

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1954-55

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 27th September, 1955.

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

Present

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*), Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS, C.B.E., M.D., C.M., (*Minister of Social Services*); His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works and Housing*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*); Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*); Mr. F. E. MILLER, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries*).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet printed and circulated.

PAPER LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier I am commanded by His Excellency the Acting Governor to lay the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) Orders.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg on behalf of the Hon. Premier to give notice of a Resolution to approve the continuance in force of the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) Orders, 1955.

QUESTIONS

Mr. L. E. SMITH: To enquire of the Hon. Minister of Communications, Works and Housing:—
Owing to the Hurricane that struck the island on 22nd September, 1955.

Will Government take immediate steps to set up a relief Committee consisting of one Representative

and any other persons of each parish for the purpose of relieving those sufferers who have lost their houses?

OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH STATION

Select Committee Report

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and prepare a Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 25/1955 relative to the establishment of an Oceanographic Research Station in Barbados.

AMENDMENTS TO WAGES COUNCIL BILL

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to postpone Order No. 1 and proceed with Order No. 2 instead.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking leave to postpone Order No. 1 and proceed with Order No. 2. If there is no objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker what I want to know is this: there are some Emergency Orders which we have to deal with and if we are to deal with them, let us do so before we proceed with this Wages Council affair. This atmosphere is of such at present that we should proceed with these Orders.

I am of the opinion that the Government should deal with the Emergency Powers today so that the public will get the opportunity of knowing what the Government is doing under the Emergency Powers Act. You have an Emergency Order and you are not dealing with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Hon. Leader agreeing with that?

Hon. R. G. MAPP rose to speak.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I think a little later today Mr. Speaker, we can proceed with the Emergency Orders.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that there was one amendment to this Bill which aroused a fair measure of discussion on the last occasion it was considered. This was the amendment of Clause 20 which says:

20. Any person who, being a member of a Wages Council or present at or concerned in any

proceedings of a Wages Council, discloses any information or the contents of any document which has been furnished to such Wages Council, except with the written consent of the person who furnished the information or the document and of the Council, shall be liable on conviction by a Court of summary jurisdiction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

We told the House then—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member dealing with Order No. 2 or Order No. 3.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: Order No. 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3, that situation is already clear.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I was saying that this was a particular amendment which caused some discussion in the House. Some hon. members objected to the whole principle of the amendment and others felt that it was put too strongly. We have debated this matter and we have come to the conclusion Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, that this amendment of the Other Place goes no further than the Clause in the present Wages Board Act.

I assured the House last time that if this interfered with the working of a Wages Council, or in any way disrupted the harmony and industrial peace of this Colony then the Government would come back down with an amendment to the Bill and take it out.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should pass these amendments by the Other Place and let us put this Bill on the Statute Book. I think when we reach the stage that negotiations of this sort break down and you have to disclose information, then you reach the stage where it would be of no use at all to consider them without the provisions of this Bill, because the whole purpose of Wages Council would be defeated.

I beg to move that these amendments be now read a first time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Minister were to look at the Order Paper, he will see the stage reached in dealing with these amendments.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I am sorry; I beg to withdraw that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is asking leave to withdraw that motion.

Mr. LEWIS: That motion was made the last time, Mr. Speaker, when these amendments were being considered. You cannot make two motions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well then, it is out of Order.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot speak again.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The Hon. Minister was allowed to debate this matter again. He has opened a fresh debate on this matter. What I am objecting to, is, that you are taking this opportunity to deal with something in a debate which to my consternation and amazement to find that of all days, a day like today—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member will not be allowed to refer to that today.

The question that the amendments be agreed to with the exception to Clause 20 was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. LEWIS and Mr. ALLDER—3.

Noes: Hon. Dr. CUMMINS; Hon. M. E. Cox; Hon. R. G. MAPP; Mrs. BOURNE; Mr. SMITH, Mr.

BRYAN; Mr. F. E. MILLER; Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY; and Mr. HAYNES—9.

The question that the amendments be now agreed to was put and resolved in the affirmative on the declaration of Mr. SPEAKER "I think the 'Ayes' have it."

3.35 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CONTINUANCE OF EMERGENCY ORDERS

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to proceed with the Resolution of which notice was given earlier in connection with the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) Orders which have already been laid on the Table of the House.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I think it is unnecessary for me to say very much on this Resolution. This Resolution is to give effect to the different Emergency Orders which were made and issued by His Excellency the Governor recently. In accordance with the law as it stands today, these Orders have to be laid before this House within 7 days and shall not continue in force after the expiration of 7 days from the time when they are so laid, unless a Resolution is passed by the Legislature providing for the continuance thereof; therefore a Resolution to give effect to these Orders must be passed. This Resolution is for the purpose of the continuance in force of these Orders.

There is a Schedule attached to the Resolution and in this Schedule the different Orders are named. They are as follows:—

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Additional Duties) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Right of Entry) Order, 1955.

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Reserved Areas) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Damage to Property) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Clearance of Roads) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Control of Traffic) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Essential Occupations) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Compulsory Assistance) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Customs Order, 1955.

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Requisitioning of Transport) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Requisitioning of Supplies) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Requisitioning of Lands and Buildings) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Control of Rents) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Disposal of Dead) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Ownership of Debris) Order, 1955;

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (False Information and Alarming Reports) Order, 1955.

The Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Shops Orders) (Amendment) Order, 1955.

These various Orders were made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 22nd September, 1955, and provision was made for the shops to remain open over the week-end by the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Shops) Order

which was made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee on the 24th September, 1955.

This Resolution seeks the approval of both Houses of the Legislature to the continuance in force of certain Emergency Powers (Hurricane) Orders made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 3 of the Emergency Powers Act, 1939 (1939—3) during the continuation in force of a Proclamation of emergency made by His Excellency the Acting Governor on the 22nd of September, 1955, as a result of the hurricane which occurred on the 22nd of September.

As honourable members will see, it has happened that Orders of this kind had to be issued in order that work and the preservation of order might be continued. These Orders were found to be necessary and they were approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. LEWIS: *Rose to speak.*

Mr. SPEAKER: This is the first reading and there can hardly be any debate on the first reading.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, is this a Resolution asking the House to approve of these Orders? Because at least copies of it should have been distributed to honourable members. If this is a Resolution asking the House to agree to the continuance in force of these Orders it does not have to be read at all; it only has to be approved.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: On Saturday last these Orders were to be laid. 3.45 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: You lay Establishment Orders but a Resolution has to be brought forward to approve of them.

Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of Order. In reading the Act, (I do not know if there has been any amendment) I have noticed one or two things. Are these Orders in force for seven days, or do you put them in for life? If we are asked to continue them, does that mean that we should continue them to eternity? Cannot we keep them in force for another month?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making some objection to the Resolution to approve the Orders?

Mr. LEWIS: I am asking on a point of Order: can we not say how long they are to remain in force after the seven days?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, we can.

Mr. LEWIS: But could we not state some time?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no obligation regarding the continuance.

Mr. LEWIS: Do you mean to say that they remain in force for ever? They are in force for seven days and we are to say whether they are to remain in force for longer. We should be given an opportunity to say whether we will continue some or all of them.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the Orders shall not be in force for longer than a month, according to sub-section (1) of section (2). It reads as follows:—

“No such proclamation shall be in force for more than one month, without prejudice to the issue of another proclamation at or before the end of that period.”

Mr. Speaker, read sub-section (1) of section (2) to the House.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order; does sub-section (2) of section (3) mean that at the end of seven days the Orders will expire with the proclamation?

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: They automatically expire today.

Mr. SPEAKER: They must be laid before the Legislature; that has nothing to do with the continuance. The question is—

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the Resolution, but—

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out one or two things in this Resolution. It should be stated here how long these Orders are going to remain in force. The Barbados Act reads much the same as the English Act read.

Mr. SPEAKER: We do not want the English Act. It may be an exact copy, but we can only deal with the statute law of the island and nothing else.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I made an error when I moved that this Resolution be now read a first time. I am asking leave to withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to withdraw his motion. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

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

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, the motion should be that this Resolution be now approved.

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I think everybody will agree that when you issue a proclamation of a state of emergency, it is necessary to make Orders for that Emergency. That is a time when, I feel sure, no one would like to cause panic or make people become unnecessarily jittery as to how they should perform the duties of this important task which we have before us. The damage is already done, and our task today or the next couple of years, is to say how we should repair this damage without undue harm to the generally normal equilibrium of the community.

I think everyone will agree that in an emergency such as this, the Government should take the opportunity, even today, of saying, in a general way, how it proposes to face some of the problems that confront us now. Within these Orders you have specific orders dealing with certain things, and had it been my responsibility, I would have stated precisely what was what so that the general public might know what is to be expected of them in regard to the Emergency.

There is no point in having Emergency Orders unless you are going to get the co-operation of the general public. And no one can deny that the public is co-operating magnificently. The voluntary assistance given by people is something exemplary; and I do not think that the isolated instances of looting and stealing and anything of that nature should be exaggerated beyond its proportions; because the infinitesimal mind is no more to be compared with what is being done in the community, from a certain point of view, than the comparison of a mosquito on the back of a rhinoceros. I do not think that we should become alarmed at that.

I should like to see, as speedily as possible, everything done and that we make it possible for some sort of rehabilitation to be affected. That is why I said earlier in my remarks that even today would be rather appropriate to state your plans; especially as to when you propose to make the schools free again, because it is known that the schools cannot remain closed indefinitely.

There are now always sanitary arrangements at the schools. It is known, too, that the sanitary arrangements in some sections of the community

are not all that they should be; and if honourable members would travel around by the Empire Theatre they would see that something needs to be done to rectify them. The suggestion is not that nothing is being done; but rather that we would like to be told about such things so as to be able to boost public morale.

Do not allow this good spirit to fail by not giving them the information today because the radio is off and that was the chief source of information. I, therefore, feel that the Government should take the opportunity with these Orders today.

There are some orders here from which you get the impression that the community is not responding, and I should make mention of one or two that strike me along that line.

3.55 p.m.

Again, members of this Government should be aware that this Emergency Order of 1939, which was amended subsequently is the same Order as that which was made in the United Kingdom in 1920, that is 35 years ago. I would draw one point to the Hon. Leader of this House in connection with this matter and it is this: Section 3, subsection 4, says:

"The Orders so made shall have effect as if enacted in this Act."

Now I draw the hon. member's attention to this for the future; it does not effect this issue today. It is this:

"The Regulations so made shall have effect as if enacted in this Act, but may be added to, altered or revoked by Resolution of both Houses of Parliament or by Regulation made in like manner and subject to the like provisions as the original Regulations; and Regulations made under the section shall not be deemed to be statutory rules within the meaning of Section 1 of the Rules Publication Act, 1893."

The reason why I mentioned that to the hon. Leader of this House is that anyone in an emergency is likely to come down with some Emergency Order and everybody would like to amend or alter such Orders, therefore, not from the point of view of taking away the authority but from the point of view of asking you to go slow; it means that these Orders are here, and that is why I suggested that the opportunity should be taken at this stage to state fully why these Orders are necessary.

I would draw to your attention and the attention of this House to the Order that will have some effect in my own capacity and in my own work; if you look at the Order dealing with essential occupations you will see it. You will also remember that this Act was copied from the English Act and that part was only put into our Act recently, some few weeks ago. I refer to Section 4 according to the amendments which says:

("1) "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorise the making of any Orders imposing any form of compulsory military service or industrial conscription."

(2) "Nothing in this Act or any Order made under this Act shall make it an offence for any person or persons to take part in any strike or peacefully to persuade any other person or persons to take part in a strike."

I would like the hon. member to tell us something of the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Essential Occupations) Orders, 1955. There is a mistake in one of the names in the Schedule to it, and you cannot alter them in here. You have the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation, Limited, and you know there is not such a Company in this island today. Perhaps some lawyer would make some money out

of it if something happens. He would say, that the Barbados Light and Power Company, Limited was sued and that the Schedule said the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation, Limited.

Now, Section 2, of this Order reads as follows:—

"No person mentioned in any undertaking mentioned in the Schedule to this Order shall leave his employment in such undertaking without the consent of the Commissioner of Labour."

Section 3, thus:—

"No person employed in any undertaking mentioned in the Schedule to this Order shall be dismissed from his employment without the consent of the Commissioner of Labour."

Section 4, thus:—

"Any person who acts in contravention of this Order shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on summary conviction before a Police Magistrate to a fine not exceeding four hundred and eighty dollars or to imprisonment for any terms not exceeding three months or both such fine and imprisonment."

And the Schedule reads as follows:—

Cable and Wireless, Limited

Barbados Telephone Company, Limited.

Barbados Electric Supply Corporation, Limited.

Barbados Gas Company, Limited.

Any Ice making or Refrigeration Company.

Any Bakery.

Any Diary.

Any food distributing company.

Any undertaking employing Carpenters, Masons, Bricklayers, Transport Drivers, or Electricians."

Now, this has a serious bearing. This is not an Order which says all undertakings with the exception of domestic services and those services of a non-industrial character. In this Emergency you only regard some things as coming under the Emergency.

In order to give the Hon. Minister some knowledge and advice in this respect, I wish to point out that at the present moment an employer has dismissed one of his workers. I refer to one of the businesses under this Order. It is true the action took place before this emergency, but I want to say that we have postponed negotiations which were taking place in respect of that man who dismissed arbitrarily on account of the Emergency. I make this reference because when you pass something like this and it is not wide enough the effect would be tremendous. I bring this to your notice because I want to show that the Barbados Workers Union takes a responsible attitude in matters like this.

The Union is now meeting with the Telephone Company in negotiations over a labour dispute, and we did not press the Board to meet last Saturday in view of the Emergency. I would like to see as many of the Workers Organisations on the job as much as possible so that they will be able to do work in the interest of the community.

I want to say that you do not have certain things in this Order. Our garages which are going to be ancillary to some of your locomotives are not in this Order. I only mention that to show that this Schedule is incomplete. Petrol filling stations should also be inserted in this Schedule. If the people at the petrol filling stations leave their job, what are you going to do?

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: That comes under Transport.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: The reason why I pointed that out is because I am sure that there is no feeling in this island today that workers will attempt to do anything in this Emergency irrational, because

as I have said earlier, the workers are part of this Emergency. They want to play their part in building back their homes and doing anything to assist themselves.

This is my view of this Order. It sort of connotes the view that this Emergency is the result of an industrial dispute, therefore, we pass an Order on that basis.

In this Emergency, I believe the Government should attempt to or stop certain types of people from carrying on with certain construction work so as to release carpenters to aid in this Emergency. I do not know if Government has in mind that idea; but the reason why I said so is because I see at the spot where the Woolworth building is to be constructed, a lot of people are working on that construction. If those people can be released to do some other necessary things, I think, that should be done. That also goes in respect of the construction of the Ministerial Buildings. I do not know if that is of such an urgent nature. I see no reason why we should proceed with the Ministerial Buildings now. 4.05 p.m.

I do not know how the Government feels as to the extent it can relieve people of the hurricane damage over a period. I would say that in an emergency those who have authority and control should not want to give the impression that you are becoming panicky and losing your balance when the community itself has not lost its balance.

Another point is this: I know that the Government can requisition lumber supplies; but nothing is said about the people who work in lumber stores. We know that lumber and hardware stores are very hard-pressed. The point I am making is that we do not want to make Emergency Orders in respect of these things unless it is necessary to have these Orders, otherwise you drive an unnecessary fear in the minds of people.

There is another point. It has been reported to me that some people have visited the lumber stores and they have been told that they cannot make any purchases of lumber. On the radio you hear that the people should help themselves; it therefore seems to be ironic to tell people that they should help themselves and when they attempt to do so, you turn them back.

I am in the position where a relative of mine has been left exposed to the weather, and when he goes to the lumber store he is told that he cannot get anything. I should like to know what are the Government's Orders as to the release of this lumber from the stores. The members of the Government should take the opportunity of stating broadly what their policy is as regards the making of these Orders.

On Thursday I went to one of those places where the distribution of food is taking place. It was not in St. Peter but in Christ Church where thousands of people have lost their homes. You find that people are queuing up for provisions and you want to know when are they going to put back the community in a habitable position so that this situation does not exist any longer. Thousands of people have to stand up in the sun, and if the rain falls there is no facility to deal with them.

I would like to know if it is a military order that a soldier must at all times travel with a rifle; I would not like the impression to leave Barbados that out of this hurricane Barbados has gone disorderly, and it necessitates the Government calling up people with guns and bullets to maintain order.

I am a pacifist and I would like to know why is it that the soldiers cannot go around and take care of people without using their rifles. I object to

the soldiers carrying these guns; it looks to me as if there is a war on. Helpless people are standing up with their baskets waiting to get food and you are there standing with a gun over their heads. That does not look as if we are in a civilised country; it looks barbaric.

In any society you will get people trying to get out of their turn, but you do not have to call out the Army to deal with that. I feel that we should not give the impression as if we are bordering on a riot; I know that there are some people in the community who like it to be said that in order to deal with some people in the community you have to resort to the use of rifles. I think the Government should wait until it is really necessary to bring out these guns and not bring them out until then.

The other Order which has struck me is this Order dealing with compulsory assistance. Paragraph 2 of this Order says this:—

"Any commissioned officer or non-commissioned officer of Police, any Officer of the Barbados Regiment or any person authorised by a person mentioned in the Schedule to this Order, may call upon any adult person to render such assistance or to perform such service as may appear to him to be necessary or expedient for the purpose of dealing with the emergency and may give direction as to the manner of such assistance or service."

I cannot interpret the law, but I hope that it does not conflict with the amendment to the Act which says that there should not be any industrial construction. There cannot be any conflict with the Act itself; Orders are only a part of the Act; but if the Act says that there should not be any industrial construction, therefore such an Order cannot be made. The amendment to the Emergency Powers Act, 1939 says this:—

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorise the making of any Orders imposing any form of military service or industrial conscription."

I am only saying that one thing cannot conflict with the other because the Order must comply with the Act. There is a long list to whom this authority is given; that list is as follows:—

The Director of Highways and Transport; The Director of Public Works; The Manager of the Waterworks; The Director of Agriculture; The Director of Education; The Commissioner of Labour; The Director of Medical Services; The Commissioner, St. John's Ambulance; The Sanitation Officer; The Harbour and Shipping Master; The Fisheries Officer; The Director of Civil Aviation; The Government Electrical Inspector; The Island Commissioner, Boy Scouts; The Chairman of the Hurricane Committee appointed by a Vestry; The Commissioners of Health for any Parish; Any Magistrate; Any Justice of the Peace.

4.15 p.m.

The reason why you say that, Mr. Speaker, is because you do not want to give a certain section of the community wide powers especially to people who would not have had to use such powers before. Sometimes people can be a little bit clumsy when acting under the influence of wide powers. No matter what you may say, it would not prevent some people from meeting certain other people in the community and when, normally they would not be able to push them around, they, acting under these wide powers would sort of push them around as a means of getting at them. I argue that you should not make wide powers unless it is necessary; that is why I feel that members of the Government should be willing to answer some of these questions.

There is one that deals with the Customs Tariff (Amendment) Act, 1955, and I should like to ask the Minister of Trade to explain this: It reads as follows:—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in the Customs Tariff Act, 1921, any goods brought into the Island, which would normally be subject to the payment of Customs duty may be admitted duty free at the direction of the Comptroller of Customs, provided they are goods *bona fide* imported solely for the purpose of relief of distress arising from the hurricane and destined for the control or distribution by any organisation or institution connected with hurricane relief."

Now, I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Trade this: the Barbados Workers Union, for instance, is not a relief organisation; but there are people in the United Kingdom and the United States who are likely to send things to the Barbados Workers Union for the relief of some of the members of the Barbados Workers Union who may have been damaged. Would an organisation of that sort be regarded in that light.

The reason why I ask that is, that sometime ago in the House the amendment to the Customs Tariff Act dealing with Cinematograph apparatus stated that organisations such as these would be given opportunity to have certain material imported duty free; and some days ago, in duty-paying a Warrant, I found that one of the items which I understood to be duty-free was not really so.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider this: I believe that if some of the friends of Barbados knew that they could send these things which would help to erase hardship from the homes of people, they would give and the poor would be distributed to more largely. The old clothing which we could afford to give would be nothing compared with what some of our richer brothers in America could give.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that with the goodwill that has been shown on all sides and the co-operation that has been given by everyone, we will not do anything in these Orders that would prevent that from continuing.

In conclusion I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Housing for one or two explanations. I know that the Hon. Minister was very anxious over Rent Control. I, myself, would like to see a bit of rent control; but I would not advocate a controversial issue in an emergency like this that is likely to prevent you from debating all aspects of the question.

From a certain point of view, you are likely to do some damage to the people whose houses you would like to rehabilitate. No one with any social conscience would agree that in a disaster anyone should make a profit; but we do not know how these houses are going to be rehabilitated. In the New Orleans some of them have been razed to the ground; and it is no question of putting back the house that was there. In some cases, it is a question of putting back entirely new houses.

Maybe, a man who has owned a house for the last fifteen or twenty years could not, with the money which he paid for an old chattel house then, put back a new one at the same price today. I agree with the underlying principle of Rent Control; but we do not want to make it difficult for those people with houses attempting to rehabilitate them.

As I said before, in some cases, you will have to build a house completely. I should prefer maybe, something of a more specific character; but this Rent Order here *does* seem, in my opinion, to be somewhat harsh in its implications. No doubt, it is

going to place a hardship upon the people to whom it applies. It says, in effect, that you cannot rent a house without getting permission to say what the rent should be. It reads as follows:—

"A rent shall be approved..

This applies to the charge that was made before. I am wondering how smoothly this can work. I am wondering too, how necessary it is.

We do not want to pass Orders that are restrictive in character if you are only dealing with two persons. Is this going to be general? I am a believer in controlling certain things. It also speaks about the landlord. Here there are a certain lot of difficulties for the Government.

The last point which I want to make is this: I should like the Leader of the House to explain what subsection (2) of section (3) means. It reads as follows:—

"Any Orders so made shall be laid before the Legislature as soon as maybe after they are made and shall not continue in force after the expiration of seven days from the time when they are so laid unless a resolution is passed by both Houses providing for the continuance thereof."

I should like also to know if today the hon. member is asking for any specific period for these Orders. Subsection (2) of section (3) says: "Any Orders so made" etc., "shall not continue in force after the expiration of seven days from the time when they are so laid unless a resolution is passed by both Houses providing for the continuance thereof."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Resolution before the House is actually seeking. May I borrow Your Honour's?

Mr. Speaker, through the Marshall of the House, handed Mr. Walcott a copy of the Resolution.
4.25 p.m.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I see; this Resolution is to approve the continuance of the Orders in force made by the Governor-in-Executive. I guess that these Orders would be revoked when they feel that they are no longer useful. Is that what is done? Are not more made? As they are now, I should like to hear what the Hon. Minister would say about them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I think the Government and this House should take the opportunity today, along with any Resolution that is placed before us, of passing a Resolution expressing our thanks to those Legislatures and Governments in the area for the ready help and assistance which they have donated to us. I think this House should also go on record in passing a Resolution of sympathy to our brothers in Grenada who have suffered a similar disaster. I feel sure that the Government has a Resolution like that to bring forward because private members do not want to take the thunder from the Government.

However, knowing that this is the first meeting since the disaster on Thursday, I think we should take this opportunity to express our sympathy to Grenada and those other places which have suffered. I feel sure that would be the unanimous wish of everyone in this Chamber.

I do hope that the point which I made with regard to those areas and the information which I have asked for will be given, because I feel it is in the interest of the public that things of that nature should be made known as early as possible.

PAPER LAID

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: I notice here among other papers that there is the Emergency Powers (Hurricane Orders) (Amendment) Order, which I should have laid at the usual time. I am asking leave to lay this Order now.

Mr. LEWIS: We were discussing the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) Orders. Anyway I am not making any objection.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Emergency Powers (Hurricane Orders) (Amendment) Order, 1955.

I am also asking leave to proceed with this Order and the original Orders together.

Mr. LEWIS: We have not been issued with copies of those amendments, therefore we do not know what are those amendments.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: The extent of the amendment is for a substitution in the amount of the fines under the various Orders.

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

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, if in this stage I am in order, I will read the amendments. They are as follows:—

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Control of Traffic) Order, 1955, the fine was \$200: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Requisitioning of Transport) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Additional Duties) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Right of Entry) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Reserved Areas) Order, 1955, the fine was \$200: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Damage of Property) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Essential Occupations) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Compulsory Assistance) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Requisitioning of Supplies) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Control of Rents) Order, 1955, the fine was \$240: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Requisitioning of Lands and Buildings) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120;

Under the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (False Information and Alarming Reports) Order, 1955, the fine was \$480: we are asked to substitute \$120.

Those are the amendments; they are reductions of the fines.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, taking the whole group of Orders, I do not know that there is any exception at all; I am wondering if the Hon. Leader of the House would be willing to make any amendments to them. [A MEMBER: You cannot amend

them.] I know I will be told that these Orders cannot be amended, but we as Socialists cannot accept these Orders. We do not want to besmire the good name of the people of this country.

Hon. Dr. H. G. CUMMINS: On a point of Order. I said in my opening remarks that these fines are the maximum penalties; you can fine any body from a penny up.

Mr. MILLER: I am not dealing with the question of the fines at all. It is only from a heathen heart that Orders like these could be made. There is no hope of a riot or insurrection, and obviously the composure with which the people of this country reacted in this Emergency would not energise any other Socialist Government to pass these Orders in connection with the people. It is heart breaking to think that the honourable members would be willing to condone the conditions as set out in these Orders. I take for instance the Emergency Powers (Hurricane) (Clearance of Roads) Order. This is what Clause 3 says:—

“No person shall place any thing or deposit any rubbish or debris on any road or lane, except he has been authorised by the Director of Highways and Transport, or by the Chairman of a Vestry, or any person authorised in or on their behalf so to do.”

Well the majority of the people only occupy the actual spots on which their houses stand, and such an Order could only come from people who are thinking of Mau Mau technique. All the shops are opened and you have distribution of food at Centres; and you have soldiers carrying guns. What is really happening? Are those in authority running into panic when the people have survived this Hurricane more or less with a smile?

I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the House: you are driving suspicion in minds of people who probably did not have any thought. The question of pilfering or praedial larceny is not enough to justify such a rigid and uncouth change to be made in a community which is now surviving the havoc of a Hurricane. There is no War and you are making people look like animals tied to some irremovable stake.

All these Orders deserve to be completely changed; you are bringing to bear the hope that these Orders will be applied to an unthinking people. The whole idea is wrong; one would have expected that the Government would have made some statement to the masses who have suffered in this community, not necessarily a promise to give them 100 per cent, but to ask them to go on with the task which is seen all over the community.

Imagine the (Reserved Areas) Order. You go to a centre, you cannot satisfy the authorities, or you cannot go in the compound of the Hospital unless you have a lawful excuse. You have people who are laid up at home because of things which happen even before the Hurricane, you send somebody for a mite of food and that person is told that he can be prosecuted if he is found in any of these areas. Take the Parochial Relief Centres, for instance. I agree that Order must be preserved and that is common agreement; but if you want to use the Military, use them in a voluntary service, but do not ask them to carry guns and bayonets. The people have honour for law whether it is right or wrong.

These things cannot be applied to an emergency in Britain. In case of a war you must get men to go to War. Here you give authority to the Commissioner of Police to call upon anybody in the road to do a spot of work. I repeat: order there must be; and you want to be rigid to see that order is main-

tained in a community which has been exposed to panic, but that has passed. Now you have people striving to hold their families together and on top of that you are imposing these closed areas; the Commissioner of Police can commandeer people and press them into service and you can take down structures. I am a builder and I have had to tell the men: "Let yourselves go and help people wherever you can."

There is a provision that you cannot utilise lumber for new construction. What are you going to do with the carpenters and masons where you have material which can be used by people who have lost their homes? I wonder if these things have had the thought and concern of those who want to modernise our people. You create warfare among the people and then when they react you say that they are beyond control. I do not think that the Hon. Leader of the House would want to create this position; it is unchristian to apply to a community like this orders such as these.

4.45 p.m.

Imagine trucks with a little food going to relieve people and you have soldiers going along with guns. I mentioned it last Saturday but since then it has been continued. The people who have been working on this are not aware of this. I was hoping that the Leader of the House would be willing to say something in reply to questions on it or even promised that some minor changes would be made. It is unfair to pass Orders affecting people when you do not know they would react under conditions such as have prevailed in this Hurricane.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask leave to amend my motion. Seeing that the original Orders have been made, I think I should amend my motion so that it would be included.

Mr. SPEAKER: As a matter of fact I think it is included. It is comprehensive.

The hon. junior member for the City may proceed.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be as brief as I possibly can. First of all, I should like to refer the hon. member to the method of this proclamation being brought to the House. I sincerely hope that it has been done in the way prescribed here in this Act; otherwise we would find ourselves in difficulty. It says here under subsection 2 of section 2:

"Where a proclamation of emergency has been made, the occasion thereof shall forthwith be communicated to the Houses of the Legislature, and if the Legislature is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within five days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of the Legislature within five days and the Legislature shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by that proclamation."

Now, if this proclamation was made on the 22nd, are you convinced when you made it on the 22nd that the Legislature was not then separated by an adjournment of five days? I am not criticising; I am not playing lawyer; I am not quibbling or any thing of the sort; I am asking that the matter be gone into.

The Legislature is meeting on Tuesday 27th. Is the Legislature separated then by five days? It would appear to me that the Legislature was then in the minds of the Government separated by five days; because they took the opportunity to ask for a special meeting of the Legislature for the passing of a Resolution.

It is strange that if reference is made to the Addendum for the meeting of the Other Place

scheduled for Saturday, you will see that the first Item of business is about this proclamation of the Emergency. If it should turn out that this proclamation was issued on Thursday and that there should have been a similar proclamation to call a meeting of the Legislature, do you mean then that the proclamation is of no use at all?

Another point is this: (and the hon. member may be able to assist the House) what I should like to know also is: who has power to revoke these Orders? Is it the person who makes them? Is that the Interpretation Act? Because it appears to me that these Orders are to be made and to remain in force after the seven days that they have been laid in here.

It is unfortunate that we should have to accept them and have to accept their continuance on the same day. I would prefer that this House accept these Orders today and let us have a meeting on Monday next perhaps; because it states here in the Emergency Powers Act, 1939 that the proclamation must be for five days; and subsection 2 of section 3 states as follows:—

"Any Orders so made shall be laid before the Legislature as soon as may be after they are made, and shall not continue in force after the expiration of seven days from the time when they are so laid unless a resolution is passed by both Houses providing for the continuance thereof."

I feel that we should accept those laid today, thereby putting ourselves in a good position not to lay them and extend them automatically at the same sitting of the House; but to wait until Monday or Saturday and try and get our facts correctly. It says here "seven days from the time when they are so laid unless a resolution is passed by both Houses providing for the continuance thereof."

Should we provide for the continuance indefinitely or should we say that they should continue for a certain length of time? Subsection 4 of section 3 states:

"The Orders so made shall have effect as if enacted in this Act."

And then it goes on to say in the next subsection that is subsection 5,

"The expiry or revocation of any Orders so made shall not be deemed to have affected the previous operation thereof."

So that it may either expire or be revoked.
4.55 pm.

I know the Interpretation Act says that nobody should make an Order, but I would like to know whether we ourselves can revoke them since we have to approve them. If we cannot revoke them, can we put a time limit on our extension of them?

The Proclamation has to remain in force for a month at a time. Is that what it is? [A VOICE: Yes.] Why do the Orders not have to come back to us? [A VOICE: They will not have to come back to us.] The reason why I ask that question, is because I do not wish us to place ourselves in a position where we would lose control. Sir, if there is a second Proclamation, will these Orders have to be made all over again? [A VOICE: No.]

The difficulty is that none of the Ministers have had legal instruction about this, apart from any they may get from my colleague. I feel it would be wrong for us to go and extend them without knowing what would be our rights after that. I cannot imagine they would be continued if they are not needed, but should there be the necessity for them, it should be that they should be so confirmed by the Legislature; and I think that is the position in which the House places itself in accepting these Orders, and extending them.

Can the Legislature meet in seven days to extend them? Can next Tuesday be the time when we can pass a Resolution similar to the one which we are asked to pass now?

I am going to suggest something to the Hon. Minister of Social Services; I do not know if he has done it already: Is he amending the Resolution by inserting the words "With the amendments thereto?" It should be amended likewise in view of your having amendments to the Orders.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Yes. I accept that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, it is not whether we agree with these Regulations. Regulations have to be made for the occasion. I sincerely hope that these Regulations, will be read over and over again to see that they are no obvious errors.

There are errors in them besides what the honourable junior member for St. Peter pointed out as regards the Barbados Electric Supply Corporation, Limited. I was wondering whether the Barbados Gas Company still exists.

As far as rent restriction is concerned, I welcome it. From the time I came to this House I was asking for some form of rent control; and I am glad that in an Emergency we have made a start with it. I take it that nobody is allowed to charge more for house rent during the Emergency. I cannot myself see how any hardship can be caused, because if you are renting a house for the first time during the Emergency you can get that rent fixed by the Police Magistrate, so I do not see any danger.

As far as Grenada is concerned, I agree that you should express some sympathy; but the House is not in the habit of passing Resolutions of sympathy just like that. Our form of expression is to pass a Resolution for some money; and after what was stated here on Saturday last, I thought the Government would have come in here with a Resolution for that purpose. At this time when we cannot offer supplies to our sister colony we should pass some money. A Resolution for money should be the form which our sympathy with the people of Grenada should take at this time.

I may say that money is of no use at this time, but if you have two stricken people, both of whom need supplies, they may be able to sympathise with one another by money, because ultimately it would be necessary.

I have not seen anywhere where the Head of the Administration of this colony has sent any cable of sympathy to the people of Grenada. If they fail to send us one, we should still send one to them.

Finally, I would say that there are some corrections that can be made in these Orders and I hope before they are printed, those errors will be corrected.

5.05 p.m.

I am somewhat still in doubt as to the restrictions which are being placed on the Legislature if we accept the motion which has been made. The honourable member has said that you approve of the continuance of these Orders but I say that these Orders should continue in force for the duration of the proclamation, so that if a new proclamation is made the Orders will have to be made again. That is how I would do it.

I am just trying to discover what the Ministers have been told and whether they can help us; we can only hope that they will not continue these Orders in force so that you will proclaim another Emergency.

Hon. M. E. COX: There are two points which have been raised by the honourable junior member for St. Peter to which I should like to make reference. The first point is the question of the Government controlling supplies of lumber to some extent,

thereby causing hardship to some of those people who normally effect their own repairs.

Soon after these Emergency Orders were made, we got in touch with the merchants dealing in lumber and hardware, and appealed to them to agree to hold in stock one third of their present supplies for the Government. The Government agreed to divide the island into two parts, one part under the control of the Director of Public Works and the other under the control of the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board for the purpose of effecting immediate repairs to as many houses as could be repaired; in other words, those houses which are not permanently destroyed.

After we decided that, we agreed with the merchants to hold back one third of their supplies in order to carry out that work; the other two thirds will be distributed normally to the customers and other people, while the amount held back would be used in cases which I have just mentioned.

It is not correct to say that these people cannot get any lumber; they can get it; but we have impressed upon the merchants not to sell lumber for repairing palings belonging to people, palings which do not at present house people. In other words, we have tried to conserve as much material for this emergency as we possibly could; but people can still get their supplies of lumber. It is true they cannot get more than they normally get.

For instance, some merchants put forward to us that there are some individuals whose amount of credit would be \$50, and we have agreed that if they came forward for that amount they could get the amount which they normally get; but if more is needed, reference should be made to the Director of Public Works or the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board. Since then we have made two changes; we have agreed to hold back one quarter of this material and only this morning we have again agreed with the merchants to keep in stock one sixth of their supplies for the Government.

[Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: A man picked out lumber and was told that he could not take it away]. I want to assure the honourable member that the situation is not as he has stated it.

We were told by the merchants that lumber was in short supply, especially siding; so that if any individual did not get his supply it might not be because the Government had commandeered this material, but because this material might be in short supply.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: On a point of Order. The case was presented to me where a man picked out lumber and he was told that he could not take it away because the Government had commandeered the lumber. Two people came to me, one from St. George and one from St. Michael. It was not a question of any paling; the roof of the house of one of these people have been blown off. I am not accusing anybody, I am only asking for an explanation. If the position is relaxed, then it is easier for people to get this material.

5.15 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: That man wanted lumber to repair his house to make it comfortable and the Government wanted it so that people can get back in their houses as quickly as possible. The Regulations have been changed; I have not had complaints to that extent.

I mentioned that on Friday morning when the "West Indian" was in Trinidad. We cabled Trinidad and got the Governor of Trinidad to send up as much stuff as possible [A VOICE: A freeness!] which caused the "West Indian" to be delayed a bit; and were it not for the Hurricane in Grenada we would have had a full supply, but after the Hurricane in Grenada we had to divide the supply. A

part came to Barbados and the other part went to Grenada; that is the position. Therefore, the honourable member need not worry.

I should like to say that houses are being rehabilitated very speedily, especially in Christ Church.

Now, the other point relates to rent restriction. The honourable junior member for the City has actually answered that question. In these cases, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to safeguard the public from unscrupulous landlords. Some of these unscrupulous land-lords try to make money by hook or by crook; and therefore we thought it necessary (the honourable member knows I am a strong believer in rent control) that rent would be controlled. Even if it were controlled for a day I would have at least seen my long wish accomplished.

As the honourable junior member for the City points out the individual is no worse off; a landlord gets what he is normally getting for his house. As the honourable member for the City further points out, if anyone is normally renting a house he would go to the magistrate and the magistrate would take into consideration the cost of the building. Therefore, there would be no cause to fear. On the other hand we will be protecting, by this Order, people who are destitute and helpless from people who are in a position to take advantage of the situation.

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

QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Honourable senior member for St. Lucy.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Speaker, I apologise for being late due to the inclement weather (laughter) and I am craving leave to enquire of the Appropriate Minister the following questions:—

Mr. J. E. T. BRANCKER: To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Whether Government is aware that the practice of the local Police Department is still to refuse to issue Declaration Forms to Applicants for Passports, unless such Applicants have before hand paid their passage money?

2. Is the Government aware that, even when such Application Forms are issued by the Police in Immigration Department, Police frequently insist on themselves filling in such Forms in their own handwriting even in the case of Applicants who can read or write?

3. Will the Government issue instructions to that Department immediately to discontinue their *ultra vires* practices relative to issuing of Passports?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications, Works & Housing:—

Whether Government will insist that the Transport Board in respect of Transport workers on the nationalised omnibuses services:—

(a) Shall pay such workers a weekly—as distinct from a daily wage?

(b) Shall not require any workers to put in more than 44 hours in each week; nor more than eight hours in any day, not more than four consecutive hours without an adequate break for refreshment;

(c) Shall make no deduction from the weekly pay packet of any worker who has been absent from duty in obedience to a summons from any of H.M. Courts?

(d) Shall provide free transportation home for workers after the late night trip?

2. Will Government provide free transportation to and from work for:—

(a) Carriage of blind persons to and from work.

(b) Carriage of School Children to and from Government-aided, and all other non-segregated Schools, for half the price of an adult?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:—

Whether Government will favourably consider lending prospective immigrants to United Kingdom the full amount of their passage money for a Group Accommodation ticket to England?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for St. Lucy is also given permission to speak, there being no objection.

Mr. TUDOR: With your permission I desire to put the following question:—

To enquire of the Minister of Health:—

Will the Minister state whether a little boy, Chesterfield Jones, was admitted to the General Hospital as a patient on 15th August, 1955, and died there on the same day?

2. If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, will the Minister further state:

(a) The time at which he was admitted:

(b) The time at which he was treated:

(c) The extent of his injuries:

(d) The treatment administered to him; and,

(e) The cause of his death.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to know whether I may ask leave on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. George who is absent to present this notice of a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking leave to give notice of a motion by the hon. senior member for St. George. There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. George, I beg to give notice of a motion which that honourable member wishes to be moved at the next sitting of the House. Mr. Speaker, it was really a motion of no confidence in the Government for its mal-administration of Hurricane Relief.

5.25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: It is immaterial to me what motion the honourable member makes. All I would like to know is the authority for his giving notice of such a motion for the hon. senior member for St. George when that honourable member is out of the island. It is my right to know the authority.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: [Aside:] This is a democratic country and if a man wants to commit suicide, he can do so; and so long as he succeeds, the authorities can do him nothing.

Hon. M. E. COX: Before I sit, I want to tell the honourable member that under the Emergency Powers Orders, you can be imprisoned for giving a false statement.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not need to bother with the Hon. Minister. I would just like to say that the records will show that the hon. senior member for St. George was present in the island on Thursday and on Friday last, and saw much more of the hurricane relief work than the Hon. Minister of Communications. The hon. senior member for St. George did not leave the island until Saturday morning.

OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH STATION

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to deal with the Report of the Committee which was appointed to consider and draft a reply to His Excellency's Message No. 25/1955 relating to the establishment of an Oceanographic Research Station in Barbados. We are about to

adjourn today, but the Americans are anxious to get an answer. As a matter of fact, they wanted an answer about a month ago. I am therefore asking leave to deal with this Report.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to permission being granted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not said anything yet. As soon as I make the announcement, the honourable member can object.

Mr. LEWIS: I know that; but is not this my time to object?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have always put the question in such a way that any honourable member can always have the opportunity to object.

The question is, that leave be granted the honourable member—

Mr. LEWIS: I object to leave being granted, and I would like you to hear the reason for my objection. I am saying, that this Message was brought here on the 20th of this month when a Committee was appointed to consider and draft the reply. If the Americans were asking for a reply as long as a month ago, then the Government was in communication with these people about this business before that, because they could not get a reply a month ago unless Government was in communications with them before that time. It therefore shows that Government was dealing with this matter all that time.

This is an important matter and the Hon. Leader of this House is asking this House to deal with it today. No honourable member, Mr. Speaker, has had the opportunity of reading this Message through because it is lengthy and it has not been printed yet, far less asking somebody who should know something of it to help him with the implications of it. Will some part of this island become American territory as a result of this? This is something which should be seriously considered.

Are we so afraid of the Americans that when they ask us to do something, we must fly and do it without giving proper consideration to it? When they wanted to put propaganda magazines in our Lobby it was done without our knowledge. This is indecent haste. They can dub me whatever they like. If I ever want to go to their country, it will be an honour to them and not to me.

I am a man for fair play. As I have said, I am not sure whether this Message has been printed and circulated. I would go as far as to say that no honourable member has been able to read it. What the Hon. Minister is asking is out of all proportion. It is something which should not have come from the Hon. Minister. Must I read this Message from a Newspaper?

A hurricane has just devastated this country and as a result the printers have not been able to get this Message out. I am appealing to the Hon. Minister to say if it has been delayed for a month, let it be delayed for a month longer. This is something which I have to ask for some guidance by people who would be able to guide me on it. I am asking the Hon. Minister to give me the opportunity at least on this occasion to read the Message from His Excellency the Acting Governor concerning this matter.

5.35 p.m.

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Very well, sir, I am asking for leave to withdraw the motion. (Cheers). Alright Sir, I am asking leave to withdraw this Message.

Mr. Speaker, some honourable members have expressed the wish that they would like to go into

the parishes they represent; therefore I do not propose to go on with any further business today. Before we adjourn I want to fix the Order Paper.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, before that is done, I believe this is the only Legislature which has met like this after this serious hurricane in the area and the House as the elected representatives of the people, do not say a word of sympathy—(An Aside) I have no draft, but we should pass a Resolution sympathising with the people of Grenada. That should not be any slip on the part of the Government at all.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY WITH GRENADA

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, That was a slip on the part of the Government. The hon. junior member for the City did say a little earlier that in spite of our own disaster we should express our sympathy in a tangible way to the people of Grenada. I am not prepared to discuss that matter now, but it will be mentioned in the proper quarter.

However, it will be an encouragement at least to the people of Grenada although we had a similar calamity from the same cause and in a similar manner and in so short a period after they have been caused distress, if we passed a Resolution of sympathy to them. I understand that they are in a worse condition than that in which we are. Bridges have been blown down and a number of villages have been demolished; in addition the water supply has been cut off. We have not suffered to that extent. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass:

"RESOLVED that the House of Assembly convey to the Government and people of Grenada their deepest sympathy for the great loss of life and property occasioned by the hurricane "Janet" on the 22nd September, 1955."

Hon. R. G. MAPP: I beg to second that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I would like to add that our thanks are due to those Governments who have expressed their sympathy with us by sending cables to us; and I think we should go on record as showing them our sympathy. We should place on record our deep appreciation of the sympathy which has been shown to us by territories such as Trinidad, Jamaica and the other islands. We want to go on record as saying that we are not unmindful of the assistance which they have given us. I think it would be proper to make an amendment to the Resolution. However, we would be expressing what the community feels; it would be impolite if we did not express our thanks to those territories.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: I quite appreciate what the honourable member has said, but I feel that that should be the substance of a subsequent Resolution.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, honourable members standing in their places as a sign of their acceptance of the Resolution as requested by His Honour the Speaker.

5.45 p.m.

The Order Paper having been fixed,

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next was put and resolved in the Affirmative without division.

5.50 p.m.