP, No. 78 by Mr. BRANCKER, No. 48 by Mr. SMITH, and No. 35 by Mr. MAPP.

CUBAN BLACK PACT DEBATE

Mr. WILKINSON: Mr. Speaker—I wish to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes in order to bring to the notice of honourable members what I think is a very important matter. In

this afternoon's papers which I saw after I came here, I see that towards the end of this week—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker—Is the honourable member reading from a newspaper?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not observed that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I was not reading from a newspaper. I said that I have seen in the newspaper, that towards the end of this week a very important official of the Ministry of Trade in London is coming here to interview the Regional Economic Committee Conference which is now going on. Purpose of the interview is to discuss the question of the negotiations which have recently been going on re the purchase by the U.K. of sugar from Cuba. This is a very important matter for the West Indies and the Commonwealth, and unfortunately, these conferences are usually held behind closed doors. We in this House have in the past protested that as a rule members of these conferences are usually only officials. On this occasion I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is a member of that Committee, and therefore we shall be represented. But, Sir, I hope that the honourable member will insist in calling up before this Committee the people who are well aware of the demands of the West Indies. Not that I am insinuating that he is not well aware of what a serious blow it is to the West Indies and the Commonwealth in general to see that England is negotiating the purchase of a large quantity of sugar from Cuba. And not only England, Sir. I believe that I am correct in saying that Canada has followed her example. As you know, Mr. SPEAKER, England has only agreed to purchase a certain quantity of sugar from the West Indies and the Commonwealth, and the rest of the sugar will be thrown on the open market. If that market is going to be reduced, our price will go down, and this position is indeed serious, particularly for Barbados. I do hope — I am sure that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph will, now that I have drawn it to his attention, see that Labour is well represented, because it affects Labour rather seriously. He will see that Labour is well represented not only by himself, but by the other delegates, and he will also see that the Sugar Producers are represented. Our trade with Canada, Sir, dates back many years. I think it is over 35 years ago, that the "Lady Boats" service started, subsidised by Canada and the West Indies. Unfortunately, since the war these boats have been coming down here half empty, due to the fact that the U.K. will not allow us to spend our dollars in Canada. It would be a very serious blow to the West Indies in particular if these boats ceased to run. Canada to us means everything. If you look at the map it will appear to the ordinary man that Canada will be our only market. Canada wants our sweets, and we want their flour, hardware, lumber etc. Yet, Sir, we are not allowed the dollars to buy from Canada what we require. I think that that is a matter which should be taken up very strongly with these gentlemen that are coming here, from the Board of Trade, Overseas Department. I do not intend to keep honourable members back very much longer. I know that they are weary. But I thought the matter was so important that I would draw it to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—In seconding the motion for the adjournment of the House for five minutes, I would like to say how pleased I am that the honourable senior member for St. James, the Leader of the Opposition, has taken this oppor-

tunity in view of the fact that this is the eve of the arrival of Mr. Bottomley M.P., Secretary for Overseas Trade, to discuss this matter which is one of paramount importance. When I say "paramount" importance, I am not overstating the case. There must have been some feelings of anxiety within the last few weeks especially among those responsible people of this community when it was seen in the Press that shortly negotiations would be carried out between the U.K. and Cuba and Canada also. Honourable members will remember that I raised the question here on the floor of this House, and that this honourable Chamber graciously agreed to the passing of an Address which was presented to the Head of the Administration in connection with this matter. I have no doubt myself that even before the passing of this Address a wide awake Government, conscious of its duty, would have taken the matter up in the right quarter. But in all matters of this sort, whenever it is possible to have the real voice of the people expressed, through their representatives in a Chamber elected like this, it will always do more good. I am not versed in the economic or trade set-up of this colony, but I am certainly acquainted enough with conditions to know that sugar is the only staple product of Barbados, and that any negotiations which are being carried on between the U.K. and a competing country like Cuba would create great hardship on Barbados and the British West Indies. Any hardship created in respect of sugar must be reflected in the standard of living not only of the agricultural labourer, but of every worker in every phase of industry. No doubt Sir, honourable members are well aware that competition between Cuba and the British West Indies where sugar is concerned is something which all of us with any sense of responsibility would dread. When I say "we," I do not necessarily mean the plantocracy, or the merchants or the exporters. We can only pay the working people of this country as much as our revenue from export would afford us to do. This gentleman comes after leaving Jamaica along with officials from the Colonial Office. It is true, Sir, that there have been so many commissions and committees writing reports on this and the other within recent times, that it is difficult for one to digest all that they have been doing. But in spite of all that, I strongly suggest to honourable members that whatever their political outlook, they should join together as West Indians and face this issue. This is not an issue over which we have to fight among ourselves. It is an issue that must be faced. It is an issue that concerns the life blood of the West Indies and more so of Barbados. Jamaica will discuss not only sugar, but cigars and citrus fruit and bananas. Trinidad can discuss oil and coconuts besides sugar and many other things. Dominica can talk about limes. Barbados can only discuss sugar and sunshine. The matter is of tremendous importance. You do not have to be employed in Commerce; you do not have to be actively engaged in representing Labour to know that anything which affects the Sugar Agreement which we have up to 1952 must affect the life blood of this country. So when we express our views here on this matter, I hope that all possible publicity will be given to them. Mr. Speaker, this Mission is coming to Barbados. This inquiry will be made. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that this should be no closed door inquiry. I observed from the report in the Press that the Mission will be discussing matters with the Executive Council of Jamaica. No doubt, they

will be discussing matters with similar bodies in Barbados. It is also reported that it is hoped to get the views of interested parties in Barbados. Let me say, that any Mission of Inquiry that came to Barbados and did not have the views of the Opposition in this Chamber, would not have got a true picture of the situation. I am worried about this situation. I observe that in another few days if not tonight, we are going to be asked to discuss a very important matter. I say if not tonight because one wants the greatest latitude to express one's views, and I have never heard yet that anyone should use their position to suppress the free expression of views by inference or otherwise, by taking people when they are tired and not at their best. In another view days, I am saying, we will be called upon to discuss a very important matter, a Bill which is in the name of the Leader of the House, a Bill to extend the powers of the Governor of this colony relative to imports and exports. I throw it out to this house. I am no lawyer, and I am perfectly willing to listen to the honourable Leader of the House on certain things. But that is a far reaching matter. Directives after directives are coming here and are being accepted. When you have extended this. —

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not go into that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not going into it. It is a Bill to continue temporarily certain enactments, but I am not dealing with it now. I look on it as important because I know that honourable members will look me in the face and say if you do not accept the directives what will you do. I know there is a superabundance of brains on the other side of the House, but I am prepared with my limited ability to take on anybody when the time comes. Because the time is right here when we must not let the people pay in sweat and blood; but we should tell Mr. Bottomley and any other official the real truth. In other words, you are giving power to the Head of the Administration to accept these directives. I know that I am talking nonsense for some people, but I will call for a full dress debate when the time comes. The time has come when you should let it be known that all these directives and import regulations as far as Barbados is concerned, and in fact as far as the colonies of the Caribbean are concerned will be questioned in the interest of the inhabitants of these colonies. I have purposely refrained because I know that Your Honour will not allow me to go into it. But that is one matter which I am very serious about. I am trying to get all the necessary data and opinion on it which I can. As regards the question that where this Mission is concerned all branches of public opinion should be represented, we have already expressed our views. It might sound, coming from a person like myself—a person of limited education—it might sound, especially to those who think they know all and are authorities on every subject, that we are accepting the principle of disloyalty. But I say that I still feel as loyal as anyone else. You, Sir, know as well as I do that if you have children and they do wrong you chastise them. But when they grow up they can reason with their parents. The true state of affairs must be told in no uncertain way to these officials. We should let them know really and truly how the man in the street feels about his cost of living. There is more than can be discussed with Mr. Bottomley and the other officials, Mr. Speaker, than the Cuba Pact. Merely to say that the Government or this or the other person responsible feels this or that is talking through your hat. Someone must tell Mr. Bottomley and the Colonial Office that the man in the street feels that

he is being screwed down. That brings me back to these directives.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should not refer to these directives at this moment.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am not doing that, Sir. I am only saying so in passing. I go on to say that I would like to have a real free expression of opinion. I know that I am getting repetitive, Sir. But there is only one style that I have: say a thing often enough and it is bound to carry some weight. Just merely getting up in the legal way or the parliamentary way and putting it to these officials from the Colonial Office is not enough. We want a man courageous enough not to care if these officials leave Barbados having him earmarked or not, a man who in spite of that will still put the true state of affairs. There are a lot of things which I feel should be discussed in connection with this matter. I still thank Your Honour for the latitude that you have given me and I support the motion for the adjournment of this House with a full sense of my responsibility. Every day representations are made to you, Sir, and to myself, and to those who are within easy reach of the people. On top of all this there are now these negotiations to be made outside of these colonies. We cannot prevent these negotiations from taking place, but what we can say is this: surely during the war years we could have gone into the open market and got a price commensurate with that which was being paid. But we did, and rightly so, keep on supplying the Mother Country at the price fixed by them. There is no denying that that was the correct thing to do. Only a few days ago it was reported that the Canadian Government cannot wait any longer. They cannot carry on any longer under the present trade relations with the West Indies, and as a result they have entered into an agreement with Cuba. I hope that that is incorrect, but I have seen it in the Press. I think that the agreement is for 75,000 tons of Cuban sugar a year for three years. I ask honourable members to view that seriously, and see if that situation will not in a way begin to affect us right now. We have been blessed with a bumper crop this year. But if Providence is not kind to us in that respect next year, coupled with this declaration by Canada I say in all seriousness that the position will be a bad one, and all the parties concerned, irrespective of their political ideologies must come together and make a serious representation when this Mission comes. Mr. Speaker, I end as I began. I view this matter quite seriously, and whenever I get a chance I like to discuss this whole matter. I want to get the real honest opinion of the man in the street, and not merely that of the Government. Any man who thinks he knows everything knows nothing.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the House do now adjourn for five minutes.

Mr. LEWIS: Before the question is put, Sir—I am very pleased that the Junior Member for St. James has drawn the attention of the House to this matter. The arguments that I have heard today from the honourable members who have spoken I was not in my place to hear when the House a couple of weeks ago sent a protest against the negotiations between the U.K. and Cuba. Honourable members have read in the Press that someone is coming to discuss the matter. What about the House of Assembly? This is the attitude that I would have expected members to adopt: why was not this House told that this gentleman and his assistants were coming here? The House sent a message to be transmitted to London protesting against this pact. Now we are hearing about this Regional Economic Conference, and we are not even sure if they will represent properly the views of this colony. The

House should have been sent a Message saying that these people were coming here, and then we could have sent back one saying that we would like them to meet the House of Assembly and discuss such economic matters as exchange, control and American and Canadian dollars. For the honourable senior member for the City to look over here and say that he sees a superabundance of brains is trying to make a joke. When the Sugar Producers want someone to represent them they pick up at least two people who do not own an acre of land, a sugar factory or anything of the sort. Any fool can learn enough to do that. They pick up a Government employee and another man who keeps books and they know more about sugar than anything else because they go to represent the Sugar Producers. Why forget the House of Assembly. It is to the House that the Sugar Producers look for representation when something is happening to ruin their interests. Why should the House say that the Sugar Producers should meet these people when the House has not even been told that they are coming? When the House has not even been sent a document to show that they are coming here?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—Sometimes I feel rather embarrassed when I hear honourable members speak. The honourable senior member for the City today referred to me as being harsh. I regret that I have given that impression. Like Mr. Chamberlain I am essentially a man of peace. If unfortunately at some times, goaded by some honourable members who feel hurt when I do not take any notice of them, I then take too much notice, I apologise. I am really embarrassed sometimes. I do not say that when honourable members are in doubt they must always run to the Government. But if they did sometimes they would get information which cannot be given in public, but which would relieve their minds of a lot of anxiety. Mr. Bottomley never intended to come to Barbados, Trinidad or anywhere else. I am reading between the lines, but the newly found God of the Opposition apparently sent him. Jamaica has a cause for grievance over and above the rest of the West Indies. I have to be careful in what I say, because in view of the way that I got this information it is confidential. Far from the persons responsible not thinking of the interest of Barbados, great pressure, as far as pressure can be brought, was brought to bear on Mr. Bottomley to the effect that in view of the fact that the Regional Committee would be here, we specially requested him to come and he agreed to do so. It was not, I repeat, the intention of Mr. Bottomley to come to the West Indies.

It is the direct result of a Resolution passed at Montego Bay that among other things we should have a Regional Economic Committee to plan for this area. We have at last got to it. That Committee was, as I have said, approved of at Montego Bay and subsequently by the various West Indian colonies. I am representing Barbados, and that is as it should be. How can Barbados be better represented than by the Leader of the Government with Mr. H. A. Cuke as adviser. You have never seen Mr. Cuke at his best. With him as adviser there is no question that the case for the sugar producers and that of the man in the street will not be put strongly. We have honourable Mr. Hunte, Mr. D. G. Leacock Jr., honourable Mr. Cuke and Sir John Saint. It is impossible to conceive of four people more qualified to put strongly the commercial point of view in the preliminary canter. In many conferences I have found that advisers have

been allowed to speak. It is quite possible — I do not know yet — it is quite possible that Mr. Cuke and the other advisers may themselves speak and not merely myself alone.

Even if that is not done, there can be no danger that our case will not be strongly put, let alone not put at all. Do not always find cause for praising all aspects of Mr. Cuke's public life, but I will say that I cannot think of anyone in the West Indies who will put the case of the sugar industry in the West Indies better than Mr. Cuke. He may not be as calm and quiet or even possessed of the profound knowledge of Mr. Harold Robinson of Trinidad. But as regards vigour, and keeping back nothing and talking as man to boy when he is talking to U.K. representatives, there is no one I know to equal him. He talks down to the ministers. There is no one whom I know, therefore, likely to put the case of the sugar industry, and that of general West Indian economy better and stronger than he. I agree with honourable members that frankly we cannot do anything more than put a strong case. We are not yet a republic. If the Colonial Office says we can only spend ten dollars we have to accept that directive. But we can put up a strong case as to why we should be allowed more dollars. The honourable member for St. Philip has asked questions about dollar allocations and dollar earnings. Some colonies have spoken about being granted more dollar allocations, and it has been shown to them that they are spending more dollars than they earn. I do not know what the position is with regard to Barbados. But all these things have to be examined in the light of the fact that we are part of the Sterling Area. We can put up a strong case asking to be treated better; but do not let us say that we can refuse to accept directives. We are not sovereign states. What we can do is to say whenever there is anything being discussed concerning the West Indies, West Indians must go along, at least as observers. I feel that if we say that with a united voice the Colonial Office will give way. It has happened before in Geneva and Havana when Sir Harold Austin and Mr. Cuke went as observers. Provided that we prepare our case thoroughly and say these are the facts I personally feel that the Colonial Office will listen. Especially after reading that parade by Lord Milverton in the House of Lords, it is obvious that far from the Colonial Office putting on the brakes, some people feel that they are going too fast in allowing the colonies to have a voice in their own government. It is not as though the West Indies alone are being treated as poor relations, because the Commonwealth countries have been so treated also. As far as the proposed pact between Canada and Cuba is concerned, I can only say that during the short time I spent in Canada the impression I got was that the local commercial world were not as alert to their duty to keep the links that bind them with Canada as they should be. Canadians right and left recalled how schooners used to ply between Canada and the West Indies 90 years ago. They are anxious still to keep on good terms with the West Indies. But they can be very sensitive. One of the things that was thrown out to us was, "look how well we helped the West Indies with flour during the war, and look now Trinidad wants to make its own flour and throw us out. I think it was Johnson who said that "you must keep friendship in repair". I believe that our fault is that our friendship with Canada has not been kept in proper repair—partly through dollar restrictions, I admit, and partly because if you do not see a friend very often you may forget him. I am talking about commercial friends. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I really rose to assure the honourable junior member for St.

James that I appreciate his bringing the point before the House. I will bear in mind what the House feels generally, and I assure them that anything which lies in my power to do I will do by bringing as forcibly as I can to the mind of Mr. Bottomley and the other officials of the British Government the feelings of the West Indies. I will assure him that what makes the position worse is that we are intensely loyal and we do not wish to be out of the Commonwealth, and that we feel that more regard should be paid to our requests for relief at least to some extent from dollar restrictions. It is very likely that during our debates at this conference during the coming week that will loom more largely than anything else on the agenda. I hope that honourable members will take the assurance that the case will be well put.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker—I thank the honourable senior member for St. Joseph for telling us so clearly what Mr. Bottomley is coming here about. I want, however, to correct one statement that the honourable member has made—that is that the commercial community of the West Indies are not as anxious to do business with Canada as we have been making it out to be. The commercial community of Barbados can speak with authority as having always been most anxious to keep trade relations with Canada open, and I contend that the dollar restrictions from which we suffer are the only reason why trade with Canada is getting less and less. We are becoming very concerned, because we see what the future is holding for us. The Canadians are fed up. They are mad about it, and they are not blaming us in the West Indies; they are blaming the Colonial Office and the British Government for withholding these dollars. I have seen some figures recently which show that our dollar earnings in Canada are sixty million dollars, while we purchase twenty-four million dollars worth from that source. That is a great disparity. As the honourable senior member for St. Joseph rightly said, we are in the Sterling Bloc. But we are, geographically speaking, in the Dollar Area. We are surrounded by countries that deal in dollars. We have always got most of our essentials from Canada and the U.S.A., and that is one reason why the cost of living bears so heavily on us to-day. We have to go into further markets with greater credit troubles to get these same commodities. I have spoken on this many times in this House. The only answer to it is: give us more dollars. We can land commodities like potatoes, onions etc. at very greatly reduced prices. I am only touching on that phase of the debate. We are not divided in this House as regards the question of sugar. We are giving Great Britain our sugar at a reasonable price with the hope that she will continue to take for a long time every ton of sugar that we can produce. I do hope that Mr. Bottomley and all the officials that come with him will be told this in no uncertain terms.

Mr. DOWDING: Mr. Speaker—It is not my intention to speak at any great length. I regret that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is not in his place. He started off his speech by saying that he was a man of peace. That of course was with reference to members of this House. But in the course of his speech I became convinced that in dealing with the U.K. he is a man of peace. I have said it already in this House, and I will say it again: if there is one man in the world who believes in you and who will think more of you if you stand up and fight for what you want, it is the Englishman. I regret that the honourable member is not in his place to hear me tell him that. On this question of sugar depends the life of every single individual in Barbados. I agree with the honourable junior member for the City that the House should have been informed of the pro-

posed visit of Mr. Bottomley. This House has the right to that courtesy. I do not know exactly what the preliminary negotiations were, and whether the officials came direct from Jamaica or not. I hope that when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is dealing with these gentlemen that he will be more strong than is his wont. I do not agree with him when he says that Jamaica is more concerned in this matter than Barbados. Jamaica is a large island. It has easy access to America, and it has a Cigar Industry, while Barbados only has sugar. We must be more concerned therefore with this question of sugar than Jamaica.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker—I feel that we are talking after this matter has been settled. I feel that this pact has already been arranged, and that Mr. Bottomley is just coming out here to white wash the whole thing. The U.K. Government has done what it wanted to do, and now it is sending someone out to deceive us. I tell you, Mr. SPEAKER, that this pact has been settled already, and the West Indies cannot do anything about it. I realise that as a layman I do not know anything about sugar. But I am sure that if this pact between the U.K. and Canada continues, that it will mean a lowering of the living standards of the masses of the West Indies. But Great Britain finds herself in a precarious condition to-day, and she does not care whom else she makes to suffer. She is interested in herself. When the honourable senior member for St. Joseph tells you that if the U.K. says ten dollars is for you, you have to be satisfied, it sounds foolish. We are letting a handful of men tell us how we must work out our destiny. It is beyond me. Of course if the people of the West Indies are going to allow a handful of men in Downing Street to ruin their industries, make them buy where they say they must buy, make them accept whatever they say they will pay for their sugar and buy all their commodities from Great Britain at the price that she wants to sell them, it means that the world has come to the unhappy pass when men are afraid of each other. The trouble is that we do not speak strongly enough. We are not serious enough about the welfare of our people. It is time that the Colonial Office realised that when they talk about sugar they must count with the West Indies. Where Canada is concerned it seems logical to me that Canada is the place where we should buy our salt fish, flour, items of ironmongery etc. England has nothing to sell us in the way of food. Why should the Colonial Office be allowed to dictate a policy to us that is detrimental to our well-being? Unless we stand up and tell them the truth it will continue. I feel that we have been taken for a ride, and that Mr. Bottomley has come to apply the plaster. England in the 20th Century is still playing the old diplomatic game. What has Mr. Bottomley come to tell us? Has he come to tell us what has happened already? That will not help us. The more you increase your production the more will you be able to improve your standard of living. But if you are not encouraged to produce more so that you can give a greater amount of work to people you are doing nothing. If the U.K. by-passes us and buys this amount of sugar from Cuba, she is helping to build up Cuba and is helping down the people of Barbados and the other British West Indian islands that depend on sugar. I have my own opinion of the U.K. Government, and I do not blame them either. They have their people to give cheap food to. If we have people in the West Indies who do not care to fight for cheap food for their people and to let the U.K. know that we are human beings too, I do not blame them. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. We should have something for our people too. But it will not be always so. You cannot go

on fooling people all the time. You need to make strong recommendations to the Colonial Office. I have seen some of these officials. Those who have been brought up in the school of diplomacy might be able to put something on our weaklings, but they cannot put anything on me. I will not say anything more. I wish them well at this spree—all these conferences are sprees. Conferences do not mean anything. This is the age of conferences. A conference is just tricksters meeting together, thinking they are fooling the rest of the people. But the people, some day when they have tightened their belts enough, will take things in their own hands again. You tell me the British Government have their representative at Government House. I do not want to say any more on that. He happens to be interested in certain things. But we are elected members of the House who represent the people, and it is our duty to voice our protest when these moves are made, and not let these things go unnoticed. Saying that we must be satisfied with whatever amount of dollars the U.K. allows us for trade with Canada is not enough. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is not in his seat. We have to say that we are not satisfied. The island is bare of many necessities because of dollar restrictions. If war really starts I will be sorry for these West Indian islands. We have got to learn to represent the colony as a whole. I have met some of these officials—Sir this and Sir that. I do not know how they appear to some other people, but when I meet them I square them up and say to myself “a poor type” I could do better. The trouble is that a lot of us in the West Indies are afraid to let these officials know what we feel about this business. Great Britain has sent commissions out here and she knows how vital sugar is to our existence. We should press more energetically because we have no secondary industry. We have got to have some resources to raise the standard of living. We cannot raise it on wishful thinking. If you went to China and asked a Chinaman what is four multiplied by four, he will tell you sixteen. If you asked the same question in Timbuctoo you would get the same answer. That is the law of economics. So if you have only one staple industry you have no other resources. I thought that by now we would be getting some revenue out of oil. I was surprised when I read how the House of Lords said: “these are our West Indian Islands. We reserve the right to do certain things.” Lord Milverton was right. Who came to Barbados in the ship that discovered or took over the island? It rightly belongs to them. We are clamouring here for rights. The British Government is not paying us much attention. I feel that the U.K. is not paying us much attention, inasmuch as she can agree to buy all this sugar from Cuba to the detriment of the British West Indies, and buy all these cigars from Cuba and put the Jamaican people out of work. I do not know how Mr. Bottomley will be able to explain it away. Of course he does not even need to come, Britain to my mind has got the West Indies tied off. England feels that we are a bunch of lethargic people who do not know our rights, so they take opportunity to do all these things. If you sit down and let people take away your rights all the time, some day they will take away your life. Sugar is our life blood, and if we cannot increase our production we are going to stagnate. We are getting the people accustomed to a standard of living which we will not be able to keep up if the U.K. continues to buy sugar from Cuba. I am sure it is going to work to the detriment of the West Indies. If we are thinking of ourselves as children of the mother country, and if this is the way that she is

treating her children—going outside and adopting strangers—then I say we are wasting our time.

Mr. WILKINSON: Sir, I am now asking leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave is granted.

Mr. WILKINSON: I move that my motion be withdrawn.

Mr. MOTTLEY seconded, and the motion was withdrawn.

Dr. CUMMINS moved, seconded by Mr. Cox that the House adjourn to this day week at 3 p.m. and the motion being put was carried *nem. con.*

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22nd May, 1951.

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

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. H. CUMMINS, M.D., C.M., Messrs. F. E. MILLER, M. E. COX, H. A. DOWDING, F. C. GODDARD, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., F. E. C. BETHELL and J. A. HAYNES.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

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

DOCUMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following:—

The Financial Report of the Colonial Treasurer for the month of April, 1951.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure from the Commissioners of Highway for the parish of Christ Church for the half year ended the 31st March, 1951.

Statement of Revenue and Expenditure on Tenantry Roads for the parish of Christ Church for the half year ended the 31st March, 1951.

Messrs. MOTTLEY, CRAWFORD and F. L. WALCOTT entered the House and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—On behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, I beg to lay on the Table of the House the following Papers:—

The Petroleum Drilling and Production (Amendment) Regulations, 1951.

The Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) Order, 1951.

Statement of the sums of money paid over to the Colonial Treasurer by the Commissioner of Police during the Quarter ended 31st March, 1951.

Report on the Vital Statistics of the Island and other Registrations for the year 1948.

NOTICES

Government Notices were given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: (On behalf of Mr. ADAMS): Resolution to approve the Order made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the third day of May, 1951, under the provisions of Section 4 of the Special Registration of Voters (General Assembly) Act, 1951.

Dr. CUMMINS: (On behalf of Mr. ADAMS): Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Payment of Passages) Order 1951," made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the third day of May, 1951, under the provisions of Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act 1949.

Mr. COX: Resolution to approve the Book of Reference and Plan of the proposed extension of the Water Works in the parish of St. Michael.

Mr. COX: Resolution to approve of the compulsory acquisition by the Governor-in-Executive Committee of all that certain parcel of land (Part of the tenantry lands of a place called Bosvigo) containing by estimation 13,870 Sq. Ft., for the purpose of establishing a district market.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Order 1951", made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 17th day of May 1951, under the provisions of Sections 3 (1) (c) and 4 (3) of the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Act 1947 (1947-13) as set out in the Schedule thereto.

Dr. CUMMINS: (On behalf of Mr. ADAMS): A Bill intituled an Act to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act 1949.

Other Notices were given as follows:—

Mr. LEWIS: Of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To*

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that the facility of loans to purchase motor vehicles, to be used in the performance of their duties, should be ex-

tended to such part-time Government employees as the Food Crops and Live Stock Inspectors and the Inspectors supervising the weighing of cane at the various Sugar Factories in the Island.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to take the steps necessary to grant such loans to these employees.

Mr. DOWDING: A Bill intituled The Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) (Amendment) Act, 1951.

Messrs. ALLDER, MAPP and GILL entered the House and took their seats.

Mr. LEWIS: Of my intention to move later in the day for the consideration of the Address of which I have just given notice.

QUESTIONS

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present in the House at the next meeting:—

Has the attention of the Government been drawn to reports that the Government of St. Lucia which had at first refused to participate in the B.W.I. workers emigration scheme to the U.S.A. has now agreed to do so because it has succeeded in obtaining better terms and conditions for emigrants than were at first offered, specifically, that 12-week period of contract has been extended?

2. Will the Government immediately re-open negotiations with the U.S. authorities with the view to obtaining a similar extension for Barbadian workers?

3. Will the Government take steps to enable Barbadians who may be in the U.S. in appreciable numbers under contract at the time of the next General Election—the first to be held in the colony on the basis of Adult Suffrage—to record their votes?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Government Scholarships and Exhibitions Act, 1949, was read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. DOWDING, seconded by Mr. MORTLEY, a Bill intituled The Vestries (Cost of Living Bonus to Employees) (Amendment) Act, 1951, was read a first time.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Dr. CUMMINS: I ask leave to take Order No. 5 on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph as the first Order of the Day under Government business.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the Day now stands in the name of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Colony.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES FOR VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Dr. CUMMINS: The first Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is a Resolution to place the sum of \$24,544 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part I, Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 4, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I suggest that each Head of the Schedule be taken separately.

HEAD VI—CUSTOMS

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head VI, Customs, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HEAD X—FIRE BRIGADE

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head X, Fire Brigade, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HEAD XIV—LEGAL DEPARTMENTS

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg move that Head XIV, Legal Departments, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HEAD XV—POLICE

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XV, Police, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HEAD XXI—SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXI, Science and Agriculture, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HEAD XXV—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

The item and the amount to be voted under this Head were read.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXV, Public Works Department, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman,—The note to this item says: "The Harbour Police Pier has recently been extensively damaged when a lighter which was unloading explosives was driven on to it by high seas. Although the owners of the lighter have denied liability, from the evidence it is considered that they are liable for the damage. It is therefore proposed to repair the pier at Government expense and when the actual cost of repairs is known, to take the necessary legal action against the owners of the lighter." I see that legal action is to be taken against the owners of this lighter; I wonder if the Government can tell us if they know whether they can proceed legally against the owners of the lighter or not.

Dr. CUMMINS: I think the matter is being considered by the Attorney General.

The question that Head XXV stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXVIII—SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXVIII, Subsidies and Grants, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HEAD XXIX—MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES.

The items and the respective amounts to be voted under this Head were read.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXIX, Miscellaneous Services, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman,—I am sorry that provision is made under item 58 for the purchase of Very High Frequency Wireless Communication Sets. When we discussed this matter some time ago I said that it was definitely unnecessary to spend this money in purchasing these Sets to be used in the event of a hurricane. I am told that some of these Sets are lying about the island and there are others in some Department. In view of the fact that you will scarcely experience a hurricane of that intensity which would cause us to obtain this equipment within the immediate future, I feel that this money can be saved. If you purchase this equipment, it means that it must lie in some Department for some time yet, and the equipment goes bad according to the weather. Besides that, I feel that we might be asked to spend money in keeping this equipment in order. I am hoping that this item will be left out because, in the event of a hurricane, we would have those Sets which are kept by the Police to carry on the necessary communications. It would be a far sighted policy if we would save this \$2,880.

Mr. GODDARD: I would like to enquire as to who is going to operate these Sets. I would like to say that there is a great sense of frustration obtaining among those who really want to do something in case a hurricane takes place; many of the members of the Hurricane Relief Committees which have been set up in the various parishes—people who are able and willing to do something—are actually threatening to resign. They complain that the Government is dealing with the matter in the wrong way; there is no public education whatever before the hurricane occurs. I feel that with visual education, they have a good opportunity, if they could get suitable films, to show the children what a hurricane really means so that the children could protect themselves. Nothing has been done about the matter although the Government has been told by these Hurricane Relief Committees that this education is most important. The set-up which is contained in leaflets and posters will take half an hour to read. I feel that the Government should tackle this matter much more forcibly than they have done in the past. These Hurricane Relief Committee are asked to do this voluntary work, and they are anxious to do it, but they are threatening to resign because they feel that the Government is not going about the matter in the correct way.

Mr. MILLER: I feel that we should do every thing in the exercise of caution where a hurricane is concerned, and we do not know when a hurricane will take place. I have not really been converted to the thought that these Wireless Communication Sets would serve in the event of a hurricane; but I am prepared to support this Resolution because I would not like to have it put on my conscience that I could have saved somebody's life by agreeing to the expenditure of this money. I do not know how this equipment would really help the people all over the colony; it appears to me that this equipment will have to be placed at some particular station, and if that is done, I do not know it will help the island as a whole. Many transmitting sets will be necessary. As regards the point raised by the honourable senior

member for Christ Church about the leaflets, I agree that it takes time to read the matter which is supplied in fine print. I wish to inform the Government that equipment should be used at certain vantage points in the island rather than continue the idea of spending this money.

The question that Head XXIX stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD XXXIII—AIRPORT

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head XXXIII, Airport, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$24,544 do now pass.

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

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

Mr. BRYAN came into the Committee and took his seat.

SUPPLEMENTARY VOTES RE CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Dr. CUMMINS: The next Resolution, Mr. Chairman, is one to place the sum of \$42,377 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951—52, Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951—52, No. 5, which form the Schedule to the Resolution. As in the case of the other Resolution, I propose to take each Head of the Schedule separately.

HEAD I—PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head I, Public Buildings, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

HEAD VI—MISCELLANEOUS

The items and the respective amounts to be voted under this Head were read.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that Head VI, Miscellaneous, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. LEWIS: As regards item 7 "Two Buoys" the sum approved of in the Estimates was \$2,500 and the supplementary provision required is \$1,500. I take it that in the case of these buoys it was not known that there would be an increase in the cost. We have been revoting a whole lot of money here and I hope the Government knows that the amount in the first set of estimates will cover the cost of the items which have been ordered. I hope that a whole collection of items which has lapsed has not been put in an omnibus Resolution and brought down here. It seems to me that if the cost of the items goes up within another two months or so, the Government will have to come for more money. I hope that that is not the case with all the items.

Mr. ALLDER: I am wondering if the condition of these buoys is so bad that they cannot be repaired. I notice that every year we vote a certain amount of money for the repairs of these buoys, and now the Government is about to buy two buoys. Our engineering skill has increased and I am wondering if it was not possible to have these buoys repaired: I do not think that they could be so bad that the foundries could not possibly make any hand of them. Of late we have been voting money for the purchase of certain items through the Crown Agents and when the items arrive, the Government has to come back

for more money because it is told that the prices have increased since the orders were given. I have seen some work done by the foundries here—work of a more technical nature than repairing buoys, and, besides that, I feel that the local engineers can build these buoys.

Mr. CRAWFORD: What I should like to remark upon is the considerable advance in the price of these buoys. At the time when the Estimates for 1951—52 were prepared, which is not a year ago, the estimated cost of these buoys was only \$2,500; and now, within a space of six or seven months, the price has gone up to \$4,000—an increase of \$1,500. I am wondering if it is not possible to get these items from sources other than the United Kingdom through the Crown Agents; because it appears to me that we are being fleeced in having to pay this exorbitant increase in the price of these buoys which are being obtained from England. That only serves to show how the entire British West Indian Colonies are being exploited by United Kingdom manufacturers. The British Government places very effective controls on the prices of our commodities used in Great Britain, but apparently it allows the British manufacturers to make up for these prices on the articles which they import. Allowing for the cost of production having risen, it appears to me that this increase of \$1,500 is extraordinary. We sit here some times and allow these things to pass unnoticed, but I think that without making some protest occasionally we are allowing people to get away with murder. In almost every sphere the price of articles which we have to import from the United Kingdom is, to my mind, completely beyond what the people of these poor colonies should be called upon to pay. I should be very surprised to learn that we could not obtain these buoys more cheaply from Canada or the United States of America. If one were in a position to check up on the prices which we are paying for imports into this colony from the United Kingdom, and the prices at which we could possibly get the same articles from elsewhere, I am sure he would be amazed at the enormous amount of money which is being wasted every year—money which could be used for the improvement of the conditions existing among the people of this island, if we were not bound by these unfair import restrictions. We do not mind buying British provided that the prices of the articles are competitive. I think that unless we begin in this colony to make a protest against the existing state of affairs, the position will become worse rather than being improved. This is one case in which we have it demonstrated without the slightest shadow of a doubt, that by our being compelled to buy British we are being exploited.

Mr. MILLER: I think that the honourable junior member for St. Philip will be pleased to know that these buoys cannot be made in Barbados.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I said nothing about the buoys being made in Barbados.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable senior member for St. John has said that they could be made in Barbados, but these buoys are not the ordinary ones. The real, serviceable, navigational buoys cannot be made in Barbados. The honourable member would make us feel that they can be made here, but the type of buoy referred to in the explanatory notes accompanying the addendum to this Resolution cannot be made in Barbados. I do not think that \$4,000 is as cheap as we could possibly pay for these buoys.

Mr. GARNER came into the Committee and took his seat.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable member has lost sight of the fact that less than a year ago when the Estimates were being prepared, the price esti-

ated for these buoys was \$2,500. The person who put down that amount for the buoys did not use his imagination in putting it down; he must have had some reason for putting down that amount of \$2,500, and in less than seven months there has been an increase of roughly 60%. I am sorry that the honourable senior member for St. George did not see his way to associate himself with this protest, because unless and until we raise our voices in this matter these colonies will continue to be fleeced. Unless these buoys are completely beyond repair, it seems to me that we should make enquiries outside the United Kingdom as to their availability and at what price before we spend this money. It is the Government's duty to call to the attention of the United Kingdom Authorities, whether they be the Colonial Office or the Crown Agents, any dissatisfaction that exists on the part of colonials as regards this particular policy; and even although we may not be allowed to import these particular articles from other sources, yet, if merely for the purpose of making out a case, enquiries being made as to the price of these articles from other sources will serve a useful purpose. We should let the British Government know that we know that we have been called upon to pay too much for these articles.

Mr. ALLDER: I think that the points which have been raised by the honourable senior member for St. George and the honourable junior member for St. Philip deserve consideration. While it might be true that the local foundries cannot make these buoys, I still feel that, as in the case of other countries, the particular design could be discarded. In other countries there is a different kind of service in respect of buoys; in this case, not only are we being asked to pay more money for new buoys, but even the maintenance costs have gone up 100%. It would be a good thing if the Government could review the situation and see if it is not possible for these buoys to be repaired. I think that that suggestion is a very reasonable one and is deserving of some sort of consideration.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I was hoping that the honourable introducer of this Resolution would have been able to give some explanation with regard to the considerable increase in the price of these buoys. The honourable member must have the facts before him, because we cannot sit here and throw away money like this. Apparently the matter is so unimportant that it needs no explanation in this House, but I do not feel so about it. The important thing which we have to do now is to make some complaint about this state of affairs. Why should the cost of these buoys be increased by \$1,500 within six or seven months? Because we get a little more money for sugar from the British Government occasionally, and the new prices are even below the current world prices, does it necessarily follow that we must submit blindly to every attempt made by the United Kingdom to bleed us? There is the question of the restriction of imports and the necessity of getting goods from the United Kingdom, but we have not got the dollars. I have asked for figures showing the dollar earnings of the colony and the Government has refused to give them; that is, in itself, very significant. If our dollar earnings are so very much less than what we need for imports, then we can see the figures with pleasure; but the minute they refuse to give us those figures, it follows, in my opinion, that the position is in our favour, that we are really earning more dollars than they are giving us to spend. Only last year Canadian manufacturers were complaining that the United Kingdom was actually taking dollars earned by the West Indies and spending them on herself and I think the figures of the

earnings in the West Indies were over twenty-five million dollars. Until the correct position is put before us, we are justified in calling for more dollars if by getting those dollars we can get the articles which we must have, especially when we can get them cheaper than from the United Kingdom sources. It is not expected that a colony such as we are, with a constitution such as ours, should sit down and submit spinelessly to this sort of oppression. If we were a Crown Colony we would have to take whatever happens; but if we are supposed to have a more advanced constitution and to be more masters in our houses than other colonies, then let us protest and take the lead so as to help other colonies which are not in the position in which we are. We throw away an enormous amount of money because we do not make a show in order to get articles cheaper from outside United Kingdom markets. It is either that the members of the Government do not care about these things or, in their opinion, the advance in the price of these buoys is reasonable; perhaps they regard themselves as so beholden to the British Government that anything which Great Britain feels like doing they will acquiesce in it. Every school child knows that the price of material has gone up and you have to pay more for it; but nobody would expect that the advance in price would be so considerable over such a short space of time as in the case of these buoys. If the advance in price is so considerable in this case, you can imagine how we are being burnt in respect of the importation of machinery. The silence of the Government in this matter is very significant; it serves to show that the matter was not deserving of any special attention. It does appear that instead of conditions becoming better they are getting worse and that this colony will be further pauperized because money which should be used to greater advantage in the colony, is being spent as a result of increased prices for materials imported from the United Kingdom.

The question that Head VI stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that a Resolution to place the sum of \$42,377 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1951-52, Part II—Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1951-52, No. 5, which form the Schedule to the Resolution, do now pass.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to.

On the motion of Dr. CUMMINS seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT the CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

ACCIDENTS AND OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES (NOTIFICATION) BILL 1951

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Thomas:—To move the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to provide for the notification of accidents and occupational diseases.

Dr. CUMMINS: In moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to say that we are now talking a great deal about industrialization and we are looking forward to the day when we will have certain industries set up in Barbados. As you know,

Mr. Speaker, with certain industries come certain diseases, and we are therefore taking time by the forelock; we are preparing legislation along the lines as that which obtains in big countries which are highly industrialized. There are one or two people who feel that these diseases as set out in the Third Schedule to this Bill might be contagious, but most of them, with the probable exception of Anthrax, are not contagious. Most of these diseases are caused as a result of poisons which come into contact with the skin. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: Sir, I think that this is one of those Bills which come before this House but which are seldom used. My feeling in connection with this Bill is that if it is passed it will be put on the Statute Book and we will have applications for more assistance in the Labour Department in order to deal with more matters. I must admit that it is necessary, in case of accidents and occupational diseases, to have a full record kept and someone should be responsible for that, and, if possible, steps should be taken to prevent the recurrence of certain accidents; but when you come to the diseases which are referred to in the Third Schedule to this Bill I am sure that some honourable members sitting around this table are not aware of what they all are, and to enforce a cumbersome Act like this would be making a mistake. It will mean a lot more work for the Labour Department and I feel along with other honourable members, that this Act will never be enforced. I do not know if this Bill should be passed in its present form, but it does seem to me that in passing such a Bill we are putting an unnecessary burden on the shoulders of the Labour Commissioner.

Mr. GODDARD: Legislation of this sort usually applies to businesses which are equipped for carrying it out, but in Barbados there are small businesses which employ a few people and those businesses will be called upon to be responsible for carrying out the terms of this Bill. I know from experience that in respect of legislation which has been passed for the welfare of the worker, a burden has been thrust on these small businesses which are really not equipped to make the returns that are required to be made under such legislation. I have not examined this Bill thoroughly and I am not saying that I will oppose it. If it is felt necessary for the welfare of the worker that this Bill should be put on the Statute Book, provided that it does not create a hardship on the majority of employers, I shall assist in getting the Bill on the Statute Book; but I will await the expressions of opinion of some other hon. members. This Bill may only entail an additional clerical burden without any results being gained. I have not paid very close attention to this Bill but at a mere glance at it, I have made those observations.

Mr. LEWIS: Undoubtedly, on the face of it, this Bill looks like a good one, but I am wondering if it has come in the absence of the Public Health Bill. That Bill has been passed by this House and I am wondering what has become of it. If you can bring a Bill like the Public Health Bill before this Assembly and then decide that it is unnecessary, what about a Bill like the present one which is before us? I hope that this Bill has not been brought forward because they have abandoned the Public Health Bill; I hope the hon. senior member for St. Thomas will tell me something about that. I should like to know whether an Order could not be made so that medical practitioners could report cases of disease to the Labour Commissioner rather than put this Bill on the Statute

Book when the Public Health Bill has already been passed by this House. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas says that this Bill is something separate and distinct from the Public Health Bill, but this Bill deals with the health of the people. It does appear to me that all that it is necessary to do would be to get medical practitioners to inform the Labour Commissioner of cases of these diseases. However, I only hope that this Bill will not be one of those to which the honourable junior member for St. James has referred, because I know of legislation which has been passed in this House and I have not heard anything more about it at all. I sincerely hope that this Bill will not suffer the same fate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: We have had this Bill in our hands and so before us for a little time and presumably honourable members who have read it are able to understand what it is all about. However, I think it is a Parliamentary tradition that the introducer of an important Bill like this makes a proper speech explaining the nature and purpose of the Bill and also explaining the real reasons which motivated the Government to present it to the Legislature. In introducing a Bill of this nature in this Chamber, the practice has been that the introducer explains as far as he possibly can, the nature of the Bill and the benefits which, it is hoped, will be derived from its passing. This Bill, I believe, arises from one of the recommendations made by the International Labour Organisation with regard to the protection of workers along the same lines as legislation for the protection of women in industry or legislation to provide holidays with pay for workers or any similar legislation. This particular Bill should be regarded in the light of workmen's compensation, it will provide compensation for people who suffer from occupational diseases, that is to say, diseases which they contract during the course of their employment, in the same manner as people are entitled to compensation for injury sustained during the course of their employment. We know that miners are very prone to contract certain types of diseases; a miner who has worked in a coal mine or any other mine for 25 years may, at the age of 40 or 45 years, find his health materially impaired, or he may find his capacity for work considerably reduced, but he may not have any outward, visible deficiency; he has not lost any limb and therefore under the Workmen's Compensation Act, he would not be entitled to any compensation at all. On the other hand, under this Bill, if you are the victim of a disease which is common to your type of employment—if you can prove for instance, that you have become ill through working with potassium, sodium or ammonium—if you can prove that your lungs have been affected through working with arsenate of lead, although you may appear to be physically perfect, and you can prove that your health has been undermined and your capacity for work has been reduced, you are entitled to compensation. Honourable members seem to interpret my remarks to mean that this Bill itself will provide the compensation; I think it will be recalled that I said this Bill should be regarded in the light of workmen's compensation, and I am only trying to explain, as far as I know, how this Act will operate. In any case, the point is that we have not got in this island as yet, industries in which people are employed and are apt to contract any disease. The honourable introducer of the Bill is of the same opinion because in his short introduction he said that we hope to get industries so that if this hope fructifies in the dim and distant future we shall have legislation to deal with the situation. I hope that this hope of our getting these industries

will soon be realised but in so far as this prospect appears at the moment, we might just as well pass a Bill to pay compensation to people who have been injured by lions and tigers, because it seems that we are likely to get lions and tigers at the same time as we get industries (Laughter) judging by the policy of the Government as regards new industries. However, the passing of this Bill cannot do any harm, and although we have not got any industries in which the people employed might suffer from occupational diseases, yet the Colonial Office has to make returns to the Secretary of the International Labour Organization as to the number of Colonies which have legislation of this sort, those which have legislation with respect to holidays with pay and so on, and if we want to put this Bill on the Statute Book of this colony for the purpose of making the records appear impressive, we should certainly agree to the passing of the Bill today. We are not like England where there are enterprises which seriously endanger the health of the people who work in them; we should take care to select industries in which people can work for long periods without their health or working capacity being seriously endangered. I hope that those honourable members who have expressed apprehension as regards the necessity for this Bill will nevertheless accord it their support.

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

Mr. BETHELL: I do not want to say very much in connection with this Bill. I would like to say that people are more liable to be injured by elephants and crocodiles before they are injured from being employed in the new industries which the Government is going to set up. I suggest to the honourable senior member for St. Thomas that the Government should take steps to avoid accidents taking place by elephants and crocodiles because they will come here before we have any new industries.

Mr. ALLDER: I have listened to the speeches of honourable members and the honourable senior member for Christ Church has suggested that the passing of this Bill will hurt some traders. I have noticed that whenever a Bill of this sort is brought before this House, honourable members on the opposite side of the House who have to shoulder greater responsibility always try to bring forward some argument on behalf of the small employer, but it is a fact that hundreds of former employees are now at their homes having been incapacitated as a result of the occupation which they have been pursuing in various industries and especially on the plantations. Many of these people have to remain at home and depend on the charity of their friends and the Alms-houses; they suffer from ailments which easily develop from the use of the fork and the reaping of canes and they are now found in the tenancies unnoticed by their former employers. In some cases in the parish which I have the honour to represent, there are some workers who have lost one of their feet due to working in the cane-fields. In those days we did not have any Workmen's Compensation Act on the Statute Book, but it was a question of sympathy where the plantation owner would consider that a worker got incapacitated while working for him and out of the huge profits made by the plantation owner, the worker was deserving of some weekly or monthly contribution. The Vestries scarcely give these people the consideration which they deserve although the Vestries are dominated by the same plantation owners. I know of a specific case in which a plantation owner promised that he would assist a woman who used to work at the plantation; the position now is that the woman, who used to pay 8 cents a week for a

spot, has been asked to give up the spot. I think we should make sure that those persons who are now working will not suffer the same fate as those who are now living in the estate tenancies and who are unable to earn a livelihood for themselves because of the laborious tasks which they had to carry out at the plantations. It is time that we do something about this matter regardless as to who gets vexed or pleased. I feel that the Workmen's Compensation Act which was passed some years ago should be made to operate retrospectively for a good number of years so as to include some of those people who have lost their limbs during the course of their work and who are still living and suffering. I feel that this Bill which is now before us is a very necessary bit of legislation, but I hope that the Government will put its house in order first; I hope that before the Government ask private enterprise to provide the necessary protection for workers, they will make sure that people, especially those who work in wells and boilers at the Pumping Stations, are given the necessary protection in their occupation, for which they have been clamouring during the War. Up to now these employees are still being met with refusal to be given certain equipment which would safeguard their health, and I know that at these Pumping Stations there are a few men who have not reached the retiring age, but who, by having to go down the cold wells and in hot boilers and furnaces, have been forced to resign on medical advice; they sustain paralytic strokes and so on. These matters need attention being paid to them and I hope that the Government will set the example so that when they have to force private enterprise to do something they will be able to say boldly: "You have to do it because we have started to do it ourselves."

Dr. CUMMINS: The honourable junior member for St. James and the honourable senior member for Christ Church seem to be unhappy about the names of these diseases which appear in the Third Schedule to this Bill. I want to assure them that as far as this list of diseases is concerned, with the possible exception of Anthrax we will never have any of them unless we have proper industries set up. With regard to the lions and tigers and elephants, we all hope to live long enough to see these animals come in; but I want to assure honourable members that although the names of these diseases seem to be formidable, there is no opportunity of people contracting any of these diseases unless we have industries established here and workers engaged in them become affected by these diseases.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that the consideration of this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I have spoken with the honourable senior member for St. Thomas and I think he will agree to the consideration of this Bill being referred to a Select Committee. A lot will have to be done to this Bill so as to make it workable, and I think it can best be done in Select Committee.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. I do not think that anybody could object to the principal of this Bill but it should be modified to suit local conditions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye" those against will please say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it. Subject to the approval of the House, I appoint the following honourable members to serve as such Select Committee:—The honourable

senior member for St. Thomas (Dr. Cummins), the honourable junior member for the City (Mr. Lewis), the honourable junior member for St. Thomas (Mr. Mapp), the honourable junior member for St. James (Mr. Wilkinson), the honourable senior member for Christ Church (Mr. Goddard) and the honourable senior member for the City (Mr. Mottley).

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker,—There is an omission on my part which I want to correct. It is that the name of the honourable senior member for St. Andrew (Mr. Gill) has been omitted from the members of the Select Committee and I am asking that his name be added to the list of members of the Select Committee.

There being no objection, the honourable member's name was added to the list of members of the Select Committee.

Mr. WILKINSON: I ask to be relieved of serving on that Select Committee.

Dr. CUMMINS: In place of the honourable junior member for St. James, I propose that the honourable junior member for St. George (Mr. Dowding) serve on that Committee.

At the request of Mr. SPEAKER, the honourable member consented to serve on the Select Committee.

Mr. ALLDER: If I am in order to speak now, I should like to say that it is a waste of time to select this Committee.

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

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 5.30 p.m.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until 5.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

STATEMENT ON ADDRESS *RE* DEATH OF MILTON KING

On re-assembling:

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker before we resume business — I am sorry that the Senior Member for the City is not in his seat. I am asking leave to make a statement on behalf of the Government in connection with the Address of which he gave notice last Tuesday. The Address concerns the death of Milton King in South Africa. I am instructed on behalf of the Government to make the following statement.

This matter was reported to the Government on March 31, 1951, and ever since, the Government has been moving in the matter. The Government communicated with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and we have the evidence given by several witnesses, including two Barbadian members of the crew and the accused. There was a preliminary hearing at which the accused—a South African policeman—was charged with murder, and there the matter stands.

Evidence was given by several witnesses at the inquest and a pathologist also gave evidence. I do not want to go into the details of the case because the matter is *sub judice*, and I think that in accordance with British Jurisprudence it would be unwise and undesirable to make any long statement. For that good reason I want to appeal to the senior member for the City to let the matter stand until we get further information from South Africa. I think he will have achieved the object of his Address in view of the fact that the Government is moving in the matter and has obtained the information which I have taken this opportunity to give.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret that the hon'ble member who tabled this address is not in his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—I am sorry that I was not in my place when the hon'ble senior member for St. Thomas made his statement on government's policy regarding the death of Milton King.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will give the hon'ble senior member for St. Thomas permission to give you the statement which he just gave the House.

Dr. CUMMINS: At your request, Sir, I will repeat the statement. This matter was brought to the attention of the Government on March 31, and since then the Government has been moving in the matter. We had information from the Captain of the ship which information was sent on to the agents or owners at London and then relayed to us through Messrs Da Costa & Co., Ltd. Government reported the matter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and there was a post mortem examination and preliminary hearing at which a South African policeman was charged. Evidence was taken from several witnesses, including two Barbadian members of the crew, and the matter is still before the Court. From the point of view of British Jurisprudence, the case still being before the Court, we are asking the hon'ble senior member for the City to refrain from making any statement. We are asking him to keep the address in abeyance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given the hon'ble member permission to make the statement, and I have also given the hon'ble senior member for the City permission to deal with this Address. But he will not be allowed to make a reply to that statement now. When the time comes and he still wishes to proceed with the Address he will be able to do so.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank Your Honour, and appreciate Your Honour's ruling. I also appreciate the statement that has been made, and I thank Your Honour for your permission to deal with the Address later in the day. At this stage I ask leave to deal with the Address which stands in my name—No. 55 on the Order Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want to ask the Government if they are proceeding further with their business.

Mr. ADAMS: Yes Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government is desirous of proceeding with their business. I must ask the honourable member to allow them to proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As Your Honour rules.

BILL POSTPONED

Mr. Speaker called Order No. 7—a Bill intituled an Act to continue temporarily certain emergency enactments.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—As I understand there is some information that honourable members will require on this Bill, I do not propose to continue with it at this stage, although I may be ready to deal with it later in the evening. As regards that, I will confer with other honourable members. I am therefore asking leave to proceed with Order No. 8 as the next order.

CLAIRMONTE PENSION BILL

Leave being granted Mr. Speaker called Order No. 8—Motion by Mr. Adams for the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to authorise the payment of an additional gratuity and pension to Frederick Archibald Conrad Clairmonte.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—This Bill is to authorise the payment of an additional gratuity and pension to the retiring Commissioner of Income Tax and Death Duties. As honourable members will see from the Objects and Reasons, the case of Mr. Clair-

monte is one of these cases in which the House will remember how the Government has acted on the principle just now established. I think that honourable members will agree with it. The principle is that a man who has been a Civil Servant and who according to the strict letter of the law might not be eligible for a pension, because of the conditions existing when he joined the service should be given it. The case of supernumeraries is one such case—people who did a certain amount of preliminary work before they went on the permanent staff. Now the Government is saying that it is unfair to deprive a good retiring Civil Servant of a pension because the conditions existing when he became a Civil Servant made him not eligible for a pension. Therefore, when the time comes, a special Act is introduced. We went further with Mr. Douglas Haynes, his case being one in which part of his service was parochial service. Or take the case of a man working for the old Road Board before it became a Government Department. It is only fair that if a man has given good public service he should be given a pension. The Objects and Reasons of this Bill set out the principle. The Civil Service has been assured that whenever a case arises which is not covered by the 1947 Act, the 1925 Act will remain, time.

Dr. Cummins seconded.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to unanimously.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 were read and passed.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox the Chairman reported the passing of the Bill in Committee.

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS and Mr. Cox the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title was read and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND TEACHERS' PENSION ACT

Mr. SPEAKER called Order No. 9 standing in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph—Motion for the second reading of a Bill intituled an Act to amend the Teachers Pension Act, 1925.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—This is a similar Bill to the one just passed in the sense that it is an attempt by the Government to make retrospective to October 23, 1947 the provisions of the Teachers Pension (Amendment) Act. As the Objects and Reasons show, the Teachers Pension (Amendment) Act, 1949, was passed to place secondary school teachers on the same footing as Government officers under the Pensions Act, 1947. The Bill was introduced into the House of Assembly in early October, 1948, but owing to prorogation the Bill lapsed. It was re-introduced in December, 1948, and came into operation on the 16th May, 1949. Unlike the Pensions Act, 1947, and the Police Force and Fire Brigade Pensions Act, 1949, it was not given retrospective effect from the 23rd October, 1947. As a result any teacher who retired between the 23rd October 1947 and the 16th May, 1949, failed to get the benefits of the legislation. It is considered equitable that such teachers should not be deprived of any benefit which was clearly intended for them.

This Bill accordingly seeks to make the provisions of the Teachers Pension (Amendment) Act, 1949, retrospective from the 23rd October, 1947, thereby giving effect to the original intention of that legislation.

I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. Cox seconded.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Before you put the question, Sir, I want to say that I am interested in the statement about persons being entitled to pensions who were employed in what has been some sort of semi-Government service. About a month ago I raised on the floor of the House the position of the retired mason foreman of the General Hospital, George Headley. He served with the old Hospital Board for about 21 years, and after it became a Government Institution he remained there another two years. The hon'ble senior member for St. Joseph said that the Hospital Board was not a Government Board and that the man was not entitled to pension. He was promised by the old Hospital Board that his case would be considered when the time came to retire. He retired in October, 1949, and has applied for a pension over a year ago; but he has not even got a reply yet. The policy of Government which the hon'ble senior member for St. Joseph enunciated in dealing with the Bill under consideration and the preceding one is so well established that I cannot understand how this retired mason foreman or any other semi-Government employee could experience any difficulty in getting a pension which apparently is now theirs by right.

Mr. LEWIS: In connection with that, sir, I always understood employees of the Hospital Board were automatically entitled to pension. But I think that as far as carpenters, masons, etc., are concerned, they are in the position that although they may be employed for years and years, they are still regarded as part time employees. The Public Works Department has had to take over some of these employees. It is an interesting position.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to unanimously.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Mr. Cox, the House went into Committee on the Bill.

The two clauses of the Bill were read and agreed to.

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

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS and Dr. CUMMINS, the Bill was read a third time and passed, and the title was read and agreed to.

BILL TO SETTLE INCOME TAX RATES

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day stands in the name of the hon'ble senior member for St. Joseph — Second reading of a Bill to settle the rates of Income Tax for the year 1951 and to make provision for certain other matters in connection with the levying of the said tax.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— This Bill settles the rate of Income Tax for this year. As honourable members will see, the Government is keeping its promise to await the publication of the Fiscal Survey before changing the rates of income tax. I say that in spite of the ribald remarks that sometimes greet my references to this Survey. But the Government is not suggesting that it may not have to raise the rates in the next financial year. I do not want anyone to believe that because we have re-introduced the present rate that we feel that the island has reached its taxable capacity. But we have given a promise that until we know exactly where we stand from a financial point of view the rates will not be raised. I would say that in spite of the frantic attempt that was made to prevent this island from getting wealth out of oil, the Government is still hopeful that in spite of the

royalties which will have to be paid, it will be possible to get substantial revenue from oil. It is not that the Government is banking on oil to guide its financial outlook; but at the same time we are hoping like every true Barbadian that we will get oil. Incidentally, I regret to say at this stage that a certain newspaper well known for its accuracy printed a reproduction from a Trinidad Newspaper not of the Protestant Faith, which painted a more rosy picture of the possibilities of oil in Barbados than was actually given. So I am informed. It reported that the Gulf Representative said that Barbados was rich in oil, when he said nothing of the sort. The Fiscal Survey is much nearer completion than the last occasion on which I spoke about it. I have seen a draft of it. If honourable members who I am glad to see in that happy frame of mind think we will not have higher rates of income tax, I think they may have to reconsider that opinion. Mr. Speaker I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker,—I am afraid that I cannot congratulate the hon'ble senior member for St. Joseph on the observation that he has just made — that the Government is awaiting the Fiscal Survey. Not that I do not expect that this survey will arrive at some time or other, just as I believe that some time or other we will have a deep water harbour. I do not consider that a sufficiently strong reason for delaying the putting of the income tax rates of those in the higher brackets on a scale that is much more commensurate with what is reasonable. People with taxable incomes of £600 and up to £5,000 I think must feel very happy that they are living in Barbados and can therefore pay such low rates, compared with other countries whose social services are superior to those of this country. After all Barbados too needs free health service, and we find a person with a taxable income of \$24,000 paying 60 cents in the dollar. Then Government is telling us that they are awaiting the Fiscal Survey. Why put it off when it is obvious that the persons in the higher income brackets are on much too low a scale: much below what is reasonable. I would like the Government to give much more careful and serious consideration to increasing the scale of the higher rates in the schedule.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker,—I am sorry that the honourable introducer of this Bill has not told us what the Government is doing about the "pay as you earn" system of collecting income tax. Every year Government must hear someone say that this is an admirable way of collecting this tax. It is a burden to people to pay one year on the income they earned the previous year. It would be a good method for Government to employ. By it I think they would collect more without creating a hardship on people. I see that the Government in its goodness has provided that the taxpayer whose liability is less than five shillings will be required to pay five shillings in discharge of his liability, provided that no tax shall be charged to any taxpayer whose taxable income is less than \$4.08. It might be interesting to know how this figure was hit upon.

Mr. MAPP: Mr. Speaker,—I think that one of the difficulties which face the Income Tax Department in introducing new methods and new systems such as the system advocated by the last honourable member who spoke is that the department has not a big staff or a trained staff. From questions that I asked it is apparent that much work and many statistics that are forthcoming are not, because there is no adequate staff to prepare them. Many details and much information that that department should pub-

lish monthly and quarterly they cannot publish; you cannot get them because the staff is not big enough. I am glad to see that provision has been made for having statistics kept at the department and for having the staff trained by an experienced officer from the Inland Revenue Department. The sooner we undertake it, the better, I am convinced, and it has been acknowledged throughout the West Indies that governments lose much money from income tax because of the lack of trained staff, and there are many loopholes through which people, especially those in the higher income brackets slip. Returns for 1949-50 from firms when the Companies' Tax was increased were less than in former years. Whatever that was due to, it seems fairly queer. Sometime back I gave figures comparing the number of people paying income tax on taxable incomes of £100, £200 and £300. They showed a considerable increase during the last ten or even five years. I cannot say for certain if any increase in the rates paid by those in the top brackets would bring in a very considerable increase in the Government's revenue, because I do not know how many people pay on taxable incomes of \$12,000 a year. In these days when we have such serious inflation, Government should take strong steps to control incomes. I say sir, that it does not help inflationary tendencies in a colony such as this to permit people to have such big incomes to their credit and leave them untaxed. A person with a taxable income of over \$24,000 a year should be taxed more than 75 cents in the dollar. It seems to me that now that the British Government is paying more for sugar than some of that increase should be passed on indirectly to Labour. I do not see how Labour will get it unless we increase Government's revenue from income tax. Companies have been enjoying bigger profits as a result of our getting more money for sugar. There is no way in which Government can pass on some of the benefits of this increased price to people other than those directly employed in the Sugar Industry except by taxing the income and the profits that accrue from it. That is my considered opinion. I have some hope in the words of the Leader of the House that this Fiscal Survey is forthcoming, and that the Government will undertake some proper inquiry into our fiscal resources and see what steps we can take. It is a matter of extreme urgency, and while we cannot go about it without careful planning, it is true that while the grass is growing the horse is starving. Government should try to get Professor Beasley to get on with the survey so that we can have it as soon as possible.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, as far as I can ascertain—I put it that way because I am merely going by the file—if you say that the minimum a man must pay is 5/-, it is pretty hard if his taxable income is less than 20/- to ask him to pay 5/-, because you would be putting him in a higher class than the £600 a year man. As far as the "pay as you earn" system is concerned, as the hon'ble junior member for St. Thomas said, it will take a bigger and trained staff before we can embark on that.

Question that the Bill be read a second time was put and agreed to *nem con*.

Clause 1 was read and passed.

Clause 2 was read.

Mr. LEWIS: I am thanking the Government for the exemptions they are making in the taxing of incomes of less than \$400 a year.

Clause 2 was passed.

The schedule was read.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I am letting the hon'ble senior member for St. Joseph know that I appreciate

the fact that while the schedule simplifies the matter this year, I am throwing out the suggestion that Government might still further simplify the matter by making the figures round figures. After changing from pounds into dollars fix rates that approximate the rate on the pound, using the decimal system. I am asking the Government to try out that although it might bring in a little less or a little more money, and get it ready for next year.

Mr. ADAMS: These points were considered last year and again this year. But it was felt that inasmuch as we were awaiting this Statistician and also in view of the fact that the Commissioner was about to retire, we should not embark on these changes at present. I do assure honourable members that minutes on those very points are before me.

The schedule was agreed to.

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

On separate motions of Mr. ADAMS seconded by Dr. CUMMINS the Bill was read a third time and passed and the title was read and agreed to.

ADDRESS RE LOANS TO INSPECTORS

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the notice I gave earlier today I am asking the leave of the House to proceed with the Address of which I gave notice.

There being no objection leave was granted the honourable member to proceed with the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

to

His Excellency the Governor

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that the facility of loans to purchase motor vehicles, to be used in the performance of their duties, should be extended to such part-time Government employees as the Food Crops and Live Stock Inspectors and the Inspectors supervising the weighing of canes at the various sugar factories in the Island.

2. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to take the steps necessary to grant such loans to these employees.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, the purpose of my bringing in this Address is to ask the Government, if the law of the island will permit them to do so, to consider the granting of loans to these inspectors, similar to the loans which are granted to Government employees for the purchasing of cars to do travelling in jobs the very nature of which necessitates travelling. I think it is a good idea for the Government to assist these people because it will put them in an independent position to do their responsible work impartially. If a cane weighing inspector has to get a car on the hire purchase system from someone who has shares in a sugar factory or who owns one, it might be embarrassing for him to carry out his duties impartially. I understand that these inspectors have already appealed to the Government in this connection and that they have been told that they are not entitled to these loans, because they are part time employees. I have also heard the argument that they might leave their employment. As far as I know, the Colonial Secretary could leave his post and go into private employment. There must be some method by which the Government would get compensation. Government will have insurance on the car in case of accident and things of that sort. I can see no difficulty in extending this facility to these inspectors. If there are any difficul-

ties, I would like to hear them. I cannot see any difficulty that will apply to a part-time employee that will not apply to a whole time one. Where the Food Crop and Livestock Inspectors are concerned, I think they have been told that they are part time employees; but far from their services being dispensed with, I think that they might become even more essential in the future, and in the foreseeable future, since we are told that with exchange restrictions that obtain, the best thing we can do is to produce as much as possible of our own food. They have been employed with the Government for a number of years, and so have been the Inspectors for the weighing of canes. So the question of the permanency of their employment is merely a legal one. The average life of a car is I understand five to six years. I cannot imagine the services of these people being dispensed with in five or six years. The Food Inspectors are employed at Lancaster Factory, and now that their services at the factory are not required for more than a couple of months a year, they are used for this inspection work. I think that they should be given that amount of independence to enable them to carry out their work impartially. If the government is unable now to make these advances to these inspectors merely because they are part time employees I feel that the sanction of the House is necessary for the purpose. If a resolution is necessary, Government will be given the O.K. by the passing of this Address. If there are any difficulties in the way I am willing to postpone it. I have discussed it with members of the Government, and they have told me that one of the difficulties is the fact that these people are part time employees. Other difficulties were mentioned—difficulties that could easily arise with full time employees as well. Sir, I beg to move that the Address do now pass.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion that this Address do now pass. The honourable member who introduced it has very fully set out what I regard as a most important matter. Certainly inspectors for the supervision of the weighing of canes at the various sugar factories should not be in any way obligated to the persons who not only own these factories, but also have money invested in companies which import and sell motor-cars. As you will perhaps agree, there is no more important official in this country today than the inspector who supervises the weighing of canes. He is the person who more than anyone else is responsible for tranquillity in reaping the crop. In these factories, unless the scale beams are regularly inspected by someone representing the Government, you know what is liable to happen, and what does happen at times when the inspector comes in at a moment that the factory manager is not expecting him. The labourers are paid by the weight of the canes and so are the peasant proprietors. The only fault that I have to find is that the number of these inspectors is not adequate. It is said that they are part time employees, which is correct. But we cannot envisage any government dispensing with their services at any time. As a matter of fact in my opinion they must in time to come become members of the Civil Establishment of the island. We cannot do without them in the interest of the peasants and labourers of this island. As the honourable member for the City said, it has been pointed out that these are part time people who are not normally considered as coming into the category eligible for such loans. As we learned when reading Constitutional Law, there is nothing that the Legislature cannot do except alter the natural organs. Like the honourable member who tabled the Address I do not see that there is any serious difficulty in amending the

existing legislation so as to make these inspectors eligible to get assistance in purchasing cars. I know that certain factory owners and certain cane weighers in this island would be more than glad if these inspectors did not have the means of going around and checking up. That is the type of person we will have to deal with by ensuring that the Cane Weighing Inspectors will at all times be able to get assistance with transport without being obligated to any firm which sells vehicles, and without having to get one on long term credit. You know, sir, how the capitalist in Barbados has been compared with the octopus, with tentacles on every possible business. Some of those who have money invested in the companies that sell cars also have some invested in shares in various factories. We cannot allow these Cane Weighing Inspectors to continue doing what they are doing now. We need them, and more of them—although whenever I say that I see factory owners with long faces. I am happy to support the passing of this Address and to second the motion of the honourable junior member for City.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker—I would like to be refreshed on certain points in this matter by members of the Government. I am going to deal with the cane weighing inspectors. I understand that they are given a lump sum to do a certain job for three or four months of the year, and where they are concerned I cannot be a party to passing an carry out this work. An officer who gets a car on the hire need not be appointed the next year. He may get a better job, meanwhile. he has only repaid \$70.00. I would like my colleague to refresh me on the matter. I am not so well acquainted with how the other officers are appointed. I think that the Address would be more properly worded if it said "to such part time officers as the Government may think fit." I think that would be better than pinning it down to the cane weighing officers. I know that transport must be difficult for them; but I think that I am right in saying that they are appointed for a certain period and there is no guarantee that they will be appointed the next year. The amount to be paid back over the the period of a year would be something like \$28.00 a month. As the honourable member for St. Lucy has said, you should protect these people from the hands of those who are interested in motor cars. I do not know anything of the terms and conditions of employment of the other officers. I am wondering whether my colleague would amend it in the way I have suggested. I think that that would be the commonsense point of view. How can you ask a man to pay so much out of what he is earning over a period of three or four month? If the honourable member would agree with my suggestion I would be willing to vote for the Address.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker—looking at this Address at first blush one might be led to say that you are being sympathetic. Government was dealing with the question and found itself in an invidious position. These two sets of people are part time employees. It is not the name of the post so much as what the post involves. When you schedule an officer for the purpose of travelling under the appropriate Act so that he can borrow money for the purpose, it is the post that you schedule and not the officer. The honourable member who introduced the Address seems to be suggesting that these men should be included in the Civil Establishment. You will find that their salaries have been increased from \$175 to £275. In other words, their salaries have been put on the rate say of a Labour Inspector whose duty it is to be their superior officer. In the normal

run of things the Labour Department would be charged with carrying out these duties. These people were brought in at a time when the Labour Department was not staffed as it is now. They have been put on the Treasury although they are not holding permanent posts. What about other posts of a similar nature that are part time? Government cannot bring down legislation dealing with the matter on these narrow lines. There are a number of other posts in which the officers, like these under discussion, are employed on a month to month basis. You cannot schedule an officer on a month to month basis when the Government itself does not give him security of tenure. If you insist that these officers should get these loan privileges you will be putting them on the basis of permanent employees, and you would have to ask the Government to include all the part time people who do travelling. Where the Food Inspectors are concerned, they go around and do cotton inspection. They were employed during the war with the Grow More Food Campaign. Lancaster Factory came in during the war and they were used at Lancaster. They are employed on a month to month basis. Tomorrow if this vote was reduced and the Director of Agriculture was called upon to terminate the services of one of them, he would only have to give a month's notice. It will be a difficult thing to pass legislation dealing only with two sets of people. The object of the honourable member who introduced this Address is to help these officers acquire motor cars. That would be more reasonable if these people were permanently employed by the Government. What I feel would be a good thing would be to reconsider the whole question of travelling. Another thing is that these people are only required to travel for Government a part of the year, while the object of this legislation is to help people who are required to do travelling for the Government every day. You have to be careful to see that you are not opening a door that would be difficult to close. The Solicitor General is a part time officer. He has to represent the Crown at the Courts; but he is not given travelling allowance. The giving of travelling allowance does not depend so much on the amount of travelling that an officer has to do, but more on the frequency with which he is called upon to do it. To do what the honourable member wants, the Government would consequently have to include all such officers. I am wondering if he had that intention. Government considered this matter and saw the difficulty of doing it without including all these other people, and that is one of the reasons why they cannot do it. We cannot bring in the part time people. I have spoken at this length because I felt that some member of the Government should make clear the policy of the Government on the matter.

Mr. LEWIS: Sir, I have included in this Address two sets of officers. It is open to any honourable member to amend it and put in others if they think fit. There are 24 members of the House, and I have not heard anyone mention yet any other part time officer that is worthy of inclusion. These representations were made to me. The job that these men do is essentially one of travelling. The Livestock Officers get travelling allowance from the Government. If you can grant a man travelling allowance, surely you can grant him a loan to buy a car.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: All employees of the Government whose work involves travelling are given travelling allowance. Because a man gets travelling allowance that does not mean that he can be given a motor car.

Mr. LEWIS: If the Solicitor General has to go to District R on behalf of the Crown it is not always that he knew in advance that he would have to go there. Another thing: where the argument that one of these officers can leave Government Service at a month's notice is concerned, there are other people in the Service to whom that also applies. As far as increasing the number of the inspectors is concerned, I think that the honourable junior member for St. James will bear me out that that point has got mixed up with the size of the crop. But it is nothing to do with it. As far as using the car is concerned, when a member of the Civil Establishment buys a car with a government loan, he uses it for private purposes as well as for his job. To say therefore that these inspectors will only need the car for work during the months that they are employed by the Government is no argument. I feel, sir, that having tabled this Address and made the remarks that I have made, Government should be given authority to review the matter.

The question that the Address do now pass was put to the vote and decided in the affirmative on a division as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. SMITH, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. ALLDER, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MAPP, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GARNER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BRANCKER, Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. GONDARD. (11)

Noes: Mr. GILL, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. WILKINSON. (3).

Mr. SPEAKER asked Mr. LEWIS to present the Address and he agreed to do so.

ADDRESS RE DEATH OF MILTON KING

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as the Address standing in my name is concerned—

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker—On a point of order. It is with great regret that I have to say something which seems to be not accepting your ruling. I cannot as a Barrister, let alone as a member of the House and the leader of the Government fail to register a very strong protest at the continuation of debate on this Address.

It is the greatest contempt of Court that any body, any newspaper or any individual can commit under British Jurisprudence. I am registering my protest at what I understood is the ruling of Your Honour that the honourable senior member for the City will be allowed to discuss the Address relative to the death of Milton King. I will not remain in the House if this Address is debated. Everything that the honourable member said in his address is already being seen after by the Government, and he has been told so in the statement given by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. Even the question of compensation, in case the verdict was given against the accused is being considered.

It is an elementary principle of British Justice, and as far as I know, it applies to South Africa too. Only to-day purely by accident I saw in an article a strong indictment of the American system which allowed trial by newspapers. The article commented on a judgement of the American Supreme Court in which it ruled that it has no authority to prosecute the newspaper, unlike the British system.

In the Leonard Scott Murder Case in America in which two Negro boys were alleged to have raped a white woman, newspapers right and left called for their conviction. Negroes were excluded from the jury, and the higher Court quashed the conviction. This article to which I have just referred, drew attention in strong language to the contrast between the American Court which appar-

ently has no jurisdiction to indict the Press for contempt, and the British Court which has that jurisdiction. It is purely fortuitously that I happened to read that article. If a man was charged with murder—as this South African policeman is charged with murder—in the Courts of this island, the honourable member would find himself before the Chief Justice charged with contempt for having moved this Address. I regret that I had to say what I have said. I did so in view of the fact that Your Honour gave the honourable member permission to continue with this address. That permission should not be given. I regret that it should ever happen that a member of this House should have to question a ruling of Your Honour. He undoubtedly has a right to question. Censures on Speakers have been made in the House of Commons. But as a matter of general principle you should accept the ruling of the Speaker.

With great respect, Your Honour is not a legal man, and you would not feel the same way in this matter as I would. It could not be done if this case were before the Court in Barbados. We would be liable for contempt if we said anything to prejudice the fair trial of the accused, and I repeat, everything that we as Barbadians wanted to see done in this matter has been done.

I am asking the honourable member not to proceed with the Address on the ground that the dignity of the House is at stake if we do something which we know is contempt of Court. The Editor of the *Daily Mirror* went to prison not so long ago for contempt of Court. What Barbadian is not indignant over the death of the King if the circumstances we heard of are true? . . .

Mr. Speaker, I understand that you have given the honourable member a promise. I am asking him not to take advantage of that promise. I express regret again that my remarks are in effect a stricture on Your Honour's having granted him permission. If Your Honour did grant him permission I wish most respectfully to say that Your Honour not being a lawyer may easily have missed this point that when a case is before the Court it is essential in the interest of justice that the matter should not be discussed in the way that this Address will be discussed. The Law is taking its course. Let us sit and see that the course of the Law is taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has made reference to my having granted permission to continue with this Address. The honourable member referred to my not being a lawyer. The entire House knows that. As far as my granting permission is concerned, that was done long before I knew that the Government had a statement to make. Out of the blue the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, Dr. Cummins, told me that he had a statement to make.

The honourable senior member for the City had my permission to proceed with the Address. When I spoke to him we discussed the manner in which the Address should be discussed in view of the statement made by the Government. The Address asked for an inquiry into the circumstances of how the man met his death and compensation to his relatives. At no point did I hear the honourable senior member for St. Thomas say anything about compensation.

I told the honourable senior member for the City that all that it was necessary for him to inquire was whether the Government was following the results of the case, and on the point about compensation to the relatives of the deceased. He promised me he would take advantage of that and I gave my ruling.

It would not take a lawyer to know that it would be foolish for anyone to ask for an investigation if he was told that an investigation was being made. The honourable senior member for the City was only prepared to ask if Government was following the results of the case and about compensation. I do not know if that is an offence against British Law.

As far as strictures being made against me are concerned, I think that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph anticipated me too much. He did not know what the honourable senior member for the City intended to say.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, exactly where you ended is where I intend to begin. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has come back into the House full of opposition to the Address. He never waited to hear one word. I want to say that those of us who are elected to this House have certain rights. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph may be a lawyer. You sir, are not; neither am I. There are other lawyers in this country. God help this country if there were not! I can talk back to any man whether he is a professional or not. If I had stood here and said what he said against the Chair, you would have heard the outcry. It is because you do not look like, say, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew or because you are not a lawyer that he told you what he did. I thank you for your ruling, sir. Have I not got equal rights with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph or any other member of this House? I have been elected here by the people of the City. When the time comes for me to toe the line with anyone let me go out. No bullying is going to work with me. Many weeks ago, sir, I acquainted you with certain facts. I asked you then whether I would be in order to present this Address. I represent the City. To my surprise a letter came to me from South Africa. The letter was from one of my constituents who was employed on the same boat on which the late Mr. Milton King was employed. I drew it to your attention and to the attention of other honourable members, including the Leader of the House. I came to you in your capacity as Speaker and you made a suggestion to me. I never betrayed that trust. But because Your Honour is not a lawyer, the honourable member has come here and made the speech that he has made. Whether a man is a lawyer or a scavenger, one has to make a living. I got that letter from South Africa, and along with it a newspaper clipping out of the "*Capé Times*". The letter said that King was beaten to death by members of the South African Police Force. I felt it was my duty to bring the matter up. If these were days long ago, the death of Milton King would never have been brought up on the floor of this House. But I felt that I would have been betraying the trust of the people who sent me here if I had been asked by one of my constituents to raise something on the floor of this House, however distasteful it might be, and I did not raise that matter. I am pleasantly surprised to hear the statement which the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has made. Let me digress for a moment and say to him that I know he would be as interested, more especially due to the peculiar circumstances of King's death, as the honourable senior member for St. Philip. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said today that it would be wrong for us to go on with this Address. The honourable senior member for St. Philip can bear me out that when I gave notice of this Address, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said he did not think it was right to proceed with the Address. He said that he would see about the matter when he went to England, and that he would

write about it from there. I heard not one word since then, and now the Government's statement is that since March 31 they have had the matter under consideration. Why could not the honourable senior member for St. Joseph instead of telling me what he did, have told me what the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has just said. Could he not have said then that the Government had already begun to move in the matter? The letter said: "we have been called up. Several policemen were lined up, and we had to pick out the people who beat King." The letter went on to say, "I am ashamed to tell you this; during the time that the detectives were beating King I ran because the word 'British' to them is like a red rag to a bull." The honourable senior member for St. Joseph is telling us about justice in South Africa. He is telling us about international law, and he knows that South Africa does not respect international law. You could not prejudice this man's trial in South Africa even if 300 witnesses had seen. King is not a man like the honourable senior member for Christ Church. He is a Negro. The policeman who killed him is not a Negro. I regret that I have to bring up all this. If the honourable member had not said what he did it would not have been necessary for me to bring it up. It is Your Honour's ruling. Listen to my argument, sir, and tell me if I am lying or speaking the truth. Long before the House went into the three-week recess I came with this matter. During that period I also discussed it with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. This is now May. Could he not have told me what the Government was doing in the matter? I am asking you to allow me to exercise my undisputable right on the floor of this House. Again I say that instead of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph telling me that he would write someone in England, he could have told me what the Government was doing. It seems that someone is lying. If this hearing had been started—

Mr. SPEAKER: I will rule now—

Mr. MOTTLEY: To rule now against the Address would be tantamount to being pushed by the Leader of the House. There is freedom of speech. If he once dominated you, I am sure that he cannot do it now. The time has come to break up this nonsense. You have ruled on something, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has said what he did, and for that reason you are asking me not to continue with the Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is under great emotion. I never allow my emotions to get away with my balance. I had spoken to you privately, and you agreed that you would not continue with the Address because both you and I agreed that it would be folly to ask for an investigation after hearing that this investigation was being made. I am maintaining my balance. The fury which the honourable senior member for St. Joseph displayed will not make me lose it. You know that you did come to the understanding that the only thing about which you would enquire is whether compensation would be asked for. Because the honourable senior member for St. Joseph anticipated me too much, that does not mean that I or any other honourable member should lose his balance. Let us all maintain our equilibrium.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When you read this Address what about it is contempt of court? The Address is saying that you heard this seaman got killed, that we regret that it happened, asking that the culprit or culprits be brought to justice and that compensation be secured for the children of the deceased. It would be contempt if the honourable senior mem-

ber for St. Joseph were the judge and I were the defendant. I would get 40 years in prison. I am not one of those people who try to raise racial hatred. Some people like to use you; but if there is any using let me do the using. The honourable senior member for St. Thomas says that the Government is investigating. Would it be superfluous to say—

Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the only point that is causing the honourable senior member for the City some doubt is the point about compensation.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am in doubt about the whole thing now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not allow that.

Dr. CUMMINS: If the question of compensation is what is worrying him, I will just read some more information which I have. It says: "If the deceased has left a wife and/or children or other dependents, the question of the recovery of damages will be raised, either from the person who caused the death or from the Union Government". So you will see that the question of compensation is being considered.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Sir, I do not say that I have no faith in the accuracy of what the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has said. I go further and say that I appreciate what he has read. All that the Leader of the House is objecting to is that this Address would be contempt of court. You, sir, are saying that in view of the fact that the Government is making these investigations, there seems little point in going on with the Address. I have gone all over this island, and heard the Leader of the House and his party make promises. I have heard some members of the Government Party promise to bring down Addresses about certain things, knowing full well that those things were being discussed by the Government and that the Government was bringing them down. No one quarrelled about that. A man might represent a constituency and he might belong to the Government Party; but he still cannot sit and keep his mouth quiet. He is still bound to give notice of an Address even if he knows that the things urged in the Address are being considered by the Government. A few weeks ago we passed an Address about the Cuban Sugar Pact. The Government had already taken steps about that pact. I never thought that the Government was not taking any action in this matter. In the circumstances what can be wrong with this Address? There is a certain amount of parliamentary right for every member of the House. All this talk about contempt of court is just "hokey". There are honourable members in this House who are strongly in favour of this Address. They feel that although the Government is making investigations it should be backed by this House. Is there any harm in that? There have been occasions when the Government has been carrying out negotiations and they have actually asked for the support of this House. This is an elected Chamber. If anyone had made rash statements it might be contempt of court. But where is the contempt in saying that it is alleged that this seaman met his death at the hands of members of the Police Force in South Africa? I have not called anyone's name. I feel that after this harangue by the Leader of the House that the Address as it stands should be passed, I have some right in this House, and there are other honourable members who feel strongly about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled against going any further.

Mr. MOTTLEY: After hearing what the Leader of the House said, sir, it is not a decent thing to do. It is not kind; it is not right; it is not

fair. You have read this Address, and you gave me permission to deal with it. In the position in which you are, sir, you should stand aloof. There should be no suggestion of partizanship.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the honourable member insinuating? I have already said that I will not appear to allow an honourable member to generate heat simply because some other honourable member has generated heat. The honourable member must maintain his balance.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the Address do now pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not accept the motion with the Address as it stands.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker—I rise to second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have said that I will not allow the motion for the passing of this Address as it now stands in view of the statement made by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas.

Mr. LEWIS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let me hear your point of order.

Mr. LEWIS: My point of order is that the entire speech of the honourable senior member for the City at this time must of necessity, be taken as one in which he is asking the leave of the House to proceed with the Address. I take it that Your Honour's ruling was that the Address could be brought before the House, but not that the honourable member could make a motion for the passing of the Address right now. The Address which the honourable member has before the House is not in the usual form in which an Address is brought before the House; it is more in the form of a Resolution. I am appealing to the honourable member to reconsider the matter in the light that the Address is not in the usual form in which an Address is brought before this House and in the light of the information which he now has from the explanation which has been given by the Government. He can put the Address in the usual form, bring it forward again and, if necessary, we can pass it at the next meeting of the House. I have merely risen to point out how I feel about the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that honourable members are really allowing their heads to become hot. What has happened is this: the honourable senior member for the City has said that if the attitude of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph were different, he would have accepted the explanation which was offered by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas. The behaviour of the honourable senior member for the City subsequent to that point shows that he has not been able to keep himself balanced. On the question of compensation being paid to the relatives of the late Mr. Milton King, the honourable senior member for St. Thomas has assured the honourable senior member for the City that upon enquiry by the Barbados Government, it was learnt that the Government of South Africa will take up that matter. I have disallowed the motion being put in its present form.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order. I would like to enquire on what motion the honourable senior member for St. Joseph made his speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: No motion was before the House at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The honourable senior member for the City spoke on a motion asking for leave to proceed with the consideration of the Address and I take it that any other honourable member is entitled to speak on that motion asking for leave to proceed with the consideration of the Address.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that the Address should not be proceeded with in its present form.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Would Your Honour give some indication as to the form in which the Address should be amended that it can be brought before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not want any particular amendment made; the honourable member must amend the Address. It is not within my province to amend Addresses.

Mr. GARNER: Am I to understand that from your Chair Your Honour told the honourable senior member for the City that later in the day you would allow him to debate this question?

Mr. SPEAKER: That was told the honourable member; but after the explanation given by the honourable senior member for St. Thomas, what is the good of asking for an investigation into the matter when you are told that an investigation is being conducted?

Mr. GARNER: This Address deals with other things besides that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. senior member for the City prepared to proceed with an amendment to this Address?

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until this day week.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that motion; it will have a bad taste at this stage.

Dr. CUMMINS: At Your Honour's request I will withdraw my motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,—I crave your indulgence to move the passing of the following Address:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency The Governor

The House of Assembly have learned with profound regret of the death in South Africa sometime between the third and fourth days of March, 1951, of Mr. Milton King a Barbadian seaman employed on the S.S. "Strategist" of the Harrison Line, plying between the United Kingdom and the Union of South Africa.

2. The House are apprehensive that Mr. King met his death as a result of an altercation with a member or members of the Police Force of the Union of South Africa and in a method that suggests foul play.

3. The House respectfully request Your Excellency to take all the steps necessary to ascertain the facts of the case and to place them promptly before the House, and they express the hope that His Majesty's High Commissioner in the Union of South Africa will see to it that if the apprehension of the House is borne out by the facts, that the culprit or culprits is brought to justice and compensation secured for Mr. King's family.

I must say that I am grateful to Your Honour for allowing this Address to be brought forward in an amended form, and I apologize for any heat which might have been generated or for any offence which might appear to have been caused Your Honour, because nothing of the sort was intended.

Mr. GARNER: I beg to second that. I happen not to be any conventionalist; I know nothing about being one. I am what I am and I am not trying to be anything else. Here it is, this case has been put to us that a man named Milton King was beaten to death by a policeman or policemen in South Africa; the information was sent to the honourable senior member for the City and he has brought forward

this Address in this Chamber so that the case will be represented in the Union of South Africa. What is wrong about that? All over the world where civilized people live their fellow brethren are protected, and this is an act of that sort. We want to let the people of South Africa know that we expect justice from them; we want to see that the death of this man is requited, that the culprits are brought to justice and we expect that compensation will be paid to his family. The passing of this Address will show that we are beginning to realise that if one member of our community is hurt, the whole community will be hurt, and we have not got to make any apology to anybody, be he white, black, grey or grizzled, for what we do. We talk about nationhood and federation; but what federation can we have with apologists walking about here in the form of human beings? We are playing a game; I have every respect for your judgment, Mr. Speaker, and I was sorry when I saw that you were being led into going against your conscience. Being a lawyer or not does not make anyone respect you any more; your character will always stand and you will always have the benefit of your conscience. Mr. Speaker, I saw the various moves being made so as to stifle debate on this question, and I will say that I am willing to go not only to jail but to the gallows and to my grave for the freedom of my people and for free speech which is a God given thing; if I have to lose my life to preserve free speech, then you can take my life. We all know about the Government of the Union of South Africa; we have read about Dr. Malan over there and we—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Barbados Government will be negotiating with the Government of the Union of South Africa and I do not think it will serve any good purpose to attack that Government.

Mr. GARNER: I consider those people so uncivilized that I do not think I could say anything this afternoon to hurt them. Everybody knows what the South African Government is; they do not care anything about human rights and this Address will remind them that we are expecting justice from them because we are civilized. There are two sides to every story and sometimes you try the line of least resistance and it bears no fruit; sometimes you appear to be strong and the strong will kill the weak. If you are a weakling nobody has any respect for you; but if you are strong, people will fear you because of your strength. We cannot allow people to trample us. From the moment the honourable senior member for the City hinted that he would proceed with this Address, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph objected to it, and said that he would rather write to the Minister of Commonwealth Relations and when he goes to England he would see about the matter. That is not good enough for me; a private chat between two people means nothing, but when an Address is passed by this House, the elected Body of people who speak for all the inhabitants telling the Government of the Union of South Africa that we are busy with this particular matter, that it has given us some worry and we want justice done, that is a different matter. Nobody will know what results from the talk between the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and the Minister of Commonwealth Relations; I am not interested in that Minister at all. I am interested in justice being done to people everywhere they have to go. We have to make this matter known on the floor of the House; we cannot sit silently when these atrocious acts are committed against our countrymen. We must have a strong Government one which is willing to protect its citizens wherever they are. Nobody will ever deter me from speaking

for justice not only for my people but for people everywhere. This is a matter of pure, human decency and if you have any culture at all, it must touch your heart. It went home to my heart when I saw manoeuvre after manoeuvre being made to outflank this Address when, in truth and in fact, it speaks well for Barbadians that they can present a united front. I am not speaking as to how I really feel about this matter because I would talk all night and say very many unpleasant things; but the time has not come for me to speak those things.

I believe in honest representation and just as other people have to represent their people without fear or favour, we, too, must do likewise if we expect to gain the respect of the people; being ambitious to the point of vanity will not do. There is no vainglory with me, I do not want it; I am interested in doing the job which my people have sent me to do. My people want representation and I am here on a serious mission because I am representing an oppressed people. That expression must be made at all times whether it suits anybody or not. I am not mincing any matters when it comes to the representation of my people because I would not thereby be true to myself. I want to be true to the people who have placed implicit confidence in me. I congratulate the honourable senior member for the City on having brought up this matter on the floor of the House; it shows that he is taking his political duties seriously. When he is informed about the matter he does not sit back and do nothing about it; the moment he is informed about the matter he moves in connection with it. However, when an attempt is made to have the matter threshed out on the floor of the House, we are more or less—well, I do not want to say what I feel about that, but nobody will ever be able to silence me, I will die for my freedom and free speech. I am interested in seeing freedom and equality being carried out in this world; some of us cannot represent the people properly because we are seeking equality from the wrong end.

I want to tell the Government that it is not only their duty to listen to us on the floor of this House when we bring forward Addresses, but it is incumbent upon them when they have any information to let us know of it on the floor of the House; if they refuse to bring such information before us, and we take matters into our own hands so as to get them threshed out, there should not be any ill feeling on the part of the Government. We are not members of the Government, we do not know what is transpiring; we must be given some information as to what is going on. I am sure that the family of Mr. Milton King will feel very grateful to the honourable senior member for the City and the members of this House who helped him in getting this Address through, because at least they have a ray of hope that this foul play which has been carried out against this husband and father in the Union of South Africa might have a more fair-minded investigation than it would otherwise have on account of what we have said and done this afternoon. I feel that in passing this Address this afternoon we are pointing out to the world that what was once said of us, that we are uncivilized and do not care about each other, is now a thing of the past; we have to represent people by deeds and not merely by words. We cannot stop the Africans, but some day Africa's millions will turn on her; the Roman Empire used to be, the Spanish Empire used to be and the German used to be, and all Empires will come and go. We are telling the Union of South Africa that we

know its laws and its ideology; the Union of South Africa with its vicious system of treating natives and people of colour, will not be allowed by God to go on in this world as it is going on for any very long time. I have implicit and undying faith in God and in His purpose in Africa. Today it is a question of deeds being done; it is deeds that will count. At this hour the whole world is calling for nationhood and organization but we are being left out of the scheme of things because of disunity, because we are disorganized. We have not seen that this individuality is carrying us to chaos and perdition; I do not care who is a lawyer or doctor or what not, you must have us along with them because I will count in the scheme of things. I do not care about individuality. Realising the responsibility which has been placed on me by my constituents and because of the undying love which I have for my people and indeed for humanity it was a burden to me when I saw the manoeuvres here this afternoon relative to this Address. I am sorry that I cannot go any further in what I should like to say; but I will have a chance of doing so at another time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your patient hearing; you and I have respect for each other and if, perchance, because of my intense love for my people I have said anything amiss to you, I am sure that, knowing me as you do, you will know that it emanated from my heart; I would rather die for my liberty than go down like a weakling. I would rather be shot to-night than not say a word on this matter; I would rather be shot by the police and carried out dead than say nothing on this question. I respect everybody's view but let us give the black man his rightful place under the sun. I wonder if honourable members have seen the clipping in the *Advocate* to the effect that Great Britain has sent people to Southern Rhodesia to settle there, but some black people stricken with paralysis have said that they have lost nothing in Africa. Great Britain is finding an outlet for her people and these same people come to you and me saying, "We cannot get any employment, we ask you to help us with something to do." If you say that you fought for these islands in the West Indies I say that I want something for my people; no doubt Dr. Malan's only desire is to raise himself to an elevated position where he can say: "I am master for ever."

Every honourable member of this House is obligated to vote for this Address; and I am sure that the honourable member who says "No" is not civilized. I am sure that the place for such an honourable member is the Lunatic Asylum because he is insane and I would like to do something with him. I take great pleasure in seconding the motion for the passing of this Address and I hope to live long enough to see the South African people repaid in kind. I have a vivid picture of what is going to happen; the way is going to be made for the black people in Africa. They are going all over that country. I could go on talking for a long time on this matter, but I am going to conclude my remarks. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you again for the latitude which you have given me. I thank you because you have exercised what I always know there is with you, that is justice and fairplay, and I am glad that you have overcome the temptation of being just a Party man. God has given me five senses and nobody can dictate to me; the day I get to that position I will ask God to open a hole and let me be swallowed up a million feet below the earth. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that you have given the right for justice to be done though the Heavens should fall.

If I am convinced that a thing is right only God Almighty can change me; I will suffer for what is right. Mr. Speaker, my heart is relieved when I realize that you rose to the hour and justified your position as Speaker of this House of Assembly.

Mr. BRANCKER: It is particularly appropriate that a matter of this kind should be discussed in the Barbados House of Assembly. This is one of the oldest colonial Parliaments and nothing could be more appropriate and fitting than that we should have a discussion on the high level on which this discussion has been maintained, dealing with a matter of such vital importance as that of the treatment of a fellow Barbadian in South Africa in a manner which the honourable senior member for St. Philip has characterized as uncivilized. An interesting point of law has been raised as to whether or not a discussion on this matter in this colony while negotiations in connection with the same matter are going on in South Africa, would be contempt of Court. I do not agree that on a point obviously involving international law, it could be decided here and now that in discussing something alleged to have taken place in South Africa which is a self-governing Dominion and in which there is a system of Roman Dutch law, we would be committing contempt of Court. It would take a very great international lawyer to give an off-hand opinion as to our committing contempt of Court in our referring to something which is being dealt with under the system of Roman Dutch law.

Mr. Speaker, this Government should feel fortified and encouraged by the action of this branch of the Legislature in discussing this matter because if it is true—and I do not doubt the source from which the information has come—that the Government has been pursuing this matter from the 31st of March this year and has been taking certain steps, how much better should the Government feel when it knows that those steps are fortified by the full, unanimous and loyal support of this entire Chamber? We should take every step that we can take in order to ensure that full investigation is made and justice secured in respect of the death of a most respected fellow-citizen of ours; we must allow it to be known that despite the complexion of the late Mr. Milton King, we expect that the South African Government will make a thorough investigation into the circumstances concerning his death. In this matter representation must not come merely from a Government official or the Executive Committee but from the entire elected representatives of the people in the General Assembly. That is the whole weight and power behind an Address of this kind; it is not a question of soft-soaping by Government officials, it is essential and vital that an Address of this nature should come from an elected Chamber such as this informing the Government of South Africa as to the feeling of Barbadians in this matter and that we are looking forward to the cessation of the system of Roman Dutch law in that Dominion. We are also allowing it to be known that we Barbadians do not allow anything like what has happened in this case to take place in respect of fellow Barbadians or fellow West Indians without our registering our protest against it. It is our duty to register our protest against this occurrence and we are doing so by means of this Address. This is not the first time that we have had to pass an Address affecting the Government of the Union of South Africa and it is not the first time that matters affecting the Union of South Africa have had to be discussed not only in Barbados but also in other West Indian islands; we have to let the South African Government know that this matter must have proper investigation by the Secre-

tary of State for the Colonies and the High Commissioner of the Union of South Africa and the whole world must know about it. We are told that there is no justice done in South Africa for coloured people especially if there is a dispute between coloured and white people; but this is the testing time. We are looking forward to reading our South African newspaper and finding out what sort of trial is conducted relative to this occurrence; there must not be any breach of justice or fairplay and that is why I am happy to support the passing of this Address, an Address which I commend to honourable members of this House. Not only the people of Barbados but those of the entire Caribbean area are watching what is happening in the Union of South Africa in respect of the death of a most highly-respected fellow-countryman of ours.

Mr. CRAWFORD: In opposing the passing of this Address at the beginning, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph declared that since the matter was *sub judice* we should have nothing to say about it. If these proceedings are slightly irregular, we can proceed with them on the ground that since South Africa has no respect for national standards of law and justice, we are justified in adopting any procedure regardless of how irregular it might appear in order to express our feelings in this matter. This matter is in respect of the death of a Barbadian seaman in South Africa and we are told that we must not express any opinion on it because an individual is on trial in South Africa regarding the matter. However, in this House the honourable senior member for St. Joseph has risen from his seat and discussed a matter which is before the Law Courts—I refer to the Christian Mission case. (A MEMBER: That is not true).

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member should not make those remarks when the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is not here.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If you refer to the *Official Gazette* you will find that on more than one occasion reference has been made to this case in this House. However, I repeat that the Courts of South Africa maintain no proper standards of law and justice when it comes to the trial of a white South African who is charged with the murder of this seaman; they know nothing about what is right or wrong and within a few weeks you will hear that the particular individual has been discharged and that the case has been thrown out. Under the present regime none of us would ever hear that a white South African has been punished for the murder of a West Indian citizen. When this incident first took place it aroused considerable comment in London. Even before the honourable senior member for the City brought up the matter here, I remember that a Barbadian student, Mr. Griffith sent a letter to the "Advocate" in which he expressed the utter astonishment and horror of the coloured people in London over the affair and expressed the hope that some honourable member would raise the matter in this Chamber in an attempt to see that justice is done. The honourable senior member for the City was promised that the matter would be raised with the Commonwealth Relations Minister; but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether in your opinion, a little private party between the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and the Minister of Commonwealth Relations will have the same effect as a protest duly passed by this legislative Body can and will have. It is a fact that after the honourable senior member for the City expressed his determination to raise the matter here, the Government took it up; but we have heard for the first time today that they protested against the

murder of this seaman and that they have asked for compensation for his family. It is highly possible that if these facts had been put before the honourable senior member for the City and if it had not been for the action of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the debate might have taken a different turn. I am in complete agreement with the submissions made by previous speakers who have supported the passing of this Address, and in the special circumstances of the case, I offer no apology for joining in what might be regarded as an irregularity in discussing a matter of this sort just now since it is engaging the attention of the law Courts in South Africa.

I think that this Address sets out the details of the case as accurately as we know them, judging from the newspaper reports which we have had. I am sure that our action here this afternoon in recording our protest in this manner must have some effect not only on the proceedings in the Law Courts in South Africa, but at least on the attempts to give some sort of compensation to the wife and children of this man who has been murdered. The fact that we have seen fit to protest against what might be regarded by the Malan regime as an insignificant affair, the fact that we have taken up the matter and discussed it, must in some little measure be of assistance in securing some sort of compensation for the relatives of the victim of this murder in South Africa. Moreover, it makes our people feel that in case of violence or injury or unfair treatment, there are people in this colony who are prepared to say a word or two in respect of their rights. I am sure that every Barbadian seaman, when he sees or hears or reads what has happened here with regard to this incident, will appreciate the ineffective efforts, perhaps, which we have made in order to express horror and dissatisfaction on the part of the people of Barbados in regard to the treatment which has been meted out to this unfortunate son of the soil. There can be nothing but utter contempt for the attitude of interference with the expression of opinion which this Address seeks to convey in respect of this particular matter; there is no justification for any member of this Chamber refusing to associate himself with the passing of this Address on the ground that this matter is being discussed in the Law Courts in South Africa. The South African Government does not care what the British Government does about this matter far less what a West Indian Government does about it. Technicalities do not affect the South African Government; with their policy of racial superiority, all they are concerned about is dominating and eliminating, if necessary, the coloured natives and it behoves an Assembly comprised as we are, to take every possible step to express our complete disgust and our utter horror at the policy of the Government of South Africa not only in this particular respect but with regard to the treatment of our natives.

Mr. Speaker, the ground has already been well covered, but there are other honourable members who would like to speak on this matter and if we shorten our remarks it is not because we do not feel strongly about the matter, but it is out of respect for the lateness of the hour. If honourable members are somewhat inconvenienced by this prolonged session I submit that in a matter of this sort we should be prepared to make any abnormal sacrifice in order to make our protest as strong and as effective as the circumstances demand. I have much pleasure in supporting this Address and I should like to express my profound sympathy for those members of the

Assembly who, for purely personal reasons and or because they do not want to offend certain people in this community, refuse to support this Address this afternoon, and are sheltering behind a legal technicality that because the matter is before the Law Courts in South Africa, this Assembly should not comment on it. I would mention that in America, the newspapers try murder cases long before they are tried in the Law Courts; day after day the newspapers actually pass sentence on persons long before they are tried in the Law Courts and in cases of this sort what I have stated is a common thing in London. I recall now that organizations in London, in the heart of the Empire have been holding public meetings in connection with this incident and sending indirect protests to the South African Government. Finally I want to emphasize that nothing we can do here in so far as irregular practice is concerned, can be regarded as unjustifiable so long as we happen to be

dealing with the inhuman Government of South Africa.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye", those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the honourable senior member for the City and honourable senior member for St. Philip to present this Address.

Mr. MOTTLEY: As Your Honour pleases.

Mr. GARNER: As Your Honour pleases.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT seconded the motion which was agreed to, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.