

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1955—56

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

3rd January, 1956.

A Special Meeting of the House of Assembly was held at 3 o'clock p.m. to-day.

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 A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*); Hon. M. E. COX, (*Minister of Communications, Works & Housing*), Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P., (*Chairman of Committees*), Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E., Hon. R. G. MAPP, (*Minister of Trade, Industry and Labour*), Mr. F. C. GODDARD, (*Leader of the Opposition*), Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY, Mr. V. B. VAUGHAN, Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries*), Mrs. E. E. BOURNE and Mr. J. C. TUDOR, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Mr. BRYAN entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Message No. 37/1955 from His Excellency the Governor:—

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of Order. My summons to this meeting does not say that any Messages are to be laid. If the Hon. Ministers knew of a Message to be laid, we should be treated with the same courtesy which they have extended to the Other Place. There was a Message to be laid in the Other Place and they gave notice of it because there was a special meeting for it. Why can't this House be treated with similar courtesy? I did not come here to-day to hear of any Messages being laid.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that any Message can be laid at any time. If the Government wants to do anything other than that, it cannot be proceeded with; but as far as a Message to be laid by Command is concerned, that Message can be laid at any time. That is my ruling.

Mr. LEWIS: I take it that that Message was not known of when you were approached about this special Meeting.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Message need not have been known of. The Hon. Minister may proceed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Message No.

37/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly informing the Honourable House of the cessation of the state of emergency.

MESSAGE NO. 37/1955.

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

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that the Proclamation issued on the 19th of November, 1955, declaring that a state of emergency existed as a result of the hurricane which struck the Island on the 22nd of September, ceased to be in force after the 18th of December, 1955, and that, as no further Proclamation was issued, the state of emergency lapsed accordingly.

R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.

21st December, 1955.

Also Message No. 38/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding representation at the final Conference on Federation to be held in London in February 1956.

MESSAGE NO. 38/1955.

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

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to refer to his Message No. 31/1955 and to the Address from the Honourable the House of Assembly dated the 13th of December, 1955, regarding the representation of the Barbados Government at the final Conference on Federation which is due to begin in London on the 7th of February, 1956.

2. The printing and distribution of the reports of the three Pre-Federal Commissioners have necessarily taken some time, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies has been unable to fix an earlier date than the 2nd of January, 1956, for the simultaneous publication of these Command papers in the United Kingdom and the British West Indian territories. Copies of the Command papers are being

laid at the first meeting of the Honourable the House after that date.

3. The opinion of the Honourable the House regarding the composition of the delegation has been taken into account, but, after careful consideration, the Government has selected the following:—

Delegates:

The Honourable Premier.
The Honourable Sir Archibald Cuke, C.B.E.,
M.L.C.
The Honourable C. E. Talma, M.C.P.

Advisers:

The Honourable Dr. A. S. Cato, M.L.C.
The Honourable the Acting Attorney General.
The Financial Secretary.
4. The Honourable the House is invited to concur in the appointment of the delegation.
R. D. H. ARUNDELL,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown.
31st December, 1955.

Also Reports of the British Caribbean Pre-Federal Commissioners.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, is it possible that we can have the Message from the Governor relative to the final Conference on Federation to be held in London in February this year read?

Hon. Dr. CUMMINS read the Message.

Mr. ALLDER entered the House and took his seat.

Mr. LEWIS: When are we to agree in this matter? Will our concurrence be asked to-day?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not to-day.

NOTICE

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to place the sum of \$312,500 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1955—56, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimate 1955—56, No. 56, which forms the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. M. E. COX: I should also like to ask for leave to move for the suspension of Rules 88 & 89 in order to deal with this Resolution in all its stages to-day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.
3.25 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 & 89

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Rules 88 & 89 be now suspended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to consider the Money Resolution of which notice has just been given.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1955—56,
NO. 56**

Hurricane Housing

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution as you will see Sir, is divided into two parts: (1) \$200,000 for the continuation of repairs to houses damaged by the recent hurricane, and (2) \$112,500 for part of the cost of the construction of another 250 prefabricated houses.

I should like from the outset to say that I understand that when the November 8th Resolution for the sum of \$710,000 was before the House, the Hon. Minister of Social Services who dealt with it gave the impression at that time that the \$710,000 was all that was required for the completion of repairs to the houses damaged. He stated, as far as I gather, that it was the final instalment.

Well, the Hon. Minister in all good faith, was under the impression from the information he had received that that was the last amount required to finish those houses; and I would like this Honourable Committee to believe that it was not an attempt by the Hon. Minister of Social Services to mislead this Hon. Committee. So far as could be gleaned from the information received by him, he was almost sure that that amount would have completed the job.

Now, Sir, the survey taken at the 7th November revealed that there were 5,251 houses remaining to be repaired and at the time the average cost of the repairs was \$100 per house. Since then, sometime around the 29th November, the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board pointed out that there were more houses to be repaired than that survey had shown: and one of the reasons given at that time, although I do not think that we can accept it, was the inaccessibility to certain houses located in certain places.

I am well aware of the fact that at the time the first survey was taken, it was during the rainy season and in the hilly parishes of St. Andrew and St. Joseph (if I may give those parishes as an example) it would have been difficult at that time to get to every house situated in the hills so as to inspect them; but the question of inaccessibility should not be presented as an excuse, because however inconvenient it may be to get to those houses, it must be borne in mind that people live in them and if an occupier, or an owner can get to them inspectors could also reach them for the purpose of making a survey.

However, after the first survey, the Manager-Secretary pointed out that there were quite a few houses of which the people who took the survey had not taken note, and, consequently, he was obliged to make another survey. That last survey revealed that there were another 796 houses to be added to the former number and that brought the total to 4,303 houses to be repaired up to the 20th of last month. In addition, as I have said, the cost of repairs was calculated at first at an average of \$100 per house but that amount proved to be inadequate. Consequently, it has been increased to an average of \$150 per house.

The other part of this Resolution is for the sum of \$112,500 which is half of the amount necessary for the construction of another 250 prefabricated houses. The final figure cannot be ascertained at present; and this is in view of the fact that the figures of the surveys show that every time

you make a survey, you get more and more houses added. For example, we have here from the list completed on the 24th last month, figures showing that of the 795 houses which are to be added to the former list, 238 were extensively damaged, 322 moderately damaged and 235 slightly damaged.

3.35 p.m.

In so far as the slightly and damaged houses are concerned, hon. members will remember that in the first instance, soon after the hurricane passed, the repairs programme was concentrated on houses which were slightly and moderately damaged and those which were pushed off their groundsills; and the more extensively damaged houses were left until those slightly damaged houses were repaired. Well, that programme proceeded for some time, and when it was actually felt that all those slightly damaged houses or even moderately damaged houses were repaired, (as I said we were not concentrating on the extensively damaged houses) this survey revealed that there are still 235 slightly damaged and 322 moderately damaged. That being the case the Government has decided to have a sort of spot-check on these additional houses. In other words, we are prepared, sir, to send around independent persons who have had nothing to do with the survey in the beginning along with other persons who did take some part in the programme, to make these various tests to find out the accuracy or otherwise of the figures which are here given.

For that reason we have come to the House for an amount which we feel will carry us over a two or three week period until three checks are made and we get the final figures. As I pointed out, Sir, up to the 20th December, we had repaired 11,051 houses and up to the 28th we had repaired 11,390, which gives a figure of 347 repaired since 20th December. I think that is all that is required at this stage so far as this repairs programme is concerned.

Now, sir, dealing with the other part of the Resolution, we have found that the 500 pre-fab houses are insufficient to meet the demands and needs of persons who qualified for houses. Actually to date, we have sited 310 of the 500 pre-fab houses; and according to the requests and demands, the Government feels that we must provide at least another 250 pre-fab houses. As is done, or was done in the case of the 500, the cost is borne partly by the Government and partly by the Labour Welfare Housing Loans Fund.

On the last occasion it was 50% and that policy has been maintained; that is to say \$112,500 will be voted and the other \$112,500 will be taken from the L. W. (H L) Funds.

In so far as the policy with regard to the allocation of these houses is concerned, I have decided to give priority to persons who own houses and whose houses were completely destroyed by the hurricane, and also to persons who were renting houses which have been destroyed. In so far as providing land-lords with pre-fab houses, this has been ruled out. We are not supplying any pre-fab houses to landlords; as I said, only to persons who had owned houses and occupied houses, and persons who were renting and who became homeless as a result of the houses which they occupied at the time being completely destroyed.

I think, Sir, the Addendum to the Resolution explains quite clearly the purpose of this Resolution and the Committee will appreciate the difficult experience in checking on these houses. At least, in the first instance, as you remember, I gave the figure of little over 7,544 houses damaged but that was a very rough estimate and apparently bore no relation —

or rather no true relation—to the number of houses that were really damaged.

We have tried, as I said, Sir, as far as possible to get as accurate figures as we could, and we are making this last test check within two weeks from now: after which we hope to come back to this House for the final instalment for repairs and for rehousing those persons rendered homeless as a result of the hurricane.

With these few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$312,500 be now passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, Government knows the attitude of members of this House as regards housing, and it is for that reason, I believe, that they are treating the House in this manner; but on every occasion when they come to the House for money, there is a lapse and a lay off and people are put off work and the whole programme is held up for two weeks before they can get into stride again. This is the second or third occasion on which it has happened.

When notice of this meeting was given, we had already expected them to call us back; everybody knew that we were going into recess over the Christmas holidays and the money was running out. The only person who did not know that was the Minister of Housing.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not true; I was away in British Guiana.

Mr. GODDARD: The people have suffered tremendously; they are still suffering even if he does not know it; they have got them out from the schools and some people are still being housed together in families with each other. I know the position in Christ Church and that is the case. They have suffered, they are miserable; and it is only God's mercy that the dry weather has just started.

3.45 p.m.

That is my first criticism. If more houses had been repaired per week, more families could have been happier during the Christmas season than they were.

My next observation is that the whole programme seems to have lost momentum; and these surveys are done in a most haphazard way. That is so, because three months after the hurricane the Government should have been in a position to tell us today what repairs are expected, if there had been a proper survey.

I know that the Housing Board were given a task which they were not fully capable of performing. They have done a reasonably good job because they had to take on extra staff, they had to take on carpenters and other people who had to borrow hammers so as to do the job. However that position need not exist today. I know that Housing is a very touchy question but I must say that with the hold-ups and the lapses and the surveys—all I can say is that these surveys are not properly done.

The Government has not yet told this House that they are not repairing stone buildings although I have heard that in other quarters. However, I understand that some assistance has been given to the owners of some stone buildings. It is said that those owners of stone buildings who are in these poor categories must apply to the Rehabilitation Fund Committee. I am a member of that Committee but I think the Government should still say whether they intend to help that category of persons or not, because the funds which are at the disposal of this Hurricane Relief Fund Committee are not adequate to undertake that as well as other things. The Government

should let us know today whether they intend to help these people or whether they would be assisting them from that fund alone.

One of the worries of the people who have had damage done to their property is that they do not know when this assistance would be stopped. I have assured them as much as I can that the members of this House, at least the members from this side of the House, would not tolerate that.

I am not at all satisfied that the repairs which have been done are all that could have been done. This is an opportunity which the Government should have grasped to carry out a broader programme. A person may have had a three-gabled house, with a shed roof, which was blown flat; there may be nine or ten people who were living in that house and the Government has put on one gable, but they have not attempted to put back the shed-roof.

Hon. M. E. COX: I object to that; that is not true.

Mr. GODDARD: When the Hon. Minister gets up I hope he will say that it is not true, because that is what I know. They are only repairing one gable and not the shed roof to a house and they are accommodating families in half houses. Only today a person told me that she had a two-gable house and a shed roof and it was blown flat; she was sheltering somewhere else and when they came to repair the house, they took the entire boarding from one house and gave her back one gable; they took some of the boarding from the second house and made one house in some instances, they have shortened the houses.

Well, I do not disagree with that, but when the Government gives back one house, it is inadequate having regard to the size of the family. You will find instances where eleven people are sleeping under one roof.

The housing situation in Barbados has always been a bad one, but unless they extend their programme, the housing programme will be worse than ever.

We have spent about \$1¼ million and from what the Hon. Minister has said today that is not enough. A grant of something like £2 million has been given to Grenada. Government should go to the British Government with a final survey, tell them what they have done and ask them for a grant to see if we cannot make some improvement; or else put our housing back to the same position where it was and then go on with the housing programme. If you go on as you are, you will be repairing these houses until next Christmas.

There is another category of large wooden houses which have been damaged and the occupiers are unable to do anything about them, and they are in a very dangerous position; some of them can fall into the road tomorrow. The Manager of the Housing Board does not know what to do with them. I have taken him to some sites and he is sympathetic with the cases, but he needs to be given some discretionary powers to say: "I will pull down that house and make a one-storeyed house out of it." You might have an old house before the hurricane which was damaged by the hurricane and therefore has got to be repaired. If a person cannot repair his house, the Government's policy should be to come to his assistance. Some houses cannot take more than \$20 or \$30 to repair them, but surely others will take about \$200 or \$300 to repair them; why should the Government not do that? Why should everybody be treated alike?

Now we come to the pre-fabricated houses. They have come down for a further 250 of these houses, and I am asking the Hon. Minister to send those 250 "prefab" houses to Christ Church. When we

ask for more houses and you give them, you will be giving them to deserving cases. The Reverend gentleman in charge in Christ Church has a long waiting list of people who have been applying ever since for "prefab" houses; these people should be given somewhere to go.

3.55 p.m.

Government is not aware of the number of families that are doubling up together, but they are doubling up; and they are doing so because that is the Barbadian way of helping one another.

I am saying that Government should not at all think that its policy to build another 250 prefabricated houses will be the last lot that they will have to build; and I am warning them that they may as well get ahead building the balance according to the list given by the Inspector. If you get that list, you will see that you will need more than 250.

As a matter of fact, he has pointed out to me that you have allocated 141 to Christ Church, but his list for Christ Church is more than 250. I do hope that when the Hon. Minister gets up to reply he will tell me that I am wrong and that Government is doing more than that.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, it was very refreshing to hear the Hon. Minister of Communications give some survey of the work done on housing, and we are thankful for the figures he has given; but I would like to say before going any further that to get an accurate survey the Government must use people who are competent to make a survey, and it must not get political derelicts to do that work. Government is using political derelicts in the making of the surveys and mainly for the purpose of bringing those people back in the House of Assembly. I am saying that if they cannot get in the House of Assembly without a hurricane they are not fit to get in the House of Assembly.

There are too many political derelicts being used in this matter, and they are being used as a means of getting a seat for them in this Honourable Chamber during the coming General Elections. That is one of the dangers of this matter. [A VOICE: Give us some names]. I will give you some when you get on a platform. [ANOTHER VOICE: We want to hear the names in here.] The names are not for you at this time and you know the names better than I do.

Mr. Chairman, so far as this Resolution is concerned, when one comes in here today and hears the Hon. Minister saying that it is an Emergency Resolution, when you examine it you will realise that it is not an Emergency Resolution; because if you read the Addendum carefully, you will see at the end of paragraph (2) this sentence: "These houses will cost \$225,000 and it is proposed to meet 50% of the cost from the Labour Welfare Fund." Well, if you are meeting 50% of the cost of these houses from out of the Labour Welfare Fund, it is not necessary for this House to approve of money coming from that Fund, because the Government has spent money out of the Labour Welfare Fund already without the permission of this House.

There is no point in the Minister saying that you will have to dismiss somebody if it is true that you are using money from the Labour Welfare Fund.

From the Hon. Minister's own statement, the amount of money voted to be utilised cannot be utilised in two weeks' time. If 50% of this money which is \$112,500 is coming from the Labour Welfare Fund, then you cannot spend that amount in a week in the repair of these houses; so on that basis, you can say that the money coming from that Fund could have been spent in getting ahead with the repair of these houses. If it is a fact that the people who were employed in the repair of these houses were laid off

and the work on those houses has been stopped, there was absolutely no necessity for that because the money from the Labour Welfare Fund could have been utilised.

I will ask the Hon. Minister of Communications these questions: is it a fact that the Government has tents to shelter people who have lost their homes as a result of the hurricane? If so, where are they? Have they been used, sold or given away? Are they rotting or what? What have you done with them?

The other point which I want to bring to the attention of the Hon. Minister is this: why is it, as the hon. junior member for Christ Church has said that no attempt has been made by the Barbados Government to let the public know if Her Majesty's Government, apart from the token grant of \$240,000, is making any other provision for granting this Island money for relief? What is going to be the position so far as getting relief in this question of housing is concerned?

It is three months since the hurricane has taken place and the Hon. Minister has said that 4,303 houses still remain to be repaired. From the Hon. Minister's estimate if 346 houses are repaired in 11 days (and I presume that the people who work on those houses do not work on Sundays and Public Holidays) then it means that 30 houses are repaired per day; and if you are repairing 30 houses per day, it will mean that you will have to work another 20 weeks before you can complete the repair of these houses.

Let me ask again whether any approach has been made to Her Majesty's Government for a grant in order to assist the Barbados public to finalise the repair of these houses? What is the extent of that grant if a grant has been made? Everyone will agree that the task of rehousing the people is a big one; and as I have said in a *sotto voce* remark just now, if the Government Bench is assisting in Family Planning, I want to let it know that all its proposals for Family Planning will go to the wind and will be disrupted because you cannot have Family Planning when eight or more families live in a 16ft x 9ft. house. Limiting of a family does not come from that sort of housing.

The Hon. Minister of Communications has said that there are three types of damaged houses—moderately damaged, slightly damaged, and extensively damaged houses. What is the difference between a house which is moderately damaged and that which is slightly damaged? I can well understand your saying "houses extensively damaged" because that seems to me to be the type of house which you cannot repair and which you will have to reconstruct. I am going to say that if you are willing to repair an old house for the people, it is just as if you are going upon a Steamship and looking for dunnage.

4.05 p.m.

In Christ Church there are still houses on the ground. It is true that there are people who are not doing anything and are waiting until the Government comes along; and some of them even aided and abetted by politicians. These people are waiting like political derelicts to see if you do not give them a house, and those who are waiting for a vote are willing to tell them: "I am willing to get behind the Minister."

I feel we should be frank and bold about this matter. The Minister is satisfied that we have reached the stage where the Addendum says that the total number of houses remaining to be repaired as shown by the survey, proves to be inaccurate. There is no such thing as an accurate estimate. [A VOICE: Why not?] If it is accurate it cannot be an estimate, and if it is an estimate, it cannot be accurate. If it is an estimate which he has given to the House, to

what extent is this going to cost the Government and at what stage or with what steps Government will be asked to assist?

We have heard £3,000,000 has been granted to little Grenada with the understanding that they put some of this back from Colonial Development and Welfare Funds as well as from their Treasury. To what extent are we going to be treated like Grenada? What is Her Majesty's Government doing at this stage to help under these present circumstances? I should like to know if the Minister is satisfied with the method in dealing with the situation. [A VOICE: What method?] Doing some houses here and then being forced to stop; and then you have the problem of not knowing precisely what this whole thing is going to cost you, because you do not have a good survey.

I should like the Minister to bear this in mind: he cannot postpone this matter too long, because you will find on the 22nd September, 1956, that you are still on the basis of trying to rehabilitate and reconstruct houses that were blown down. Some houses are beyond repair; therefore, if you give prefabricated houses to people, I would advise you to be careful that you do not give houses of too high a cost, because when the time comes that you have to demolish these prefabricated houses, you will find that you have spent much that was not worthwhile.

Another point I would like to point out to the Minister, is that you are using a substantial portion of the Labour Welfare Fund for the purpose of rehousing these people. We have no objection under these circumstances, but in this account, I cannot feel justified because in the Bill we have just passed dealing with the sugar levies you have deducted money to put into Labour Welfare Funds, and you did not at the same time make it clear that you are making a loan to repair houses. But I hope that in taking money out of the Labour Welfare Fund that does not mean that you have not stopped or put a slow pedal on the granting of loans to repair houses, because I want to make it very clear that those who have red blood in their bodies have a principle that cannot be short circuited.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think, sir, that there is a method or lack of method in dealing with the rehabilitation of the people of Barbados after the hurricane. It is a matter upon which this Government or anybody else connected with the Government cannot congratulate themselves. It is the biggest bungle in the history of this colony, at a time when we should be seeking the assistance of people outside.

Imagine the hon. junior member for St. Peter wanting to know whether the British Government is going to give us any money. Don't you think that the British Government reads the Debates, and that they have not read what this Government had done within the last three months and how many houses there are to be repaired? Hon. Ministers come in here with an air of finality asking for \$710,000 and expect that this is all to be done. They themselves said that they have left the worst houses to the last, therefore, the cost of the houses will go up; they said that themselves. Now that they have discovered that there are more houses to be done, they come back in today and tell you that the people who made the survey are a bunch of villains and that they —

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I object to those remarks. I am sure he did not hear me say that.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said the survey was inaccurate and he is now going to have an accurate survey.

Hon. M. E. COX: I did not say that; I said I would have a test check.

Mr. LEWIS: He is going behind the backs of the very people he employed to make it.

Hon. M. E. COX: I said we were going to do it with the aid of the people who made the survey.

Mr. LEWIS: What are you carrying the others for, to show them where they went wrong? And you want to bring more people to rehabilitate! You ought to have made a test check and every other thing from the very day of the hurricane.

This Government has been doing nothing but making political strategy of the hurricane situation, and this has caused all the trouble. I must tell you that there are very serious stories going around about it, and it means that the people's money is being misspent. This is a political racket and nothing more.

Imagine coming in today and saying that you have some slightly damaged houses when these should have been repaired ever since. They do not know what to do. You have been warned all along that you have been mishandling this thing; and in the meantime of course, you are giving "hurricane political honours," "Janet" birthday list, that is what it is!

4.15 p.m.

That is the kind of thing which is happening; you are advertising at every stroke that you are doing nothing but making political capital out of this business; and then you say that this is not the final vote either. We were told on the last occasion: "Yes, this is the end of it." At least when you said that this is the end of it, don't you think that on the next occasion you should have said: "This is not the end of it?" Are you saying that there is more to it because you have not yet fixed the date of the Elections? I think it is time that you should have a policy and you should pursue it; you are doing absolutely nothing with considered judgement. You brought in all sorts of things here; imagine what would have happened if you did not have the people to criticise the things you bring in here!

You said on the last occasion that the houses which you are going to deal with would require a higher figure because they were the worst damaged, and it would take a long time to repair each one of them. How have you come to discover this position now? Have you dismissed any of the people who made that survey? Are they still working with you? Can the Hon. Minister say that any single one of these people has been dismissed from his employment? Are you still going to employ these people?

The next paragraph of the Addendum to this Resolution says this: "As funds are almost exhausted, it has been decided to approach the Legislature for the provision of a further sum of \$200,000 to enable the repair programme to be carried on, as it would be most undesirable to stop this programme at the present time." Has anybody asked you to stop it? Did some of the Ministers suggest that the programme should be stopped and they had to be reminded that it had to be carried on?

The Hon. Minister of Social Services in all good faith, said that the \$710,000 was the ed of this matter. They had faith then in the people whom they employed to make this survey; and has it now been shown that you should not pin your faith in the people whom you employed in this matter? Or perhaps you want to continue with that for reasons which have been stated today? You say you did something during the rainy season and therefore you could not do it properly: did the rain not stop falling at all? Is it that you went to a particular

house and because the rain was falling you did nothing to it at all? Was the rain falling every day?

You have said that these houses would cost something more and therefore this is no new idea. This was the old idea. You have been given the wrong estimate, therefore you will carry along six more people with you so that you can do more. You have been warned all along that you should adopt some policy.

There is no necessity for the people who are working in the Department to make any survey at all; you must have people who are capable of making a survey of what is to be done and give it in to the Department. What has become of the good work for which people have been rewarded with New Year honours? Is this some of it?

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am thoroughly ashamed of what has taken place after the hurricane; and in every aspect of it, it is appearing to one that the people who have accused the Government of making political capital out of disaster are right up to the hilt. That is shameful; the people who are deserving of assistance and who have not got it ought to know where they are standing for assistance, now that some months have elapsed since this hurricane has taken place. We want Progress Reports on this matter so as to see what has been done with the money. Why is there so much secrecy surrounding it? Do not tell me that you are starting another survey about this; the people who made this survey should have told you: "There is a house which was damaged to this or to that extent." Do you want people to go around to check and recheck and what-not? This is an absolutely disgraceful showing by anybody who could claim to have the interest of anybody at heart.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should say a few words in connection with this matter. I, too, am very disappointed over the way in which these Resolutions have been brought down. The Hon. Minister of Social Services has told us: "This is the final Resolution; this money will cover all the damage." That was a very brave statement for the Hon. Minister to have made because, if he did not have the proper figures, he should have had them amended.

They have come down with another Resolution and still we are not told things exactly. A day or two after the hurricane the Police Force was instructed to go around and discover the houses which were damaged or which were slightly damaged; the Police Force is a non-political organisation and I am sure that they could have made a tabulation and carried out this survey.

4.25 p.m.

Apparently their information was thrown to the four winds, and lo and behold, the whole rehabilitation campaign has been turned into a political move. I do know that in one parish that the Chairman of the Hurricane Relief Committee was quite willing to carry on and was carrying on very well, but he was given instructions in a letter from the Minister of Communications to the effect that a certain person who was not even a member of that Hurricane Relief Committee should be put in charge of the repairs of those houses in that parish. Is that the way that this thing should be done? This is not a Party matter.

Hon. M. E. COX: Will the hon. member repeat that statement for me?

Mr. HAYNES: The Reporter will repeat it for you. Putting all that aside, there is no policy

or idea which can be applauded on the part of Government. The Government has lost this golden opportunity.

As the junior member for Christ Church has said, the five Ministers should get together with their advisers and make a proper Housing Scheme. They had information about this matter many months ago. The Vestries received a communication from the Government asking about damaged houses and what was the position as regards sites; whether proper sites could be found for houses which were damaged on out-of-the-way sites and other information along such lines.

I happen to know that in the parish of St. Andrew the matter was gone through very carefully and the Vestry in a reply to the Government pointed out where new sites could be found for those houses which were in inaccessible areas. I am told that this work which the Vestry put in on that matter was absolutely wasted.

As a matter of fact, no reply was given as to whether the Vestry's report was received; and I may say that to my astonishment the places where nobody should be allowed to live, were the places where they have put prefabricated houses and where they have repaired houses which were damaged extensively. These houses should have been put in places where the people who live in them would be happy; and if that had been done in the long run it would have saved this Government the money for running roads in parts of the parish that are not needed for such roads.

All this is very disconcerting. To my mind, the Hon. Minister of Housing should say that these figures are accurate now; but from what I do know, they will always be inaccurate because if everybody who has a house to be repaired is getting it repaired, you will never stop repairing. Everybody knows that a wooden house is always in need of repairs.

However, for all that although I am very pleased to see a Housing Scheme for the rehabilitation of these people, my point is that there should be some system and a policy should have been made and pronounced and carried out; but nothing of that sort has been done. Houses are still being put on hilly sites.

The old silly policy of putting houses on hilly sites is still being perpetuated and for no reason whatsoever. Beggars cannot be choosers. If you want to remove the people to better sites there is no reason why you could not remove them to places where you want to put them. I think it is a very sad state of affairs that you have not tried to remedy this ill at this time. You had a golden opportunity to do so and you have lost it.

Now, I have come to one of the most serious points which I rose to speak on, and it is with respect to the subscriptions to these various Funds for Hurricane Relief. Fortunately, on my part, I visualised what was going to happen and the little bit I had to give I gave it in a way which I considered was best to give it. I do not mind what is being done so far as the Aided-Self-Help Housing Programme, but I am sure the people who are contributing to these various funds are going to be very chary of giving any more money because most of the money given has been badly dispensed.

I happened to pass by a certain parish one day and I saw the Churchwarden pelting shoes to people outside a building, and my estimation of the crowd that was outside was that it was over 1,000 people who were literally catching the shoes. [A VOICE: Where?] I am only going to tell you what I saw. [ANOTHER VOICE: Tell us where?] In one of

the parishes of Barbados. Those who want to find out where it took place will find out eventually.

I consider that the giving away of shoes is something which should not be done like that. A pair of shoes is something which should be tried on to see whether it fits the foot. The same thing happened with respect to the giving away of clothes and food. I can tell you that some people receive 12 pairs and some none at all.

When happenings such as those get to be known by people in other parts of this world and we get another calamity, we need not look for any help. People learn from experience and those people are not going to give their hard-earned money when they know that it is not going to be spent in proper channels.

Food was sent to a parish where there was hardly any damage. If you are going to have what I will call general relief, well, you can give everybody. But if you are granting Poor Relief or Hurricane Relief, well give for Poor Relief or Hurricane Relief but do not give General Relief. You must have a policy. I have mentioned this on one or two occasions already in this House and I only hope that some result will come out of this debate.

4.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, a short matter upon which I want some information is whether the Minister of Works realises that Government is becoming practically the owner of nearly all the houses in Barbados. It will eventually or practically come to that. And is Government taking the trouble to protect those houses by some sort of insurance? That is a very important matter, because these houses to my mind are as important to be protected by some cover or other as any other Government building. I would tell any of those Ministers that if they would go to a Solicitor and ask him to raise money on all of those houses, the first thing the money lender would ask is if they have an insurance coverage on these houses; and if not, to cover it and then come back to him. The only way to do business is the right way. If you do not, you will find yourself in a very bad hole. In other words, the day will come when what is happening today will end, and you will be no better off than you were on this occasion. All this is because it is not realised today that the Government has not planned on the same line as individuals plan their own business or their personal household business. If they do not do this, they will find themselves always fumbling as other Governments all over the world. It is the only word for it; never getting any further than where they were before—a lot of talk and nothing else; hot air, gas and nothing else: no firm policy. It is a serious matter and I know, sir, that if these few words—I am speaking on behalf of Barbados—are not taken any notice of, that will be too bad.

Mr. J. C. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is not to prolong this debate that I have risen from this seat, but I feel that as long as I occupy this seat, I am supposed to voice the ills that affect my people in this parish of St. Philip and the island as a whole, and to see ways and means to alleviate some of these ills. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not happy over the activities of those in the parish of St. Philip. I could make some rash statements but I do not want to go too far. Three months have elapsed since the visitation. I would not attempt to say that the Government is not trying to remedy the damage, but I still think that if the repairs were in better hands, in hands that were more energetic in relieving the stress of my people, I feel more could be done. I can see a lot of things being done in the parish of St. Philip but there is a lot of mum-

bling and jumbling. [*Cheers*] I must say some things are not going right in St. Philip. There is a lot of back-scratching and the people suffering are not getting any help. I want to say that I am going to support this Resolution, because any attempt to hold up this Resolution would be an infringement upon the needs of the people who are still suffering in the St. Philip parish. I hope the remarks made will stimulate the Minister of Housing and that he will get up and go around a bit in St. Philip. I could say a lot but I do not want to start anything; but it is not satisfactory to me because the time will come when the repercussion will rebound on their heads. Some of the people sent out to repair the houses used to sit down in the back bush and ask if anybody down the gap had been damaged, stand up in the public road and tell you: "I really did not go down there because there was nothing damaged." I hope that something will be done soon.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few remarks to those which have been spoken already; and some of the charges made by some hon. members are justified, especially one made by the hon. junior member for Christ Church in respect of not completely repairing houses of those people who suffered during the hurricane, and there are many windows and doors which are left unattended after the gangs have worked and left such houses. The fact is that there seems to be an insufficiency of material carried on the job. The workmen go there. I am told, and as a special favour repair some of these houses; and in cases where they have to leave a particular job, sufficient explanation is not given by these men who are sent. The people in recent weeks have become very dissatisfied, and especially last week I have been receiving numerous letters of complaint from people in the parish which I represent—letters from those who have had repairs effected to their houses already as well as those who have not been noticed. I do not want to put the blame particularly on any particular individual, because to my mind the Housing Board cannot do more than they set out to do, but it seems as if those persons who were sent out by the Department were not sure of a definite policy by Government. Therefore when repairs were to be effected to certain houses, the supervisor would in some cases say, "well I don't know if I can repair that; and therefore I would have to come back and repair." Or in another case they would say that Government said that only the roof to the main building must be repaired and the adjoining roof or shedroof is not to be included.

4.45 p.m.

As a result, some of the owners of these homes were unable to effect such repairs by themselves, and even when it came to a case where a person is a worker in the sugar industry, he found it difficult to get a loan from the Labour Welfare Fund so as to carry out further repairs to his house. I would like to suggest that it is very clear that there is some confusion of policy operating between the two Departments which are responsible for the repairs to these houses, and the Labour Fund Department. You find that the Inspectors who used to go out to inspect houses on which loans have been sought, have been taken away to work with the Hurricane Relief squads for months, and therefore the granting of loans has been suspended. Even although the granting of these loans has been suspended for some time, yet you hear that there are no funds in the hands of the Manager of the Labour Welfare Fund and people are inconvenienced to that extent.

I would like the Hon. Minister of Housing to realise this: many of these people would have effected the repairs to their own houses if they had been given permission to obtain loans from the Labour Welfare

Fund. That would have been a smart way—or rather an intelligent way of relieving the burden on the Central Government Funds. When the people found that they could not get loans from the Labour Welfare Department, they waited for the Housing Board to repair their houses. What the Hon. Minister should have done was to make it as easy as possible for such workers to get loans and they would go ahead and help themselves. In any case the Government had made a pledge after the hurricane to people whose houses were damaged in this strain: "Go ahead and help yourselves; the Government will come to your assistance afterwards." There are many householders who have been running around for the past number of weeks to find out where and how they can get this assistance. Some of them have committed themselves to certain debts and they are not even sure at this late hour whether they are going to get the pledges which the Government made at the time acknowledged.

I am only appealing to the Government in this respect; they must not abandon the people who have been depending upon their assistance ever since the hurricane took place. It does not matter what it costs the Colony; you have promised the people something already and they are looking forward to this promise being fulfilled. I would repeat for the benefit of the Hon. Minister of Housing, that it is clear that every hon. member of this House is willing to see as much done as possible in the rehabilitation of these people's houses. Therefore, let the Government see that all the repairs are carried out to those houses which were damaged. Let them reduce the charges and accusations which are being made and which will be made, because many of the people in recent weeks have become more dissatisfied than they were during the early stages of the work. The only thing for the Government to do is to disregard the cost, because it is very necessary and expedient that such assistance be given at this stage. What is more, since you have it as a part of your policy to pay strict attention to the re-housing of the masses generally, the occurrence of the hurricane has only helped the Government to carry out its always-intended policy at an earlier time than they would have carried it out. In that case, if money is spent now, I do not think the Government would have to spend it in another year or two to come.

What I should like to find out from the Hon. Minister of Housing is this: why was the number of pre-fabricated houses allocated to the parish of St. John reduced, taking into consideration that the survey which has been carried out up there shows that more than that number of houses have been totally flattened? There are some houses on which, in my opinion, they are wasting time and money in putting them back up. If a house has been entirely flattened and the materials which were in that house are all rotten and broken down, and you put back up that same type of house with that material, slightly adding a few boards and shingles, that is a waste of time, money, and material. Therefore, I have been thinking that a recommendation would have been made to the Housing Board that wherever such houses are met, a pre-fabricated house should be given.

I should also like to know from the Hon. Minister of Housing if these people who are being given pre-fabricated houses have to pay any part of the cost of these houses, and if so, how much of the total cost they have to pay for each unit house.

4.55 p.m.

I agree that the survey which was carried out at first was not good enough. There were some districts where there has been a considerable amount of damage, but there were others where only a house or two were damaged and no notice was taken of dis-

districts where there was only slight damage because of the fact that those people who visited the various parishes after the hurricane took place were more attracted to those districts where the damage was heavy than to those districts where there was only slight damage. That is the reason why those isolated houses which were damaged were not included in the first instance.

I am very happy to hear that a further survey will be carried out, and I hope that the Hon. Minister of Communications will make sure this time that it is thoroughly done so that adequate provision can be made in the future to handle them. I am also glad to know that this is not the final allocation for which provision will be made.

After looking around the countryside, my humble opinion of the way in which repairs are carried out to houses which were damaged is that after the crop season is over, many of those houses to be repaired will still be there to be put back up. It is true to say that very much was attempted in the first and second weeks after the disaster and those of us who were concerned in the matter were satisfied that everything was going well; but events which have happened later have proved that the speed at which the programme was carried out at first has not been kept up as it should have been. What I would like to see done (and I hope that the Hon. Minister of Communications will see that it is done) is that larger labour gangs be put on to work in the re-construction of these houses, just as it took place during the period immediately after the hurricane, so as to see how quickly you can get through with this whole thing.

I noticed in the Newspapers last week an article which stated that Grenada was given £3½ million, part of which is a loan and part of which is a gift, and I was wondering whether Barbados was eligible for similar consideration from the Home Government. I hope that it is not short-sightedness on the part of those in the Government whose duty it is to make applications to the British Government for assistance in the construction of these houses.

On the other hand, while I agree that the Government should assist sufferers in the hurricane regardless of the cost to the Island, I would hate to see too many prefabricated houses of the type which I noticed in the Silver Sands area being erected by the Government and given to the people.

We in Barbados have no great love for that type of construction and it has been conjectured that some of the children of labourers to whom those houses will be given might one day with a knife in their hands try to cut up the sides of those houses which are constructed of hardboard. It is known that after a while that material gets soft on account of the weather. Some of us use it in our homes and we know that although you will dress it properly, after a while dampness affects it, and therefore it becomes undressed—to use the term which the hon. junior member for St. Andrew has recently used, — and therefore, it needs replacement. The type of houses which I would like to see constructed for the workers of this island is the usual gabled house made out of the best material of pine or deal that is available and I hope that the Hon. Minister of Housing will pass on this suggestion.

I hope that he is convinced that these houses should not be constructed with hardboard sides because if he is convinced, he will pass on the suggestion and those who have something to do with the construction of these houses will not use that kind of material. It is my opinion that that material should only be used if a war was raging and other materials were not available. We should use in the

construction of these prefabricated houses the customary building materials which we used in chattel houses; and I do not see the necessity of using hard board in the construction of homes for the poor.

What is more, I am told that the hardboard which is being used in these prefabricated houses costs a penny more per square foot than pitch pine. I speak subject to correction, but I have been informed to the effect that hardboard is priced at 32c. per square foot and deal board is priced at 30c. per square foot. I am sure that some of us can remember when we were youngsters seeing certain wooden houses; and those houses look the same way today as they were when we were youngsters. Because of that, I cannot see any reason why we should be so willing and ready to get away from the use of that material which has stood the test of time.

With these few remarks, sir, (I am told that in the not too distant future a delegation will be leaving this island for the Mother Country on another bit of business) I hope that they would take the opportunity of approaching the Secretary of State for the Colonies in acquiring a greater measure of financial assistance to help us to overcome the cost of this present calamity.

5.05 p.m.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I note from the Addendum of this Resolution that the total number of houses repaired is 11,000 at a cost of \$1,142,000. That is an appreciable sum already spent on this hurricane rehousing, but I also note that the Government now claims that the results of another survey to damaged houses have revealed that the average cost per house will be much higher due to the fact that the majority of these houses are extensively damaged. Now, this is sheer childishness. You cannot come to the House in December, three months after the hurricane and like a magician pull a rabbit out of a hat.

You want to claim that you have certainly discovered that these houses are seriously damaged. Had you made a survey before? You must have known to what extent the houses were damaged, but what has happened is this: that these damaged houses have remained unrepaired for such a long period that depreciation—or, in fact, deterioration has set in to a greater extent: and those houses which normally would cost \$300 to repair would now cost \$500 or \$600; because it is elementary knowledge that a house with the roof off exposed to all the elements day after day, week after week, with the heavy rains we have had since the storm must deteriorate. It is surprising that some of them are still there; so that the attitude of the Government unnecessarily in prolonging the repairs of these houses has attributed to a greater extent in pushing up the money we have to spend on them.

Now, apparently the Government feels that all they have to do is to come here, beg for money for hurricane repairs, have the money voted and the responsibility ends there. They are nothing at all to do with the way in which the money is squandered, and whether or not it is spent on the purpose for which we voted it. If the Minister of Housing and the Government had as much interest in repairing hurricane-damaged houses as they have in finishing the Ministerial Buildings in Bay Street, nearly all the houses would have been finished already.

It is of little interest to them that they are still a large number of people seeking shelter in factory buildings; and as a matter of fact, this week they have been given notice in the parish of St. Philip that the crop is going to start and they have to get out. I do not know where they are going; but it is the Government's immediate concern to finish the Government Ministerial Building at Bay Street so

as to move into them, because they picture themselves strutting into the offices every morning. It has not occurred to them that a large number of people have not got a shelter over their heads. [A VOICE: They had to get out of the schools too.] Only Government would not think of that. You would have thought that Government would have left over the Public Works' constructions and concentrated on hurricane damaged houses; and it is ridiculous, Sir, to picture the amount of material and labour that it took to finish the buildings in Bay Street along with a notice from the Governor that they are moving in, while after the crop you will find labourers in the country district without a shelter over their heads. Maybe it flatters their sense of responsibility to have these all over the island still seeking shelter where they can find it.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no justification for these houses not being repaired by the 1st January; everyone of them should be finished before. It is for this simple reason that I have come to the conclusion that this hurricane repair programme is being purposely detained in certain districts. There can be no other excuse at all for the incompetence that is being displayed today.

By the time you have got through, Sir, we will have spent over \$2,000,000. Compare that with the estimate given by the Government; especially as they come in here and said they would deal with the entire Resolution because they were certain of this complete survey. What was the total estimate of their first survey? Compare it with the final amount, and you will find two things: either half the money has been squandered; or that the entire programme have been purposely detained and we will spend twice as much as we would have spent. There can be no other reason at all, and of course they are getting the finance for the programme from sources which they should not touch at all because Government has no justification at all in touching Labour Welfare Funds for this purpose. They are taking 50% of the cost of the additional funds for repairing houses and a small amount for the cost of prefabs from the Labour Welfare Fund, while this should be deferred payment for working the Sugar Industry and not for housing programmes. The United Kingdom Government included the amount of these funds in the price of sugar and was specific that the money would be voted for the purpose for which it was set out. This cess on sugar was instituted purely and solely for improvement of conditions in the sugar industry and there is as much justification in using that fund for the Rehabilitation Reserve Fund as there is in using Labour Welfare Funds.

5.15 p.m.

It is basically unfair, and it is a scandal that this Government should take up Labour Welfare Funds to spend on general repairs after a hurricane; there is absolutely no justification for it. The Royal Commission recommended that there should be a cess of 2/- per ton on all sugar produced in the country for improving housing, but that was not done. About eight years after, in negotiating the price —

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is straying from the Resolution. I think the honourable member should keep to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I could not be keeping more to this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution does not tell us anything about sugar.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The Resolution refers to sugar because mention is made of the Labour Welfare Fund; it is a shame to use these funds for repairing houses generally. In Britain they use a

fund for improving the condition of the coal-miners; could you imagine any Government in Great Britain taking money which should be spent in improving the condition of the coal-miners and spending it in general repairs on housing after a flood or after any other disaster? That is what this Government is doing now and there is absolutely no justification for it.

If you have all this money from the Labour Welfare Fund for repairs to housing, why was it not dished out before to the workers to whom it belongs? You have thousands of applications from the sugar workers long before the storm, asking for assistance in the repairing of houses and these people could not get the money. The Government has loaned out the money, they have invested it all over the world and the amount accruing to the fund has never been made available to the sugar workers; and instead of taking this money out of general revenue, they are robbing the sugar workers of the money to which they are entitled and squandering it on hurricane repairs, in mal-administration and according to what some other honourable member have said, they have degraded this matter into a political racket. That is all it is.

In some parishes hurricane houses repairs have been a perfect racket. Every political tout of the Government Party can find a job and some of them feel so sure of themselves that the material is going into their own houses; they are repairing their own houses which were not damaged at all. They are repairing palings and sleepers which no storm has damaged and you will find that people whose houses have been damaged are still scotching all about. That is because the Hurricane housing boss is a political stooge of the Government.

Everytime I pass along Bay Street and see the eagerness with which the Government is pushing that building, every time I get a letter from an old woman or Old Age pensioner that his house has been destroyed and the Government says that he should pay 2s. per week out of his pension for a pre-fabricated house, every time I think of these things I think of the kind of Government which we have in power. There is all haste with the Government Headquarters in Bay Street, but on the other hand there is squandermania and what not in relation to these housing repairs; whenever they are finished, they are finished. It does not matter.

I want to know if the Government really feels that these Old Age pensioners who formerly had shelters over their heads for which they paid no rent at all, can afford to pay 2s. out of the 5s. which they now get as pension towards the cost of a pre-fabricated house. For the last seven years we have been telling the Government that these people cannot live on this 5s. a week. The Government cannot do anything on their own; an expert or a Government servant must do it for them. It was recommended that an increase in the Old Age pension should take place: but now they are telling us that these people must pay 2s. out of the 5s. towards the cost of a pre-fabricated house.

Everyday, even up to today, I am getting letters from Old Age pensioners who cannot see their way to meet the Government's demand with regard to this payment for these pre-fabricated houses. I hope that the people concerned in this matter will realise how the national revenue is being squandered owing to the incompetence of the Government in the matter.

A Government which had said less than two months ago that a little less than \$¼ million would have been sufficient to meet the cost of the hurricane housing repair programme has told us what we have been told today. I told them then that they were

being super-optimistic if they thought that in the manner in which they were carrying on this business this money would have been sufficient. Even a blind man could have seen what was happening; but it really does not matter to them. We were fortunate in finding this accumulation of Labour Welfare money there, so they could pick it up and spend it in any fashion: and therefore they need not have any special regard for their policy or lack of policy in this matter. I have never seen such bungling, such hopeless inefficiency as I have seen in this hurricane repair programme in the two parishes which have been most affected.

5.25 p.m.

Inspectors come and inspectors go. As a matter of fact, there have been some inspectors in these parishes who have recorded it as inconsistent with their self-respect to be part and parcel of the Government Housing Programme and they have refused to work on it. You can ask Mr. Lashley if there are not inspectors who refused to remain working on this programme. Personally, I believe that one of the hardest headaches of the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board is to get men whom he regards as competent and honest enough to supervise the work in the country districts.

Mr. Chairman, if the Government had a proper conception of its responsibility in this matter, there would not have been this large expenditure of money on this housing programme, nor would it have been left to be done in such a casual, off-hand, piecemeal manner. Let me say that the Parochial Authorities had this work first in hand to do; then you said you centralised it; then you left it to be done under the authority of the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board on whose shoulders the administration programme affecting the entire Island rests with out your taking steps to see if he had adequate assistance from the other Departments. Senior officials from other Government Departments should have been seconded to him, not every political tout who works on the side of Labour Party Members, and of whom you know nothing of their character or their background. You should have had responsible senior men from the WaterWorks Department, the Public Works Department and wherever else they could be in charge of this work in the parishes, not every Tom, Dick and Harry, if I may coin the phrase of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. There should be competent men in every area to keep a proper check on everything that is being done.

This Housing Programme is running itself. That is what it has boiled itself down to. The Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board knows as much sometimes of what is happening as the Premier of Soviet Russia: because it is impossible for the Manager-Secretary to be in direct contact with the detailed work of such an extensive programme of work as this is. Every parish should be a special housing representative who should be a competent man, not someone who has been picked up overnight and who knows nothing of the parish. You should have sub-divisions in every parish under the control of a similar type of officer; and if that were done, by now we would have been nearer the end of this programme than we are now. If the average person were to go and look at the work which has been completed in Christ Church and St. Philip he will be amazed at the number of houses which remains to be either repaired or to be replaced by new houses.

I have been very much affected by the complacent manner in which the hon. senior member for St. John seems to look forward to the prolongation of this Housing Programme until after the crop

season. He said so as if it were no matter that the people should be sheltered after this long number of months though we could find the money and the material. I have before me a letter from an old woman of 78 years and she told me that she experienced the 1898 storm and knew of the repairs to people's houses which took place afterwards; and she pointed out that the conditions which existed now are entirely different from that which existed then.

In other words, she meant to say that in 1898 with an arch Conservative Government, which was a Government of planters and merchants (and you can refer to what was done by looking up the debates of this Chamber at that time; I myself have made it my business to look up the debates of what took place then to rehouse the people) there was more general satisfaction, more efficiency and more expeditiousness in the manner in which the sufferings of the community were looked into then than today. Check it up. Check what happened then and what is happening now, and if you have any sense of decency you will be ashamed of yourself.

My personal satisfaction springs from the fact which one hon. member has called a bungling and juggling, that in a matter of this sort it is bound sooner or later to boomerang on the shoulders of those responsible for it and the time will come in the not distant future (it is much too early now) when the amazing revelation will be made on the floor of this House of the manner with which Government permitted large sums of money to be mis-spent and squandered during this Housing Repair Programme.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, it might as well be admitted from the start that almost all of the criticisms both in particular and in substance which have been made in this Committee this afternoon have been made before.

That is quite natural, Sir, in view of the fact that it is a very old problem in the handling of this hurricane rehousing which we are discussing now. We have discussed it four or five times previously and I think that members on this side of the House have to admit with a lot of anger as well as sorrow that the Government has not yet got the hang of what we are trying to tell them when we criticise the hurricane rehousing programme.

Mr. Chairman, to any person outside of this Government it is obvious that the rehousing of the people after the hurricane would be a colossal task, that it would take some time and that it would require large sums of money. Everybody knew that, and they themselves admitted it—they admit it up to now. But you will recall, Sir, that when the first Resolution was brought to this House asking the House in Committee to provide certain sums, I drew the attention of the Committee to the fact which was very well known to everybody else outside of them that a lot of money would be eventually required when a lot more houses would be discovered needing repair than the number they were then giving; and consequently, unless they moved very carefully they were bound to do something which would bring a lot of criticism, and not only criticism, but a lot of hardship.

And what I was careful to stress, Mr. Chairman, was this: that the whole financial operation of rehabilitating in this island after the hurricane should be treated as a matter of very major importance, and should be dealt with precisely as if it were a supplementary budget. Take account of this fact, for instance. When the hurricane occurred the Current Financial Year was half gone. It occurred

at the end of September, and that was the sixth month of the 1955-56 Financial Year. Well, it meant that for the next half of the Financial Year, everything that they had planned or estimated or thought about would prove completely irrelevant to the projects they now have in hand. This was not merely a matter, Mr. Chairman, of finding an extra twenty or thirty thousand dollars, but supplementing what is normally voted or put aside for Hurricane Relief, that is to say, a portion arising from the major disaster involving millions of dollars in damage, and therefore calling for millions of dollars worth of expense. They had therefore, half the Financial Year to do something new, something which was entirely unexpected. Instead, therefore, of scrapping those estimates which had to do with their ordinary capital expenditure on the building of their new buildings and the normal building programme and taking the housing rehabilitation as a part of the normal financial plan, they proceeded on the assumption that it was possible for them to do both things at the same time: and that is why we have had an extraordinary situation in which the Public Works Department started off quite rightly to attend to the hurricane damaged houses and then suddenly was taken off to go back on its normal course of duty with the completion of the Ministerial Buildings. The Housing Board was brought in and given a chance far beyond its competence with very inadequate personnel, and with hardly any directing force whatever.

That being the case, Mr. Chairman, it is not to be wondered at, that so many ugly and distasteful remarks are going around. Who has not heard of lorries of lumber arriving from nowhere and going to destinations not previously spoken of, of materials dropped here on this spot, but moved by secret instructions from here and taken God knows where? Who has not heard of capital losses of money to the Government involved even in the payment of workmen. All of these rumours are coming to the ears of members of the House. It therefore means that we are heading for a scandal of very large proportion if we are not already there, and all of it I submit springs from the fact that this Government has not treated this matter with the seriousness which it deserves.

This was something that should have appeared to be so serious and so important to them that almost everything else they were doing which could be dropped should be dropped like hot bricks, and this matter attended to. It would have been the best thing to come to this House and say that six or seven million dollars (or whatever they thought a generous estimate would be) is what was required, and that the expenditure of this money would be split up as follows: food, housing repairs, money grants, grants for furniture and clothing, and things like that. Though the revenue to be used would be general revenue, the Sugar Funds may have been brought in and I agree in this connection with the hon. senior member for St. Philip; it is one-sided and disgraceful to use one of the Sugar Funds and not the others—and in the revenue for this supplementary budget which they should have brought in covering the last half of the financial year, they should have given an estimate of what money they thought they were likely to receive from the United Kingdom, from private sympathisers and from the various funds collected.

Having done that, it would be possible for them to plan their expenses in a much more sound and reasonable way. They would not be presenting the spectacle of not knowing what they were doing by asking for large sums of money every two weeks.

5.45 p.m.
I cannot put it too strongly, Mr. Chairman, that with every day that passes, all of us who are outside

of this Government get the impression that they themselves are not aware of what is actually happening. We feel that if they were aware of what was happening the things of which we complain would not be happening to them. I do not know how the Minister of Housing feels about this, but it is a terrible thing to have to admit publicly that you have to check the estimates which have been given by persons whom you have asked to make the estimates, and in whom you must have had some confidence.

Apart from anything else, that is an indication that the machinery is out of gear and the Government itself must be at a loss to understand what it should do. Unless the whole rehabilitation programme is centrally directed, unless the Minister or the Government has all the ends of the strings in his hands, they will not be able either to repair the people's houses or to safeguard the people's money.

I do not know whether any member of this Committee would be prepared to say with any accuracy that he could keep track of the large sums of money which we have so far spent. It must be nearly \$3 million, probably nearer \$4 million; and before we are through we will have spent perhaps another million dollars. On the basis on which they work and from what the Government has told us this afternoon, they have no means of knowing when all of this will be finished. On their own admission, since building costs are likely to be increased, it would appear to me that we are likely to be asked to provide still more money.

It is not good enough, Mr. Chairman, and this ought to be an occasion for worry to all the members of this House. Here it is: we are in the month of January, 1956; the financial year will end at the end of March, and in the months of October and November in which, presumably the Estimates for the next financial year are being prepared, that is the time when we have had to re-organise the whole economy of the island to meet a disaster. It would be interesting to see what effect or influence on the next budget this hurricane has had; that would be interesting indeed. The money, certainly to a certain extent, is being unaccountably spent.

The next thing is that this House ought to get from the Government an assurance that the tax payers of this island are not losing their money in a way in which it would be hard to trace, and in a manner in which they cannot recover it. The next thing on which an assurance ought to be given, and which has not yet been given, is that the people who have really suffered from the hurricane are the people whose houses will have been repaired or replaced when all is said and done.

I can remember, Mr. Chairman, the first occasion on which the Minister of Housing gave us some idea—admittedly it was early in the Emergency—of what houses had been repaired or damaged and what had been destroyed. I think that at that time the figures, so far as my memory serves me, were that the houses damaged were 4,000 or over.

What surprises and terrifies me, Mr. Chairman, is that every time we discuss this matter, I notice that there is an alarming increase in the figures given as to the houses that have been repaired. Of course, it may be argued that a preliminary count may reveal a certain number and a more detailed subsequent investigation will give you a larger figure. But even if you admit the Minister said that they were 4,000 or 4,500 houses damaged, and you admit that the number was nearer to 7,000 than 4,000, yet you would expect to hear that at least 7,000 or 8,000 houses have been repaired.

When you get a number like 11,000 and 12,000 houses damaged with a possibility that even more might be discovered, you begin to be seriously alarmed. You become alarmed because while a difference

of a few hundred houses might be admissible, a difference of 3,000 is an amazing thing, and there seems to be a blunder somewhere. If the Government has some method of really ascertaining the number of houses which have been actually destroyed and damaged, it would be a blessed thing even for them, because they will then know how much money they have spent or ought to have spent. I fear, from what we have heard this afternoon, that there is still room for a certain amount of doubt that we will know these figures with any certain degree of accuracy.

I have always said that it is a great dereliction of duty on the part of this Government not to prepare an overall supplementary Budget covering the last six months of the financial year, because their whole Capital works programme had to be modified, amended, and in some cases scuttled as a result of the hurricane. If the Housing Authority set up under the new Bill has actually been working, they would have discovered that they would have had to stop whatever they had been doing on September 22 last year and take over the whole housing rehabilitation occasioned by the hurricane. You cannot do these things by half measures and the best way of doing them is to know what you are about. The large sums involved must give rise to public disquiet over public expenditure when a Government, in 3½ months can be given more than \$3 million dollars to spend and still wants more, and when that Government, by its own admission, cannot give an assurance that every penny is being well spent. It is time that there should be an inquiry; and even in their own minds they should be the first persons to settle the mind of the public on that scope.

5.55 p.m.

One of the significant factors of this whole post-hurricane period has been of course the absence through illness of the Hon. Premier who is the Minister of Finance. It is really surprising to me, since he has been well enough to resume some of his public duties, that he has not, so far as we know, taken this matter seriously in hand to give the public assurance in any matter which he might choose on the spending of its money. When in three months of any financial year you find yourself committed to an expenditure of several millions of dollars on only one aspect of your problems, it is time to reassure the public that all is well.

On the technical matters of the house building as to whether a prefabricated or other house which they are building is serviceable and will stand up to another hurricane, I have no direct knowledge and in that matter I have to be guided by people who know. I am told by carpenters and others, both those concerned with the building of these houses and those who are not, that there are many defects in the structure which could be remedied and which would render these houses inoperative against the sort of disaster which made their building necessary.

I am further told that the estimated cost of prefabricated houses is exorbitant according to the knowledge and experience of people who build houses; and if both these things are true (and I hope the Hon. Minister of Housing will say something on both: That is, if the houses are not as strong as they should be and if they are costing more than they need to cost), I am wondering if a swindle is not being practised on the people of this Island.

It is all well to hold ostentatious ceremonies when a new Aided Self-Help Housing Scheme is to be opened and to speak platitudes and half-truths about what the Government is doing about

its housing problem; but while Aided Self-Help Housing is going on at a proper pace and the other Housing Programme unconnected with the hurricane is being built, yet there remains this full problem of homeless people who are being crowded together to be remedied; and the Government's attitude to the problem, as outlined by the Hon. Minister of Housing, does not give me the assurance that the problems are being tackled in the right way. Members should not be afraid of being critical of Government's policy in this matter because it so happens that one of the members of Government represents a constituency which is hardest hit by the hurricane; and I should imagine that he of all people should know that there is some substance in the criticisms that are offered.

I think that the rest of the people in the island who are suffering privations as the result of the hurricane are hoping that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries will bring to bear his experience of his own constituency on the attitude of Government and would see that his colleagues realise that what has happened in Christ Church is happening to a less extent in other places, and that the rehabilitation of the population after the hurricane is the same in kind, if not in degree.

Mr. Chairman, one last word with respect to this matter and it is only in emphasis of a particular matter. This Government has a reputation for spending public money very easily and not always with the best results. It is a reputation which any Government will find it hard to live down because the records are there to prove.

I only counsel members of this Government to believe that members on this side of the House are speaking the truth when they give voice to the grave disquiet which is felt in this community in the mishandling of this situation: and I am also asking them to believe us when we say that there are very ugly rumours going about which, if they are true, would, as I have said before, provoke a scandal of major proportions in this Island. [Laughter.] They can laugh us to scorn; but if they can prove that what we say we heard is not true, everybody would be happier for it. It is not that their own welfare as a Government is my prime concern; as a matter of fact it is not my concern at all. What concerns me is that whoever has to succeed them as a Government will find it normally difficult to take over and administer this country after the muddle they have left behind.

It is therefore in the interest of all the people in this island: and I am asking members of the Government to take heed and to beware and to make it doubly certain that the things which we on this side of the House say we fear (and indeed we do fear) have no grounds; and the criticisms which we have made of their policies which shook them out of their confounded complacency and made them realise that the people of this island employ them as servants are unwarranted: and that they should do the work which they are put to do efficiently and with care of the money which has been spent by them. Public Servants, especially those who have been elected, should always have an uneasy conscience about these matters because apart from anything else which concerns politics, it is in times of disaster that people come either to trust or distrust their representatives: and it is no use boasting of your power or of the authority which you wield. It is no use your telling the people how good a constitution they have had, if their own institutions are being undermined by the awful muddle, bungling and uncertainty which

exist and which ought to have been cleared up many weeks ago.
6.05 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I promise not to be long, but I cannot allow certain statements made by some hon. members to go unchallenged. First of all, the hon. junior member for Christ Church said that the Government was in the case of roofed houses only repairing one house and leaving the other two or one as the case may be without repairs. That is a statement which has absolutely no foundation of truth; and if the member was as interested in his constituency as he claims to be, I am sure that he would have seen in his parish let alone other parishes, that there are many two-roofed houses whose roofs had been replaced, and even in some cases shedroofs have been repaired—[A VOICE: Not in St. John!] You do not know St. John well enough.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to repeat the statement he has just made. He said even shedroofs have been replaced.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, that is a speech! On what is he interrupting me?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear on what he is speaking.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am asking Sir, for a confirmation of the remarks the Hon. Minister has just made that the Government is authorising the repair on shedroofs in St. Philip. No shedroofs at all have been repaired and every single authority in St. Philip thought the Ministers and the Government had given instructions that no shedroofs must be touched.

Hon. M. E. COX: I cannot speak like him; I will bring facts and figures.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I do not want facts and figures.

Hon. M. E. COX: They can get up and say anything at any time. The member also said they were no repairs to stone buildings. Where the roofs on stone buildings can be repaired, the Secretary of the Housing Board has instructions to repair roofs on buildings belonging to persons who fall within the category of poor people.

I have already pointed out that where one owned a small house—a house of a lesser value than a wooden house—and the wooden house can qualify for repairs, there is no reason why the stone house cannot. I have no figures to show how many roofs have been replaced. But the policy is to repair all houses belonging to persons who fall within the category of poor persons.

Now, the hon. junior member for Christ Church in his ranting, said that I said in my speech that the Government is spending one and a quarter million dollars, and that is as much as we could do. I will forgive him because of his association with J. & R. rum over the holidays just gone!

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that; but he is incapable of understanding the Queen's English.

Hon. M. E. COX: But nothing of that has ever been mentioned — half million, million or anything like that; so that to get up here and quote that is absurd. Now, Sir, the hon. junior member for the City as usual makes a lot of noise and hears a lot of things, but whenever you ask him to give information he —

Mr. LEWIS: That is nothing. I was not one of the members who said that.

Hon. M. E. COX: The member referred to the whole setup as a racket.

Mr. LEWIS: But you said it was a racket.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, he labelled it as a racket. And if he were the responsible individual in this community as he claims to be, and he knew that something was wrong in Government Depart-

ments, it was his duty to report it to the proper authorities. It is a saying, "He who sleeps upon his watch trespasseth upon his duty and may as well go over to the enemy." If he knew that something was going wrong, knew all about this racket, knew all about the bad administration of the housing setup, should he not have reported to the Ministry which is responsible for it—[A VOICE: You can fool little children.]

Mr. Chairman, everybody knows from the time the hurricane came on us and I made a broadcast (and I also said it in the House of Assembly) we did not have the machinery nor the men to cope with the catastrophe which visited us on 22nd September. Everybody knows that we had a lot of people coming forward as carpenters who borrowed hammers.

6.15 p.m.

We had to accept them until we found out that they were not really carpenters. We had all sorts of people coming in, and in our hurry and sympathy to get the people back in their houses as quickly as possible we hired anybody that came along. We cannot tie people's hands and tell them that they must be honest; that is nothing which we could control. If you know that people are dishonest and you fail to report that, then you are condoning the thing about which you have complained. [Mr. LEWIS: You are the person condoning the whole thing].

The hon. senior member for St. John spoke about the Government not finishing houses and referred to the windows and doors of houses. The hon. member or any reasonable person will appreciate the fact that the provision of windows and doors is expensive. In addition to that, it takes some time to build these windows and doors.

The Government's policy has not been to repair windows and doors but rather to put back these houses as quickly as possible, and make them habitable and go on to other houses which are lying on the ground. In cases where windows and doors are not supplied, it is not too much to ask the owners of houses to build their own windows and doors. [Mr. ALLDER: Admitting that you are not completing the house.] You cannot stop to repair every hole in a house; there are too many houses which are on the ground to stop every little crease or crevice in a house.

The hon. member also referred to the loans which are administered by the Labour Welfare Organisation. It is true that there has been some delay in granting these loans to people, but there again the persons who are being used as Inspectors were drawn into this hurricane re-housing organisation in order to expedite the repairs of these houses. We were short-staffed: and it is not true to say that the granting of loans has been suspended, but rather that the tempo of the granting of the loans has been reduced. The granting of loans has not been suspended: but the loans are not granted at the same rate as formerly, because the majority of the staff is occupied in the hurricane re-housing programme.

Reference was made to the number of prefabricated houses to be provided and the hon. junior member for Christ Church said that these 250 additional "pre-fab" houses which are provided for in this Resolution should be given to the parish of Christ Church. I quite agree with that; you could give that parish 2,000 houses, but on the figures which we have, the last report on the 20th of last month revealed that there were 479 houses permanently destroyed. And when you subtract 271 from the 500, you will get 229 of the 500 which we had already agreed to construct, and which, I believe have been almost constructed. When you subtract the 229 from

the 479 you will get 250, and that is why we have come down for these 250 houses which, we feel, would be sufficient to meet the demands in so far as the houses which have been permanently destroyed are concerned.

Hon. members will also appreciate the fact that you have 120 terraced houses which will also take the place of a considerable number of houses which were permanently destroyed. I do not know where the hon. member got his figures from, but the report reveals that there were 472 permanently destroyed and we agreed on 500; 271 had been sited up to then, 310 have been sited to today and as I have said, when you subtract 229 from 479 you have 250. That is how we have arrived at the figure stated in this Resolution.

The hon. senior member for St. Philip as usual has offered criticism in this matter. Of course, quite a number of hon. members talked about this matter of rehousing being a political racket, they talked about Government stooges being used in this set-up and all that nonsense. I will tell you this, Mr. Chairman: there are not a quarter as many people in important positions in this set-up who were supporters of the Government as compared with the number who I happen to know have always been enemies of ours, and people who have been pushed in by the Opposition; for instance, in St. Philip we had two bad cases; there was a man called Ashby, who up to 1951 elections was a supporter of the hon. senior member for St. Philip, and another called Tudor from Beckles Road, who instead of going up there and doing his work, took the hon. member around the various villages and made a fuss saying that the work was proceeding too slowly. He said that two gangs more should be brought on and on the next day the two gangs were on.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I object most strongly to those remarks which the hon. senior member for St. Michael has made. I never heard a plainer and more unvarnished mis-statement of truth in any part of this island. The first man to whom the hon. member has referred, is such a close collaborator and stooge of the Government that up to day he was at the house of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. [Laughter]. As far as the other man Tudor is concerned, he has never carried me anywhere in St. Philip. On the other hand, in my capacity as a representative of the parish of St. Philip, I have been to the parish and Tudor followed me; I wanted to see that the people's houses got repaired. I had a long list of people who brought letters to me in this connection.

I am replying to what he says and I am objecting to his mis-statement which is made to mislead the Committee.

6:25 p.m.

Hon. M. E. COX: That is not a mis-statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is absolutely one. Let me again repeat that Mr. Tudor was appointed by them and he refused to remain on the job because he could not tolerate the position. He did not stay a week.

Hon. M. E. COX: I am still satisfied that what I said is not a mis-statement. At one time we were accused of playing politics and at another time they are saying something different. On the one hand the senior member for St. Philip said that if I were as interested in the repair of those houses damaged by the hurricane as I was in the construction of the Ministerial Building in Bay Street, those houses would have been finished already. They have accused us of playing politics because we are repairing more houses than what was on the original survey. They said that the original survey was correct because it was made

by the Police and the hon. junior member for St. Andrew referred to it in his speech. He referred to the Police as being an independent and non-political body, therefore as a result of that the survey made by them was a perfect one.

Hon. members will remember that that survey disclosed that there were about 4,000 houses permanently destroyed and 3,000 odd which were rendered uninhabitable. Now, because the last survey reveals that more houses than those were damaged and permanently destroyed, he is saying we are dragging on this programme; although everybody knows that the survey taken by the Police was done hurriedly. He is saying that we should have accepted the survey made by the Police. The Government having brought in other people to survey, they have accused us of playing politics; but of course if they did not say something, knowing that this is election year, they would not have been regarded as having any political sense. The hon. senior member for St. Philip suggested that we must have honest men to supervise the work in all the parishes.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I said that you need senior responsible Civil Servants to be seconded to the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board to help him to get on with his work. I said further that you cannot pick up, coining the phrase of the hon. senior member for St. Joseph, every Tom, Dick and Harry to do this work as there is too much money involved.

Hon. M. E. COX: I wrote down what the hon. member said. He said that in the country districts you should have honest men to supervise the work.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I referred to the necessity of having senior Civil Servants with a sense of responsibility on secondment to the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board to be put in charge of work in the country districts, because it was impossible for Mr. Lashley, the Manager-Secretary of the Housing Board, to supervise the work done over the entire Island and to be responsible for the details also. He cannot know everything that is going on; he cannot possibly know everything that is going on.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, while I do not intend to continue in that trend, the hon. member said at first that we should have seconded senior officials on this work, then later on he said that we should get honest men to supervise the work in the country districts which meant to say that the people whom we have working are all dishonest people. The hon. junior member for St. Lucy then got up and talked of the dropping of lumber by the people in the employ by the Housing Board and of his having secret information of some of it being removed from one place to another.

I have heard of two cases and they have been investigated. I think the people were dismissed but I am still appealing to hon. members who have got information about any dishonesty that is going on to bring it to the notice, if not of the Housing Board, to the Ministry and I can assure hon. members that those individuals will be dealt with accordingly.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Hon. Minister of Communications got up and made it clear that the policy of the Government is to repair shedroofs and more than one gable of houses. I am glad he made that statement because I know, and I have been told, and I have seen that that is not done: and they know that it is no use their saying that these people are repairing more than one gable. They are repairing one gable only and they are not even repairing them promptly.

I am glad that he made that statement because I will certainly tell the people that come to me that they can expect Government to repair their shedroof and if they have a house of two gables and both are damaged they will get both repaired. I thank him very much for saying so.

Mr. LEWIS: I am going to ask the Minister of Housing one question. When he started his speech introducing this Resolution, did he not say that the Hon. Minister of Social Services had in all good faith given information to the effect that the Resolution he introduced was the last and the end of rehabilitation? Will he say that he said so now?

Hon. M. E. COX: You could not be my school-master.

Mr. LEWIS: It is impossible to teach you anything. You said that the Hon. Minister of Social Services was misled on the last occasion and you come in today and say that the people who misled the Minister on the last occasion are perfectly honest people and that there is nothing wrong; it is only a little misinformation and you go on to say further that as to the fellows whom you suspect you are keeping a secret check on them.

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I never said that. I said that I am using the same supervisors along with some independents to make spot checks.

Mr. LEWIS: The honourable member said he was making spot checks which is much the same as secret checks, because they are independent persons doing it and not people who are connected with them, and in some cases he will carry some of those that were taken on the last occasion; so he knows on whom he is going to use those spot checks. For the first time the Hon. Minister of Housing has admitted that something is wrong with the Housing Programme and if he admits that, that will be an honest opinion. I have got all this information about your being deceived and being given wrong figures out of your own mouth.

The honourable member comes in here today and says words to the effect that it is a racket. I have accused him all along of making political capital out of this thing and I will excuse him because that is a failing of persons who should be in politics. The very first meeting of this House to give consideration to this matter was a political move and it is a fact that everyone of these Resolutions that come in here dealing with this matter has been brought in here to be dealt with in a hurry. Everytime they have been brought in here the Minister has said "We must get through with them quickly; we must get them done today or the work is going to stop." None of them has ever come in to be dealt with in the proper way to show that you have given some thought and consideration to what you are doing. The Minister came in here for money to build a School, but with the criticisms, they have had to abandon it.

6 35 p.m.

The honourable member for St. Philip did not know how to reply to him. He was not building a school at all, but with this long behind hand and with all the political information, he was still going on with the building programme. I say, your record is a bad one and there is no Government that will get on in the same way as you are getting on in this island. You should ask for mercy. It is not your money you are spending and you have a right to be business-like with it. You have started up Ministerial Status for other islands to follow and your record is most unfortunate, and you know it; and when an important Resolution comes up the Hon. Minister said that he was out of the island.

Hon. M. E. COX: I never said that.

Mr. LEWIS: You said you were out of the island. The information I have been hearing is this: that he wrote a letter to the Reverend gentleman in St. Andrew telling him that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew was to be in charge. Is he going to deny writing the letter? Just like that the lumber was moved from his premises to the premises of the hon. senior member for St. Andrew. [VOICES: Shame! Shame!] But the Reverend gentleman had a good record down there. Have you signed such a letter? I want you to get up and deny that you have done that; that you have put the senior member for St. Andrew in charge of the distribution of lumber in that parish. Get up and do it, because I wish strongly to help you to counteract this thing. I know that you have been making it a political issue—and the matter in Christ Church should be investigated; the member of that constituency can deny that your policy is to repair shedroofs, and now you say you are going to bring the facts another time. Did you forget that you had this Resolution to do today? Are you worthy of being called competent at all? You ought to be ashamed of your display. You do not even know now whether you repaired shedroofs or not, and you are the man in charge of the policy. You ought to know the number that are not repaired.

I said, and I say again, that this is a lamentable display by this Government. You abandoned building the school on the Bay Pasture and the Foundation School, because the criticism that went on in this place caused it to be postponed, and you mean to tell me that after you had got the assistance, you did not withdraw it but had to wait until it got to the Other Place. Well, I tell you, sir, if the Minister for Housing is not ashamed of what has gone on—

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I am not replying to anything; but I would like to know where the honourable junior member for the City got his facts, and inasmuch as the Reverend in charge had a clear and clean record, to find out why they should be crying "Shame! Shame!"

Mr. LEWIS: I did not say a thing about the character of the person put in charge. I am asking if it is not a fact that you were put in charge by the Minister.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, what has really mystified me, sir, is that there should be no item of greater importance affecting the Ministry of Housing today than repairing hurricane damaged houses; and it is amazing the colossal nonsense the Ministry has displayed as regards the policy of Government in repairing these damaged houses. From the very beginning, all he has done is to come in here every time we have to vote for money for this purpose and display the little he knows about what is going on in the Department for which he is responsible.

When we had the first Resolution, he said that the Government was employing all the people they could get for doing repairs to houses at a time when the Director of Public Works, Captain Tomlin, could not get into the Public Works yard because of the large number of people who were at the Offices looking for work—people from all over the island; and the Minister for Housing has said in the most bombastic way that they were employing all the people they could get. And now, he crowns it today by making a most absurd statement ever made that at the Labour Welfare Department the tempo of loans was not being maintained but they were still fending money. It is not true. Either he is misleading the House or the Department is telling lies on the Gov-

ernment. But the Government is sending millions of dollars outside to be invested and taking out money from the Labour Welfare Fund since the hurricane. Since the hurricane they were turning back applicants, at a time, Sir, when the Government who said they knew what they were doing, and a Minister who has no sort of ability at all, should have ensured that the Labour Welfare Department had increased their staff to deal with them.

6.45 p.m.

If a house has been damaged and the owner or occupier goes to borrow money to repair it, you do not lend him because you would not get it back after that; that is sheer nonsense. I would not have expected the Minister to display such a thing. The Department has been instructed not to lend people any money. The Manager was on pre-retirement leave; he was not there at all. When people came to me they stated that the Minister has instructed the Department not to lend out any money. You are taking up the tax payers' money and repairing houses as a gift; but when the people will repair them themselves, the ignorant Minister tells the Department not to lend out any money. The people who sit in office have no foresight unless the members of the Opposition tell them to do something, and then they depend on Civil Servants to put into operation what we tell them to do.

Now I see what the Government's policy is the position is clear to me; they want to keep the money in the Department so as to spend it in this housing repair programme. There is no justification for repairing these houses out of the Labour Welfare Fund. I am waiting to see if there is going to be any fundamental change in the policy of the Labour Welfare Department after this. They are thousands of applicants who would be glad to get a little money from the Labour Welfare Department; people have been approaching me and the Manager will tell you that I made myself a nuisance to him, constantly telephoning him about this money. I have been told repeatedly: "Our instructions are not to advance any money now."

The final thing is this question of repairing shed-roofs and kitchens. On the last occasion when we discussed this question, I asked the Government to include kitchens and shed-roofs in this housing repair programme, because one hon. member shouted across the table to me at the time: "I do not think we can do that." The Housing Authorities in St. Philip have repeatedly told every person in the parish that the Government has said: "We cannot repair shed-roofs and kitchens." I can take any hon. member of the Government to Cox Hill and show them numbers of cases in which the houses have been repaired and the shed-roofs have been left in the same condition. And the Minister of Housing has said that they are repairing shed-roofs! If shed-roofs are being repaired, it is the same thing which took place after the Constitution flood; after that flood people who did not even live near the flood area, people living in Bush Hall, Brittons Hill and so on, had their houses repaired. If these shed-roofs are being repaired they are only repairing them through the advocacy of certain people. I am glad to hear now that the Government has decided to repair shed-roofs; I will relay that information in the district before the week is out and then we will find out what the position is. I am sure that when Mr. Lashley hears that to-night—in fact, I am wondering whether he will be able to sleep. All Mr. Lashley's estimates for repairing the hurricane damage are based only on repairs to front houses, not to shed-roofs; therefore, if they are repairing shed-roofs now, they will have to come back here for a lot more money.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: There is one question which I would like to get clarified by the Minister and it is this. To those of us who cherish parliamentary institutions and dislike any aspect of dishonesty, corruption, or chicanery, anything which savours of unparliamentary conduct should be made clear. I say it here, and I intend to say it elsewhere. The charge which has been laid here today, and others which I have heard, but which I do not intend to raise now, is that the Minister of Housing gave instructions—written instructions—that the authority for this relief should be taken away from the Reverend Woodroffe and given to the honourable senior member for St. Andrew. If that is not true, it should be flatly denied so that our public life can be on a plane on which it should be. How are you going to preach honesty in a community when it is believed that people in high places can act in such a manner and go on like that?

The honourable senior member for St. Andrew has made a statement to the effect that her integrity can be compared with that of anybody else, but that does not say that the Minister did not give instructions which it has been said were given. If that is so, the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has no right with the distribution of hurricane relief, unless she is the only Labour member in this Chamber. There are other matters which will be dealt with on another basis; when it comes to public interest, any Minister should be able to say something about it.

It is true that what I have heard sitting here involves such persons in this Chamber that I believe, if the public ever gets to know this situation, it would be a public scandal, more or less putting our politics on a level with the Tammany Hall politics in the United States of America. [Cheers] All you need to do is to get in power and all the little satellites will come around you and you will give out your gifts. The Barbados Government has so much freed itself from that, that wherever I go—Well, we had a charge in respect of the British Union Oil Company, but nobody has offered me money for committing any bribes. All I say is this: now that we have instituted Ministerial Status, and it is now going on, any aspect of nepotism or any aspect of bribery, is something from which all self-respecting people should try to exonerate themselves.

Mr. TUDOR: I too, like the hon. junior member for St. Peter, must raise my voice in this matter. The charge has been specifically made in this House by the hon. junior member for the City, that the Hon. Minister for Housing has written a letter to the Chairman of the Hurricane Relief Committee in St. Andrew, who happens to be the Rector of that parish instructing that person to hand over lumber and the administration of housing hurricane repairs to a member of this House, that member being the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

6.55 p.m.

The first and perhaps the most serious aspect of this thing is that in his action the Minister of Housing was sort of inferring about the statutory Chairman of the Hurricane Relief Committee that he thought him a dishonest person. That is the first inference to be drawn. That is an insult coming from one Minister to another member of the Party. The second inference to be drawn is this: that members of that Party have some special qualifications over other members of this House to be singled out for certain privileges which they feel other members should not have. I have heard all I want to know. I am glad to see the Head of the Government is sitting in his place and noting all

these facts. If he feels that the Minister's statement is incorrect he should instruct his Minister —

Hon. M. E. COX: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. I have never written anything but I would appeal to the honourable member to let us have a debate on that.

Mr. TUDOR: The Minister should say who wrote the letter. When the honourable senior member for St. Andrew spoke, she never gave the House the impression that she had not received any such authority. She merely said that her integrity could be matched, presumably, against Father Woodroffe's or against the Minister's.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the debate.

Mr. TUDOR: That has a lot to do with the debate. The appeal honourable members have had from the Hon. Minister of Housing is that we should not withhold disquieting rumours from him and he has even asked us to extend out services by becoming informers. What this House still wants to know is whether what has been charged against him and against the honourable senior member for St. Andrew is correct. Has there been a letter written to the Rector of the parish or to the Churchwarden? To whom has it been written? If the honourable senior member for St. Andrew did not derive her authority from the Minister of Housing, from whom did she derive it? I happen to know how the latter came by her authority. I am making no reflection on her work in administering the Hurricane Relief in St. Andrew.

Mrs. BOURNE: Get the facts and stop talking.

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, they have it within their power to set their own minds at rest. If it is a fact —

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. This is not the Annual Estimates which we are considering when the whole Department is an issue. I appreciate your difficulty because things will happen in all Parliaments; but both the Minister and the hon. member have said that the facts are not right. Should we go on with this until midnight?

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, what I heard was to the effect that the hon. senior member for St. Andrew did not deny anything. She said "get your facts and see if that is so." The inference is that the Minister has got a good record.

Mr. TUDOR: I do not know why the hon. senior member for St. Joseph interrupted me because it is obvious to me that we are not investigating anything dealing with a Government Department. The charge is that a Minister of his Government wrote a letter giving certain instructions to a person not under Government's authority to do something for a member of that Party. As long as we are discussing Hurricane Relief and any matter to do with the hurricane, some latitude should be given to this Committee to deal with anything on that part and it is no use your saying that we should have a debate on the matter. We can have it now. The Hon. Minister of Housing can say that he wrote a letter or not. He might not have written it to the Rector. All he has to say is: "I have written a letter to So and So on the basis of the facts which I have at my disposal and I am prepared to make known those facts."

7.05 p.m.

But I hope that they realise that this is a very serious matter indeed. I mean the very least the Premier could do instead of interrupting me is to say what the true facts of the matter are, if he knows; because it may be that it is something not

being a Government matter concocted between the Minister and the party concerned. It is not my intention to prolong the debate by grumbling on the matter, but it is important enough to warrant some explanation. If it had been substantiated that the Minister had done a thing like that, his resignation should be asked for immediately, and if a charge like that has been made, the Minister or the Head of the Government should have taken steps immediately to deny it [A VOICE: You want the portfolio?] I should like at this time to remind the Minister that it would not be for him to give me a portfolio. The Head of my party will have that power which he may give or withhold. So, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry all this has happened. I feel very distressed to hear anything like that, and I hope that both Ministers concerned, the Head of the Government and the Minister of Housing, will lay the true facts before the public because it is now public property, and we are all now waiting to hear the truth about it, because it is going to be discussed in the interest of the parties concerned. The facts should be known.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks which have been made against the Hon. Minister I should like to ask that some statement be made to remove . . .

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, again, I make an appeal to you. This is a Resolution for money to spend on houses to be repaired, and they bring in accusations against the Minister as regards conduct in running the Ministry. The Public Works Department was charged with doing something and the parties concerned, the Minister himself and the hon. senior member for St. Andrew have both denied the charge. I repeat, it is impossible not to have some irrelevant matter to be debated in every Assembly. I submit that it has reached a stage now where hon. members should see that this part of the discussion should stop as they are several accusations and if this is permitted some would go further, especially since the members are telling the Minister he *must* answer.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether the Hon. Minister would clear up the accusations rather than leaving it at that.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: If the hon. member or members can prove any case of misconduct by any Minister, I would be the first to —

Mr. ALLDER: I am not making any charge. I have heard the facts made by hon. members and if he knows that the facts are incorrect he should make some statement to clear the air.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to show that I have not gone wrong in what I have done. This is a Resolution for Hurricane Relief and Repairs to houses, and we were told that this was something to do with lumber for houses. Can the senior member for St. Joseph say it is irrelevant? You discovered that you have not only got wrong information, but that the houses will cost more and still they accuse me of saying that they were racketeering. I think it is time to tell them what I have heard because I can prove it. I told him that he did write a letter to the effect and the senior member for St. Andrew did not deny that she was put in charge.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, I must object. I never said that the information had anything to do with his character.

Mr. LEWIS: I said that the man had a good record, but I cannot find out what is the truth.

Mrs. BOURNE: Mr. Chairman, it is not true; and I must object to that. If he is uncertain as to what I said, I can ask for the debate.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, if she says that I said he had a good record . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear her say that.

Mr. LEWIS: Did she confirm it?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I draw your attention to Rule 134. I think honourable members who are concerned with this question have said that we have not got the facts right I happen to know that this is true. I appeal to the House in a matter not strictly relevant to this debate. It has gone so far that it is leading to a quarrel between members. I appeal to members in agreeing to the discontinuance of this debate.

7:15 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of hon. members to Rule 134. It reads as follows:—

"The House will interfere to prevent the prosecution of any quarrel between members, arising out of debates or proceedings of the House, or any Committee thereof."

I am appealing to hon. members. For the whole afternoon I have been hearing: "Asides," "Out of Order," and things of that sort. I feel that this is a Resolution for the repair of houses which have been damaged by the hurricane and all the debate hinges on that. That is why I did not stop any hon. member. [Cheers]. In this particular instance relative to lumber going to St. Andrew, that would be in the same Resolution. I did not want hon. members to think that I did not want them to express their opinion and that is why I did not refer to this matter before. However, I am now appealing to hon. members who want to speak on this Resolution, to speak on the Resolution; if they do that until morning I am quite willing to sit here and hear them. But on this particular question of wanting me or the Hon. Minister to say more than what I have said, or what he has said, well, he has said that he did not write anything to anybody. [A MEMBER: He did not say that he did not write a letter to anybody.] I would not want you to correct me even if I am wrong. The Hon. Minister said that he has not written to anybody in connection with any instance; anybody in St. Andrew. The lady member of this House has said that the hon. member should try to get his facts right before putting them before the Committee. There is nothing to prevent anybody from saying anything he likes.

Mr. LEWIS: I have mentioned a rumour which was brought to me. The hon. member should have ended up by saying that he has not written any letter concerning what took place. Could not the hon. senior member for St. Andrew explain what the facts are?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As far as the lady member and the Hon. Minister of Housing are concerned, I feel that they have put the matter very clearly. I am therefore not entertaining anymore of that.

Mr. TUDOR: This is a matter of expending large sums of money on hurricane housing rehabilitation and while it is true that certain parishes and parts of the island require less money to be spent on them than others, yet at the same time hon. members of this Committee have to be so mindful of the taxpayers' interest, that the rumour of any irregularity in the spending of money or in the repairing of houses must cause us some disquiet. I have listened to what the Hon. Minister of Housing has said with a certain amount of interest, but I became more and more convinced that this Government is very unhappy about its position in that it cannot assure the House on any point on which the House wants an assurance. We do not know if the Permanent Secretary wrote the letter from his Department; we do not know if in the administration of

hurricane rehabilitation in a particular parish whether letters have gone out from the Permanent Secretary—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled that as far as this letter is concerned, I am not entertaining anything about it. I am quite willing to hear anything in connection with the Resolution; nobody knows if a letter has been written at all.

Mr. TUDOR: You will therefore put us in a rather awkward position because we cannot discuss anything which they bring in.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I say that I am not entertaining anything about the letter; I will listen to any debate relative to the Resolution.

Mr. TUDOR: What is it that you are not entertaining, Mr. Chairman? [Hon. G. H. ADAMS: That is playing with the Committee.] He should be the last person to intervene in this debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He who?

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: It will choke him to say "Premier."

Mr. TUDOR: I mean your colleague. What are you entertaining, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Nothing concerning any letter written to any Chairman in any parish.

7.25 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR: Well then, let us put it in this way. As regards to persons in each parish who are in charge of hurricane rehabilitation, what is the nature of their appointment? Are they appointed by the Governor-in-Executive Committee, or by the local Hurricane Relief Committee? Or do they owe their appointment to directives from the Ministry of Housing?

That is really the important point. How therefore has the particular person got his or her authority? I refer to the authority which the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has. How has it derived? They cannot argue now that I am speaking irrelevantly because she possesses authority and they are also other people who possess that authority.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing about authority given to the honourable senior member for St. Andrew in this Resolution. I do not see anything of that in it.

Mr. TUDOR: There is something fishy and very disreputable going on.

Hon. Dr. H. G. H. CUMMINS: Mr. Chairman, I object to that remark about fishy and disreputable; and I am asking that those words be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Social Services is objecting to the remark used by the honourable junior member for St. Lucy and about "fishy and disreputable."

Mr. TUDOR: Mr. Chairman, of course I do withdraw them. Sir, I hope you will appreciate the position of members of this House. We are here considering the grant of a large sum of money for the repair of people's houses and for the building of prefabricated houses. The question which therefore arises is who has the authority to look over these matters. It is not therefore so very unfortunate that I am discussing one aspect of this matter because at least in one parish we do know who possesses the authority for the repairs of these houses.

Sir, this is a simple question which this House wants to know. How has the particular person got his or her authority — the authority which the honourable senior member for St. Andrew has? [A VOICE: That is not the question.]

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of Order. The honourable and learned senior member for St. Joseph referred to Rule 134 of this Chamber which reads thus:

"The House will interfere to prevent the prosecution of any quarrel between members, arising out of debates or proceedings of the House, or any Committee thereof."

May I sir, venture in anticipation to the clarification of that to remind you of what you know quite well in May's fifteenth Edition on Parliamentary practice, Page, 440, which deals with that same subject matter: "Challenges and Quarrels." I think that will assist us in interpreting of this matter. It reads thus:—

"The Commons will also interfere to prevent quarrels between Members, arising from personal misunderstanding in a select committee. The sending of a challenge by one Member to another, in consequence of words spoken by him in his place in Parliament, is a breach of privilege, and is dealt with accordingly, unless a full and ample apology be offered to the House."

[Asides] I am not dealing with the asides or rude, attempted interruptions which I have been hearing. I have only pointed out that in Sir Thomas Erskine May's Treatise on the "Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament" it is explained what happens should there be quarrels arising from a personal misunderstanding and I referred to it. It is on page 440, Chap. XVIII and the publishers of May's Fifteenth Edition are Messrs Butterworth & Co., Ltd.

Mr. LEWIS: If Your Honour will look further, you will see something with respect to the question of privilege arising. That is dealt with in our Rules too.

Hon. G. H. ADAMS: I am definitely not going to say what I would say in another place, but I would say this in a general way. When persons read and tell you their authority to speak, and when those persons who speak equally understand and apparently understand English better, and when such a person takes a sentence out of its particular context and lays that down in a particular context, then no language is too strong to use of that person.

"May" quotes a single instance. Everybody who has read that knows that May is quoting a single instance. "May" says: "The Commons will also interfere to prevent quarrels between Members, arising from personal misunderstanding in a select committee." Now it gives a reference and that happened in Select Committee once. Anybody who reads it will know that. That is only a particular instance and the learned, doubly learned, honourable senior member for St. Lucy gets up and wastes the time of the House by quoting that, apparently saying that Your Honour's Ruling is wrong.

Mr. BRANCKER: Mr. Chairman, I would be the last person to say that your ruling is wrong, because your rulings when untrammelled, are some of the best rulings given in any Colonial Chamber. I was pointing out that as regards any person who makes remarks under the heat of a quarrel, an explanation of what is meant from such words arising from personal misunderstanding was dealt with in May's under Chapter XVIII — Maintenance of Order during Debate. I am suggesting that it must be a quarrel in the sense of the term to constitute an offence against Rule 134. Sir, I am still a practising lawyer.

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

On motion of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of a Resolution in Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. M. E. COX, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA in each case, the Resolution was read a first and second time and then agreed to.

FEDERATION

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this is not a regular meeting of this House, it is a Special Meeting. We had a Message read today from His Excellency the Governor which calls for a Reply. I do not know if you will accept the suggestion that a Select Committee be appointed to allow a Reply to His Excellency's Message to be made speedily.

What I would like to know is what is going to be the procedure for complying to the request in the last sentence of that Message. I am referring to Message No. 38/1955 from His Excellency the Governor to the Honourable the House of Assembly regarding representation at the final Conference on Federation to be held in London in February 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the last sentence?

Mr. LEWIS: The last sentence states that the Honourable the House is invited to concur in the appointment of the delegation.

Mr. SPEAKER: As a matter of fact, I certainly am not in a position to answer such queries.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the next meeting of this House is scheduled for the 10th of this month. There must be some Reply to this Message from His Excellency the Governor this month or very early next month.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: This House now stands adjourned.

7.40 p.m.